

NAVAL OFFICERS' WORLD AFFAIRS SEMINAR

John Morley

U. S. Accredited War Correspondent & News Analyst

23 September 1953

25X1A2g

Today's speaker is a United States accredited War Correspondent and syndicated columnist, recently back from his third consecutive assignment around the world in the past three years and his tenth trip to Korea since 1950. He comes to us today direct from St. Louis where he addressed the 35th National Convention of the American Legion and Legion Auxiliary under the auspices of the National Legion Auxiliary, with such dignitaries as Secretary of State John Foster Dulles and Vice President Richard Nixon. He is author of the syndicated column "After Hours". His writings have appeared in the Saturday Evening Post, Ladies Home Journal and other magazines and newspapers throughout the world. His subject today is "Eyewitness 1953 World Report...Uncensored". Mr. John Morley.

* * *

My thanks to you, Captain McIntyre...and to your Seminar Committee for the compliment of your invitation to speak to you today. It is a personal pleasure for me to be speaking to officers and personnel of the 13th Naval District here in typical Navy atmosphere. You see, during the past several months and several years I have been exposed to Navy surroundings from private visits with Secretary of the Navy Anderson and Admiral Arthur Radford, as well as the more active side of the Navy when I covered the 77th Task Force off Korea waters, reporting their heroic achievements in defense of our ground troops in Korea.

Because you have made me feel a part of your team in Korea and your generous reception here this afternoon, I am inspired to let my hair down, so to speak, and report things to you which normally I would not make available for public consumption.

Reporter's Responsibility is to Report

Our job as reporters is to report. It is not to impose personal opinions, pretend final 'answers', or presume powers of prediction from a private crystall ball. Our duty is to rush to the hot-spots of the world and report what we SEE...drawing upon our experience for sober, unemotional, unbiased evaluation of FACTS. Given the naked truth, intelligent Americans can assist their Government in determining the 'answers' that safeguard America.

My report this afternoon begins from the West Coast to Washington, D.C. and then from Europe through the Middle East, India, Africa, Southeast Asia to Formosa, Korea and back to the West Coast. I left California in February, 1953 and opened my lecture season this last September in St. Louis.

RETURN TO CIA
LIBRARY

Approved For Release 1999/09/10 : CIA-RDP83-00423R001200840002-4

The most significant reaction in Washington during my interviews with the President, members of his Cabinet and Congressional leaders was the spiritual emphasis which seems to permeate in high governmental and military offices. Time and time again I heard important officials refer to their Christian faith more often than I have ever heard it before in my frequent trips to Washington.

I was impressed with a new emphasis on security. My briefing as a War Correspondent on my way to cover military zones in Korea was more thorough than any previously experienced. In view of past laxities, as proven by recent exposes of espionage, it is heartening and encouraging to observe this greater vigilance and careful scrutiny of men like myself assigned to confidential military zones. I learned that this careful screening is conducted on personnel into other phases of governmental assignment.

I left Washington for Europe with more optimism that the Ship of State, civilian and military, was in more capable hands than at any time in the past.

Eyewitness Report from Britain

It was my privilege again to interview the eminent Prime Minister of Britain, Sir Winston Churchill, and other prominent members of the House of Commons. Since my last interview with him, he had been honored by his appointment as a "Knight of the Garter". I slipped up by calling him, "Mr. Churchill" and he reminded me, smiling, that he was now a Knight of the Garter and should be addressed as "Sir". I asked him how he felt as a Knight of the Garter. His answer was typically Churchillian. "I don't feel a damn bit different, except that I have a terrible time keeping up the other sock."

In an interview with Mr. Richard Butler, Secretary of the Exchequer, I asked him for the latest report on the financial condition of Britain. You will be surprised, as I was, to get his optimistic reply. "We are better off financially today," Mr. Butler said, "than at any time since the end of World War II." Here are the facts of Mr. Butler's optimism.

Early in 1953 the British Government reduced income taxes about 18% across the board. They reduced or eliminated most of the amusement and sporting events' taxes, as well as taxes on hundreds of personal items and household goods. This economic windfall for the British people resulted in Britain collecting more taxes than prior to these reductions. It is another proof that when you give people an incentive for more take-home pay, they work harder and produce more with the result that the government treasury is ahead of the game.

CHURCHILL in Bad Health

Prime Minister Sir Winston Churchill is a very sick man. I was told by people close to him that he had suffered two strokes this year. At 79 he is declining fast and considerable anxieties are heard in London as to his ability to carry on. He certainly was in no physical condition to go to Moscow, as was recently rumored. Foreign Secretary Anthony Eden, in announcing that the Prime Minister was not going to Moscow, evidently convinced Sir Winston that his physical condition did not warrant it.

Eyewitness Report from Germany

The brilliant victory of Dr. Konrad Adenauer and his more recent victory in the state of Hamburg is the most optimistic report of present day Germany. When one realizes the Communist gains in Italy and France in recent months and the declining power of Communism in Germany, we begin to realize that our former enemies have become the greatest bulwark against Soviet aggression in Europe today. Here are three figures which show the importance of Germany in the Free World today. In this Summer's critical elections, which I covered in Italy, one out of every three Italian voters supported the Communist Party. In France one out of every four voters vote Communist. In Germany one out of every 158 votes was Communist in the recent elections. This doesn't necessarily mean that the Communist Party in Italy and France is gaining converts, but that many of these increasing votes are cast by non-Communists merely as a protest against the prevailing governments. This is a very important point to understand, particularly in Italy and France, where the Communist power appears to be increasing.

The man responsible for Germany's staunch support of democratic principles and alliance with the Free World is Dr. Konrad Adenauer. This courageous Christian man, who defeated the Reds in 1953, did the same to Hitler's Nazis in 1933. His democratic principles became apparent back in the 30's when Hitler's conspiracy raised the Nazis into power in Germany. Among the few who dared to defy Hitler was the Mayor of the city of Cologne, who refused to permit the Nazi swastikas to supersede the flags of the German Republic, in those days under dying President Von Hindenburg. Because of this defiance Hitler arrested Cologne's Mayor and kept him in a concentration camp between 1933 to 1945, when the United States' victorious armies liberated Germany. The man who defied Hitler in those days was Dr. Konrad Adenauer, who today is continuing his defiance of enormous Communist pressures from the East.

Eyewitness Report from Yugoslavia

Marshall Tito, President of the Republic of Yugoslavia, is probably the most controversial figure in Central Europe today. I have had the opportunity to speak with him before and after U. S. economic assistance was made available to Yugoslavia. There is considerable misunderstanding about this Communist Dictator and whether or not the United States can afford to place such confidence in him. One day I asked President Eisenhower if he trusted Tito. This was when General Eisenhower was Supreme Head of NATO in Paris. President Eisenhower's reply was typical of most Army and Navy Commanders I have spoken to on the subject. "Mr. Morley," General Eisenhower said, "as a military man I am chiefly concerned with the creating of an army to defend Europe and the Free World against any Communist aggression. I am not concerned about Marshall Tito's politics. I know he has about a million seasoned, veteran troops. This is a greater army than all of NATO's present military manpower. I also know that Tito is a marked man by the Russians and he needs our help just as we can use his."

Trouble Inside Russia

I had an unexpected opportunity to talk to Marshall Tito during the course of a peasant outing which he and his wife, Jovanka, attended. I asked him for

his opinion on conditions inside the Soviet Union because it is generally
Approved For Release 1999/09/10 : CIA-RDP83-00423R001200840002-4
I suppose that Tito has more spies inside Russia than any other nation and
I suppose the same thing applies to the satellite countries. My impression
of his reaction and that of other Yugoslavian officials is that the days of
George Malenkov are numbered and the man to watch in Russia today is popular
Marshall Gregory Zhukov.

This is not the first time your reporter has observed this popularity
of Marshall Zhukov. In some dozen trips behind the Iron Curtain since 1950
I noticed that more and more of Zhukov's portraits were displayed in the
windows of residences and stores which used to display the pictures of
Stalin and Lenin. This is a very significant change of events. When one
realizes there are 200,000,000 people in Russia and less than 5,000,000 of
these are Communists, it is apparent that the popularity of a Soviet Marshall
would be greater than that of a Communist leader. The rise of Marshall
Zhukov dates back to 1943 when he engineered the military strategy that led
to the surrender at Stalingrad of German General Von Paulus and 350,000
Nazis. It was this military catastrophe against Hitler that broke the back
of the Nazi invasion of Russia in 1943. Marshall Zhukov is also credited
with liberating Moscow and Leningrad. By the end of the war in 1945, he
was unquestionably the only Russian actually challenging the popularity of
Dictator Stalin. Because of this challenge to his Communist throne, Stalin
removed Zhukov and demoted him to the Odessa military garrison, taking him
out of the limelight of Russian popularity. After the death of Stalin this
Spring, his successor, Georgi Malenkov, was immediately challenged by
Lavrenti Beria, head of the Soviet Secret Police. To meet this challenge
Malenkov needed the support of Zhukov and the Red Army, so he brought
Zhukov back to Moscow from Odessa and with his assistance arrested Beria
and his lieutenants and threw them into prison. As matters stand today, it
is the opinion of Marshall Tito and other experts on conditions inside
Russia that Zhukov is in an excellent position to challenge the power of
the Communist Party. It is true that Zhukov carries a Communist Party card,
but like Konev, Timoshenko and other Red officers, their membership in the
Communist Party is more for reasons of expediency and promotion rather than
belief in the Communist ideology.

The Trouble in Trieste

The tempest of Trieste really began in 1919 when the Allies took
Trieste from Austria-Hungary and gave it to our then ally, Italy, after
World War I. Secretary of State John Foster Dulles was President Woodrow
Wilson's righthand man at Versailles and was in on this deal. "This Trieste
problem is going to give us trouble some day," Dulles was quoted as saying
to President Wilson in 1919. Today, it appears to have been the under-
statement of the Century.

From 1919 to 1945 Italy ruled Trieste and during these 26 years forcibly
took away the land of Austrians, Croats and Slovenes and offered it as a
reward to Italian citizens willing to migrate to Trieste. This is the reason
why today there are five times more Italians than any other nationality in
Trieste.

At the end of World War II, with Italy on the losing end, the Allies
took Trieste from them and under the 1947 Peace Treaty ceded the Isonzo

Valley and part of Trieste to Yugoslavia, later revising it under the Morgan Line into British and U. S. Zone A and Yugoslavian Zone B. Later, in 1948, to help DeGasperi defeat the Communists in Italy, the U. S. and Britain promised Italy a part of Trieste. About the same time, in order to get Tito closer to our side after Russia threw him out of the Communist Cominform, we made further promises of more territory around Trieste to Yugoslavia. The trouble started a few weeks ago when the United States and Britain announced their decision to withdraw their troops from Zone A, and inviting Italy to take it over in accordance with the previous agreement of 1948. As matters stand now, our troops are still in Zone A waiting for further diplomatic developments.

Eyewitness Report from Italy

U. S. diplomacy in Italy in recent months has taken a serious setback. This is due principally to what is considered by Italians I talked to in Rome as American interference in their internal political affairs. They refer to the statement of Ambassador Claire Booth Luce, who implied in her Milan speech during the heat of the recent Italian political campaign that unless the Italian people voted for Alcide DeGasperi, economic aid to Italy would be reviewed. It's the same old story of untrained American citizens appointed to important foreign posts without the proper experience and training in international affairs. We spend millions of dollars in training Generals at West Point and Admirals at Annapolis to defend us in the event of war, but we have no schools of equal stature to train our ambassadors, who could go far in avoiding conditions that necessitate the use of arms. Diplomacy should be the first line of defense for America and diplomats should at least receive as thorough an education in diplomacy as our military officers receive in military tactics. As I travel around the world I have the privilege of visiting many of our embassies and enjoy the friendship of a number of our ambassadors. We have no doubt a number of efficient career diplomats at the head of some of our embassies. They are brilliant and capable Americans. But we have entirely too many ambassadors whose principle qualification has been that they contributed a substantial sum of money to the Democrat or Republican political pot. This practice is dangerous to the security of the United States.

A bright side to this question of ambassadors came up recently when President Eisenhower and Secretary Dulles appointed the first career woman as Ambassador of the United States in the history of this Republic. Mrs. Frances Willis of Redlands, California, our new Ambassador to Switzerland, is the first State Department career woman to be elevated to an ambassadorship. This certainly is a step in the right direction.

Eyewitness Report from Iran

The situation in Iran has been greatly improved by two things in recent months...the defeat of stubborn Mohammed Mossadegh and the renewed negotiations between British Anglo-Iranian Oil Corporation and Shah Reza Pahlevi and his sister, Princess Ashraf, who is credited with being the real power in Iran today. The Soviet Union for years has conspired to overthrow the Government of Iran by supporting the Communist Tudeh Party. Russia covets Iran for more important reasons than oil. The real reason is that Iran offers to Russia the only available waterway to the open sea. When I was in Istanbul I went to the entrance of the Black Sea and saw the Turkish mines and nets submerged in a blockade of the channel, so no Russian ship can pass through. The only water route for Russia is through Iran.

Approved For Release 1999/09/10 : CIA-RDP83-00423R001200840002-4

If the present government of Shah Reza Pahlevi profits by the mistakes of both Mossadegh and formerly his father, the senior Reza Pahlevi, whose bad record notoriously imposed upon the Iranian people, Iran will be financially able to rehabilitate itself and stay friends with the West. Britain has offered Iran an increase of oil profits from 15% to 50% which now compares favorably with the 50% royalties that American oil companies always paid for Near East oil.

Eyewitness Report from India

The report from India and Pakistan is more optimistic today than in my several previous trips in the last three years. Both Prime Minister Pandit Nehru of India and Prime Minister Mohammed Ali of Pakistan told me, during my visits in Karachi and New Delhi, that they agreed on the controversial subject of Kashmir to permit the 4,000,000 Kashmirians to vote whether they want to stay with India or go with Pakistan. Since 85% of the population of Kashmir is Moslem, it looks very much like they will vote to go with Pakistan and India will lose the most beautiful vacation land of its continent. If this plebiscite is held in March, 1954, as planned, the tensions will be removed from this explosive spot which had threatened to flare up into serious proportions in the past five years.

Eyewitness Report from Formosa

It was my pleasure again recently to be invited to the modest home of Generalissimo and Madame Chiang Kai-shek up in Grass Mountain some six miles out of Taipeh. It is always a refreshing visit for me to be with these sincere, Christian dedicated leaders of Free China. Among many questions I asked them was one inquiring for the reason that the Chinese people on the mainland did not give them greater support during the Civil War against the Communists. I was expecting them to blame American foreign policy and certain questionable representatives whom our government had sent into China, and who were more sympathetic with Communism than with the Kuomintang. But the Chiangs made no reference to any American emissaries. They simply implied that their greatest shortcoming during those critical days of 1948 and 1949 on the mainland was that they trusted too many relatives and too many friends. My visits with them are always inspired by their infinite faith in God and their dedication to the liberation of their soil.

I saw a greatly improved army under the able assistance of United States General William Chase, as well as a greatly improved Navy, thanks to the valuable contribution in '50 and '51 of Admiral Cooke.

Eyewitness Report from Korea

This was my 12th trip to Korea since 1950. I covered the last Chinese offensive this July, the Armistice signing at Pan-mun-jom on July 27, and for a brief period events following the truce. One can fill a book with observations on Korea. I can say frankly to you, men of the Navy, that all of your heroic efforts on the seas and our other military contributions by air and by land would be utterly wasted if we resorted to any policy of appeasement during this Armistice period. Our miscalculations in Korea are known to most of you. For three years we seemed to have no will to

bring a military victory. Our previous policy was bogged down in Washington with uncertainty and reluctance to make decisions for fear of offending some of our friends, principally Britain and France. It appeared to us in Korea that United States foreign policy was trailing on the apronstrings of Britain. First, we announced we were not going to defend Korea. As early as June 1, 1950, our government considered Korea outside of our defense perimeter in the Far East. Those were the instructions to the Navy Commanders in the Pacific and to our Supreme Commander in Tokyo, General Douglas MacArthur. On June 25, when the Reds crossed the 38th parallel to invade the Korean Republic, Washington changed its mind and ordered MacArthur and a few thousand green troops into Pusan. The heroism of our armed forces was the only encouraging aspect of the whole mess in Korea. I watched our Air Force on bombing missions hold back their fire along the borders for fear they might commit an international incident in violation of their instructions from the State Department. The Yalu River sanctuary protecting the Communist MIGS is a dark chapter in our Korean experience. In the process of containment we lost over 25,000 dead, 150,000 casualties, not to mention \$21,000,000,000 that it cost the American people to prosecute the war.

This is all behind us now and the only optimistic note of the present is that our foreign policy appears to be headed toward a more realistic and promising direction. Politically, I believe, it is an exaggeration for the Republicans to claim credit for the Armistice at Pan-mun-jom. It seems to me that the Armistice was engineered by the Reds because they had reasons to believe it was to their advantage to enter negotiations. They simply accepted our terms which had been offered to them since 1951 at Kaesong.

After covering the Armistice signing at Pan-mun-jom July 27, I flew over the Communist lines near the 1½ kilometer demilitarized zone that we established. This was the same day of the signing ceremonies. Even before the ink was dry on the Armistice agreement, I saw the Communist bulldozers rolling right close to the demilitarized zone erecting new air strips in violation of their agreement at Pan-mun-jom. They have built a total of 38 air strips, some of them within 28 miles of the city of Seoul. This is additional evidence that the Reds are not sincere in their peace overtures, nor that it is wise to trust the signatures and the agreements of Communist atheists.

The Controversy over Syngman Rhee

Since returning to the United States I have heard considerable criticism of the President of the Korean Republic, Dr. Syngman Rhee. As is the usual custom back in the United States, most of the opinions on the world situation and world personalities seem to reflect opinions based on emotion and wishful thinking and politics more than on genuine facts. The case of Dr. Rhee is no exception. It seems that the greatest criticism directed against him was due at the time when he released the 27,000 prisoners who had announced their refusal to return to Communism. I was talking to Dr. Rhee during an inspection of his troops at the Front this past July and I asked him this and other questions for an official reply. First, may I bring you up to date on the facts pertaining to the so-called "volunteer prisoners" who were guaranteed protection by us in the course of a propaganda campaign which we directed.

Beginning during the Spring of 1951 and continuing through 1953, we

periodically dropped circulars from planes over the area, urging for enemy troops to surrender voluntarily, for by so doing we would extend them every facility at our disposal, including good food, clothing, etc. and promising them that they would never have to go back to Communism against their will. Over 52,000 troops deserted the Communism armies and surrendered to our side. While we called these troops volunteer prisoners, the Communists called them deserters and by International law are subject to execution.

I asked Dr. Rhee why he released the 27,000 prisoners which he did in apparent violation of his agreement with the United Nations not to interfere with the decisions of the Supreme Commander, who in this case was General Mark Clark. Dr. Rhee's reply to the effect was that it wasn't he who violated any agreement with the United Nations - it was the United Nations who violated their agreement with him and the Republic of Korea. This is the gist of the story as I gathered it from high government sources in Korea during my recent assignment. It seems that in 1951 the Korea Republic secured assurances from the United Nations that in sacrificing a part of its sovereignty in favor of the United Nations military prosecution of the war, Korea would be consulted on any major policy decisions. It was specifically understood that the United Nations would never permit any Communist interrogators to enter the Republic of Korea territory to examine or speak with any volunteer prisoners without the permission of the Government of South Korea. Dr. Rhee said to me that the United Nations violated this agreement with him by voting to allow Communist Poland, Communist Czechoslovakia, Communist Korea and China and unfriendly India to enter his prison camps to interrogate these prisoners without the permission of South Korea. The mistake we made, Korean officials told me, was not in releasing the 27,000 prisoners, but in not releasing the whole 52,000.

Our present experience certainly vindicates the decision of the South Korean Government to release the 27,000 prisoners. The Reds have come down to the neutral zone and have gone beyond the agreed process of interviewing and resort to inquisitions and intimidations. They secured the names from dog tags of these prisoners and have been known to go back to the homes of these former Korean and Chinese prisoners and intimidate their families to force their return. Even Indian General Thimayya of the Neutral Commission reported recently that the inhuman tactics of the Red inquisitors is beyond the bounds of agreements at Pan-mun-jom. I watched their shenanigans in holding our American prisoners for blackmail the same way they held those four Navy flyers in Hungary. I think we paid thirty thousand dollars apiece in blackmail for those four flyers. So long as the United States continues to pay this blackmail, so long are they going to put the squeeze on you at every opportunity.

Somebody said to me, yesterday, when I was speaking in Kansas City, "Now that the Reds have the H-bomb and we have reasonable information that they might have it, we should make compromises. Mr. Morley, we can't get tough today." Of course, just coming back from Korea where I was caught in that last offensive, having covered many of the real problems of Korea, physical, mental, and civilian and otherwise, I can assure you that I know that this

great country isn't ready to make sacrifices because the Russians may happen to have the H-bomb. The H-bomb, ladies and gentlemen, doesn't change the moral law of the United States, it doesn't change our courage and our liberty. The H-bomb doesn't change, "God give me liberty or God give me death." The H-bomb is a new weapon a very treacherous weapon and probably should be considered very seriously. We can compromise where compromises can be made honorably but the suggestion of compromising with principle is not in the character or in the disposition of the American people and I can count on the number of letters that I have been getting from the American people that they do want their military organization absolutely intact.

This idea of the shifting winds building up our defenses, year after year, all of a sudden the Congress goes on an economic binge and down go our budgets. In the next six months, up go the budgets. Well, I know it is not the intention of Secretary Wilson to operate that way because it is costly and it brings inflation and I know that those of you who are committed in our Naval organization know from practical, first-hand experience better than we know of the practicality of maintaining the standards of our military organization. I say that to all of my audiences across the country. I am a firm believer, as most of you I know are, in a military defense so long as we are being challenged from every quarter, by these atheists and communists and, finally, we are not just fighting Communism.

I wish that I could tell you that after covering seventy-five and one-hundred thousand miles around the world on this assignment, I could come back home and say to you that all you have to do is to whip these Reds in Russia and everything will be under control. I wish it were that simple because we can if we make up our minds and if we are going to be dedicated to a military war, we can win that war. We have the know-how, we have the technology and we have the brilliant military leadership, but that isn't the big problem as we correspondents see it. If I were to ask you or a civilian group, as I will, tonight, at the Club, "What do you aspire right now more than anything else in the world?" Supposing you had your choice and the power to bring it about. I would venture to say in the United States most people who have everything else will say that we want peace above anything in the world and the reason we say that, ladies and gentlemen, is because we have everything, everything that materialism can provide in this civilization.

But, if you were to ask the same question as I have asked it in audiences in Europe, in the Near East, in Asia, many, many times, "What do you aspire most right now?" The answer is always the same, it isn't peace, it isn't freedom, it is "food". Food is the number one aspiration of the billion people on earth who are hungry. So you can see the differences of opinion. Food is the problem.

So, after we defeat our Number One enemy, Communism, and we defeat these other vacuums, vacuums like untrained diplomats, vacuums like complacency and indifference, vacuums like political economies in the military organizations, vacuums of greed and selfishness, vacuums of spiritual decline, vacuums of letting somebody else do the job, of shirking our individual responsibilities, I believe frankly that after we defeat Communism and defeat these vacuums which millions of us unwittingly create, then and only then and perhaps, God willing, America will attain her greatest and final victory.

Approved For Release 1999/09/10 : CIA-RDP83-00423R001200840002-4
has caused by sending food packages across the border into East Germany. What effect did you find?

Answer: The question was asked, "Has the President's program of supplying food to East Berlin been very practical in winning friends on our side?" That question has been on the minds of many correspondents, so it is not original with me. About a year or so ago, Mrs. Morley and I were the guests of Admiral Radford at Pearl Harbor and we enjoyed several hours together. We had dinner together and this question came up. He asked me exactly the same question as you have asked because at that time I had just come from Germany and, also, at that time our country was spending a lot of money on the Voice of America and we had adopted the method of dropping these balloons with literature and circulars. They were very effective as far as they went but were not too effective because the people behind the Iron Curtain are very skeptical about any kind of propaganda.

I said to Admiral Radford, "Admiral, I would like to have you read this column." I had just finished a column on this subject and my suggestion at that time was, "Why wouldn't it be just as effective to drop from airplanes millions of these little bags; it would cost a very small amount by comparison. Take the budget away from the Voice of America and away from these circulars and just fill these balloons and all of these tea bags with coffee or sugar. You know coffee and sugar sell for about \$15 a pound behind the Iron Curtain. I think that would be an effective plan and the President is absolutely on the right track in doing more of that sort of thing. While I was in Germany, the Communists put warning signs on the billboards that if you crossed into the Western sector to pick up these packages you were going to be shot. Well, there were thousands of Germans who crossed and got these packages and nobody was shot.

Question: The suggestion that the people we are trying to reach in the major target areas (as you so ably put it) are deep inside the Soviet Union frontiers and by reaching them with anything of this character we would be violating frontier regulations. Would you extend your comments further?

Answer: There are about eighty million people living within the perimeter of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania which is solidly Russia today. Thus, we can forget that part. But, I am thinking principally of Poland, Bulgaria, Romania, Czechoslovakia and Hungary and I believe that if we could accomplish our purpose in those areas first, the other areas would soon learn our way. The people of Poland who live on the Soviet frontier speak Russian. They intermingle, they frequently cross the frontiers in the deep Soviet and Polish Communist sectors so it wouldn't be too long, without any effort on our part, and we could infiltrate into the Soviet area without any legal, diplomatic violations. I like to do first things first. Thus, I am convinced in my own mind that the Soviet people would revolt. I am not saying this just generally speaking, but because I have had first-hand experience and I know that even some of the military, the Red Army officers and men, are very bitter against Communists. I have seen evidence of it in the days when our relations with the Russians were more friendly

and we mingled a little more. It is dangerous to fool around with the Soviet frontier but there is a tremendous amount of work that we can do in the so-called milder Communist areas where the people are just waiting for this economic assistance.

Question: In the areas where our economic aid has been substantial, did you find civilian resentment?

Answer: In the first place, I have heard rumors and statements from people travelling abroad, usually tourists who go through in six weeks or several months and come home and have all the answers. They talked with a couple of taxi drivers, they had a bad deal with the handling of money, tips or something, and they came back with a lot of unfavorable statements. I have seen polls taken by local Communist parties where they appear to be very unfavorable. I would say, frankly, that if I had any access to a Gallup poll, or other accurate poll, I would be in a better position to answer that question. My answer is a biased answer, frankly because of my friends, natives and nationals of the countries that I visit who are on the side of America; I wouldn't be caught dead with them if they weren't. They are very friendly to our government. They compliment us. They thank us for our aid so the reports I bring back are reports that are very favorably on the side of the United States. However, I have heard unfavorable reports which I place in the same category as the patient getting well and screaming at the doctor.

Question: Would you comment on the attitude of people abroad on the McCarthy investigations and the McCarthy personality and also whether or not his solutions, his answers, his investigations, have been favorably interpreted abroad?

Answer: In the first place, McCarthy probably is better known in Europe with the possible exception of President Eisenhower or Mrs. Roosevelt and the reason for that is publicity. Senator McCarthy has all sorts of ideas like Beria. He is on the front page of every newspaper in the country today with this Beria fellow, but I don't know how accurate it is. However, he has a very uncanny faculty of getting himself on the front page. I have known Joe McCarthy for a long time and, frankly, I believe that he is sincere in his concern about Reds infiltrating into government but he is also sincere about wanting Joe McCarthy to be the Vice-Presidential candidate in 1956. He apparently wants to climb the political ladder as every other senator aspires to do.

It was my privilege during World War II to have served in a branch of Naval Intelligence as a civilian counter-espionage agent. I know something about spies, Russian, Communist, Nazi, Italian, and Japanese. I remember Alger Hiss, when everyone else thought he was one swell fellow, your government knew all those negative facts, but evidently the Department of Justice didn't have the courage to do anything about it. It took a Senate investigation to wake the people up. In spite of the fact that Joe McCarthy does step on some people's toes, and he has been stepping on many of them in the

Army recently, too, even in spite of all these things. I believe nothing else, to awaken the people of America to the terrible danger of Communism.

Now, Europe doesn't like it. As you know, Europe didn't like General Eisenhower. If you wanted some facts during the campaign last November, Europe was predominately on the side of the Democratic party because the party gave them the biggest hand-outs. They did not want President Eisenhower to win. I can give you one good example why they didn't and the same thing works against anyone else in America who is critical against American foreign aid as Joe McCarthy has been. I remember one day when I asked General Eisenhower, after my address to the Chamber of Commerce in Paris in 1951, "General, how do you feel about this economic aid? Are we getting full value for the dollar?" General Eisenhower said that he was very disappointed with the kind of goods that some of our Allies were buying with American financial aid. Specifically, I said, "What do you mean, General?" He said, "I don't like the purchases by Britain of scotch whiskey and cigarettes. Those are not as essential at this particular time as other things that they could buy." Now I didn't report it but other reporters did print it, and it brought the wrath of God upon the shoulders of Eisenhower. A few months after that began the agitation and by 1952 he came back to America and no European was going to trust the Republicans in continuing economic aid. So, not only Joe McCarthy but even the President became unpopular because he began to sharpen his economic principle.


Question: Would you comment on socialism in England?

Answer: The people of Britain love it, especially when it comes to socialized medicine and other features of the former labor economy. You can go up and down the street where they get false teeth for nothing and get three or four sets. You can get corsets for nothing and medicine for nothing. You can buy about a hundred dollars worth of medicine for one shilling if you get all the order filled at one time. It costs a shilling every time you get an order, at the present time. You can see that some of the people find it to a great advantage. I have seen it for one shilling in different parts of Britain but in some areas it costs a little bit more, in some areas it costs nothing. It just depends upon the time that you are there and under what conditions. Most areas in Britain do not place a cost on the filling of prescriptions.

In addition, there are a lot of free so-called medical appliances given to the British people and, by and large, it is my opinion that the greatest section of the lower class people of Britain like to get their medical treatment without any charge. It is a popular single item. As far as the more intelligent, as far as the people who do some thinking, they realize this lends itself to other socialized practices.

Approved For Release 1999/09/10 : CIA-RDP83-00423R001200840002-4

25X1A2g

Attachment for Seattle Process Sheet Report 4160-A 

"Eyewitness 1953 World Report...Uncensored"

Approved For Release 1999/09/10 : CIA-RDP83-00423R001200840002-4