Dear Mrs. Roosevelt:

The Saturday ceremonies and the luncheon made an inspiring occasion for me. May I thank you again for a most happy day?

Our few moments spent together in conversation brought back to me the many gracious and helpful things that you have done for me through the years. I am always grateful for your example and your constant inspiration. Your interest in my new work here is deeply appreciated. I thought perhaps you would like to have the reprint of the first Department issue.

Most cordially,

Margaret Hickey, Editor
Public Affairs Department

Mrs. Franklin D. Roosevelt
Val-Kill Cottages
Hyde Park, New York
Many thanks for your letter & for sending me your article on maps &c. It was very much appreciated. If there is anything you can do by way of it, of course.

DHC
IT'S TIME TO VOLUNTEER AGAIN

By Margaret Hickey
Editor, Public Affairs Department

Announcing the Public Affairs Department

To the JOURNAL's long history of interest in, and support of, the citizenship activity of American women, is now added this department concerned with public affairs. The Public Affairs Department wants to help you and your community
outside fringes where people talk about "doing something" to actual achievement.
Bruce Gould and Beatrice Blackmore Gould

But after victory the feeling of emergency slipped away. The habit of giving time and talent to activities outside the home was broken. Many became the "tired women of peace."

At a result, brave postwar plans are still on paper. We still talk of access to good schools as the birthright of the American child, but actually only 30 per cent of the children from lower-income homes go through high school. The millions and a half youngsters who left classroom sit-outs during the war are not picking up their broken study courses. To help 16,000,000 youths between 14 and 20 "grow into their best selves" will require wise counseling and sound vocational preparation.

Community advisory centers number 3,000, but fully 5,000 are needed for veterans and the estimated 52,000,000 or approximately 27 per cent of our population. The second wave of veteran's problems is long-term ones—housing, employment, education. A recent Census Bureau survey shows that veterans are living in trailers or rented rooms or doubled up with other families. Close to 2,000,000 are not yet drawing pay checks or school credits: 85,000 are unemployed; another 1,060,000 (October, 1946) live upon 25 weekly unemployment benefits.

The Public Affairs Department will make it possible to share knowledge and experiences gathered from those who are working on these great community problems. It will report to you on outstanding work being done—for one peg of actual community experience is worth volumes of plans on paper. It will bring you the story of people working out specific problems. It is far more effective to go to the mayor's office with a petition from your neighborhood for a new playground than it is to talk to him about juvenile delinquency.

The Public Affairs Department will devote itself primarily to the story of well-planned community housekeeping. It will bring you the work of women's clubs, civic education, veterans', farm and labor organizations.

It will not neglect internal beginnings. When groups of neighbors and friends start out to work for a new youth center or a child-guidance clinic, these efforts many times lead to the best results. There will be a consultation service. Treatment for common community ills of uncommon importance to every citizen will be outlined in helpful reports and articles.

The Public Affairs Department will help you to volunteer again—your leadership, your interest and your skill—in the battle ahead for a decent and peaceful world. The task is a continuing one. It's action from the bottom up that counts—through working with people.
The four children scurried like squirrels across the park. Joyce, who was just five and knew about much matters, fell behind the others to pick up a baby leaf. Carl, sagging his brother David on, yelled, "I'm the leader, I'm the leader!" Behind them Mrs. Ruth Wagoner, a shrill but gentle woman, yelled, "Watch that snow. Don't step in it."

In the distance the snow-capped Rockies were huddled in clouds; here in the park, the lake, agitated a dusky blue in the gray dawn, lay at peace in the Denver-sharp sunlight.

It was another source of work or high-mindedness. To all intents and purposes, Mrs. Wagoner was simply a woman enjoying herself, the children and the dappled city park. To all intents and purposes the children were simply children, as are most children. Yet, not too far away, in the dusty-brown building which houses all Denver's welfare organizations, this outing was neatly catalogued under the BX. Mrs. Wagoner was listed as: "volunteer—nursery training," while the children were listed: "orphans. Denver Orphan's Home."

This outing, indeed, was Mrs. Wagoner's Friday afternoon outing for her community, at once her chosen cheer and her pleasure. No one seeing her could guess at the drive, the training, the discipline that made these outings successful. Just as an expert mechanic makes piano playing appear to be child's play, so the soft smile and relaxed rhythm of Mrs. Wagoner's own body belie the functional value of his contributions to running a community welfare bureau.

It was that card in the office—the Volunteer Community Service office—in downtown Denver which proved Mrs. Wagoner's worth. The fact that she enjoyed her work was symptomatic of the spirit of that office and of her community; to the highly organized, machine-rutteled civilization in which we live, spirit is no longer enough. The type of volunteer who was once described as "a person with a lump in her throat and nothing in her head" is today as out-of-date as the bootblack.

Volunteer work today, to be effective, requires not only success in the job to be done, but this too: a businesslike approach to the job and a willingness to accept the necessary training and supervision demanded for it.

In short, Lady Beautiful is the volunteer worker—with the accent on worker—is in, Mrs. Wagoner may look like Lady Beautiful as the members through the park, but Lady Beautiful would never have taken the two years of nursery-school training Mrs. Wagoner undertook, would never have come rain or shine every Friday to pick up there, five, five or six orphans for the park or museum, would never have let the Girl Scouts invade her home two nights a week—and never, never would have been encouraged in her efforts by the hardheaded business men and women, when all is said and done, to back the welfare organizations of today through their support of the Community Chest.

It was the Community Chest and its partner, the Council on Social Planning, which brought community co-ordination and streamlined efficiency to Denver's welfare volunteers and a half-years ago. There were the days, remember, when in each city the threat of war drew hundreds and thousands of men and women out of their homes into the life of their communities and community asking, "What can we do to help?" There was a danger that those volunteers would be swallowed up in inefficiency and the red-tape mechanization that rose high on every place. Before these dangers could become more than small warning shadows, however, the Denver Community Chest stepped in and created the Volunteer Community Service office—a three-days-a-week office of the volunteers, the agencies, the organizations, an office which would eliminate overlapping, serve as a clearing office and serve as a clearing office to match the volunteers' abilities and the work crying to be done.

With Mrs. Loe T. Fialer, veteran civic leader and past president of the League of Women Voters, as its first chairman, the office began to function on a business basis. It was decided that a trained social worker should direct its operations, and Mary Alice Galister was selected. Her training qualified her for membership in the American Association of Social Workers, but her background also included volunteer community work, and, as a crowning touch, she was a native Denverite.

Under Miss Galister's careful but quick hand the office soon provided practical answers to the ever-revolving volunteer cries of, "What can I do?" To the community, it gave assurance that what the volunteer did do would be needed work. To the agency and club—the highly organized Red Cross and the local, newest Proto Club alike—it gave an understanding of what other agencies and clubs were doing, checked references of volunteers, maintained standards and in general created the businesslike atmosphere without which welfare work becomes well-intentioned nonsense.

It had as guide the veteran St. Louis Central Volunteer Bureau. It had as examples scores of other similar organizations developing throughout the country. It had as support the Local Council of Social Planning, the Community Chest and, back of them, the benefic national body of these groups, Community Chests and Councils, Inc., with its advisory service to volunteer offices headed by Dorothy de la Pole. The Community Chest—personified by businesswomen—first pulled to gather diverse welfare groups into a common budget and set the seal of bottom approval upon their activities; it was both economically and socially sound that this same group should now support the need to convert willing eagerness into an asset, instead of a liability.

After the war, it would have been relatively easy for Denver to close its office. There was, as always after the storm, the smell of apathy, the rest after work. The hundreds of phone calls answered by, "Well, I thought I'd just skip it a bit," "Later on, maybe, but, right now—no."

But those who looked close-eyed at the last seventeen-year-olds running the streets; the crowded, dingy rooms in the juvenile detention home; the climbing cost of living and the descending figures on available nurses, teachers, doctors—they knew that now more than ever, the volunteer's hand and heart were needed desperately. The Denver office never thought of closing.

Today Denver is one of the ninety cities throughout the nation with a central working office for volunteers. Because of its activity and the feeling touch of its director, the office provides a fine basis for study. It is by no means perfect, but like a healthy newborn baby, it's alive, and kicking. And growing widely. It is now in itself a business process of fulfilling the seven-point blueprint of a good volunteer agency, as laid down by Miss de la Pole.

A good volunteer office, Miss de la Pole says, should be prepared to:

1. Receive requests for volunteers from agencies that need help. Eighty agencies call upon the Denver volunteers' office. The "request book" runs like a diary, lists each request. They include: "State Society for Crippled Children wants 50,000 envelopes stuffed with Easter seals"; "Girl Scouts need two leaders"; "Detention home wants room decorated"; and so on.

Miss Galister and her secretary, Mrs. Electa Ziegler, handle all requests, fulfilling them swiftly, or checking back with the agency on delay. (Continued on Page 110)
2. RECRUIT VOLUNTEERS, REGISTERING AND CLASSifying VOLUNTEERS WITH SKILLS AND TALENTS. Denver's recruiting job is weak, but the October register boasts 562 tried-and-true volunteers, though some are from earning money by typing, mimeographing to dollmaking, child care and recreational groups. Most Denver women would rather work with children or babies.

3. GIVE AN ORIENTATION COURSE FOR VOLUNTEERS. Denver once insisted on attendance at an annual these work orientation course, but by this time she is delighting in the variety of candidates. The course provides on-the-job training and supervision. Volunteers retire in defeat if they feel they are not doing a job well.

4. MARry JOBS WITH SKILLS AND REFER THE VOLUNTEER. A cross-referencing system is the backbone of the Denver volunteers office. Denver can boast two trained registered librarians, a score of trained social workers, dozens of typists and many other specialists for social jobs—as well as "graduate" volunteers who have got their work training in the school of experience. Volunteer volunteers are carefully interviewed before placement; the "right job for the right volunteer" is the watchword.

5. Lioo OF BOTH THE AGENCIES USING VOLUNTEERS AND THE VOLUNTEERS SERVING THE AGENCIES. Miss Gallacher runs a private complaint clinic, and both volunteers and agencies are encouraged to present their difficulties. If two volunteers report lack of work, lack of interest in the volunteer or a nonsensible approach on the part of an agency, the agency is ruled off the list of those served, with the reminder that if and when its attitude changes, the agency can call again. Volunteers who are responsible about their work are similarly treated, but the volunteer who is unhappy, though dutiful in her job, is redirected to another job.

6. RECOgnition OF VOLUNTEERS. So closely knit and personally integrated is the Denver volunteers' office that recognition of volunteer work and a sense of personal pride in one's accomplishments has not been needed. There is also a hang-over of distance for the generation of wartime because of the badges. However, the office plans shortly to adopt the V-V with the stars (great seals, you know) which is the national award for 100 hours of volunteer service. The Denver Community Chest this year, for the first time, awarded dependable workers a red-feather emblem.

7. STEp OUT OF THE PICTURE WHEN THE VOLUNTEER HAS PROVED HIS LOYALTY AND ABILITY TO THE SATIsFACTORY of the agency he serves. So truly does Denver's volunteer office serve, but not need of the agencies' business that the agencies now, by and large, are registering their member workers with the office. This means the American Association of University Women, for example, can be called upon as a group, or individually for needed work. It also means that users of volunteers, such as the clinic, can rely on the quality of the help when they have trained.

Because the Denver volunteer is friend-to-friend feeling of the Denver volunteer office, the tasks of recruiting and recognition have been neglected for more pressing administrative work. To date, the best volunteers have been interested through friends and, similarly, have received their training without seeing other workers or their jobs. It is usually true, however, that active campaigns are needed to gather in the what-can-I-do women and the nobody-ever-asked-me-girls, and thus enlarge the scope of the bureau's work.

One of the most important past successes in the field of private welfare also have proved the value of some reward other than "psychic income." For example, the Junior League—an organization fast becoming better known for its community work than for its social standing—sends a series of story cards to any woman who does not fulfill a hard program of civic service. Two warning cards, red and blue, are sent any girl failing in her responsibilities. Then comes the third card, a yellow one, and the fourth, the red card.

Denver's specialty, however, is its invention of the "at-home volunteer." Recognizing the need of the young mother to give her children the right touch to their community and, while she cannot leave her home, Miss Gallacher asks the volunteers to receive assign- ments which could be completed at home. Now, like so many bees at work on a single honeycomb, all over Denver mothers of infants and toddlers and daily conducting surveys, making patterns, checking lists by sleuthing, creating, writing, making cards, distributing them to her neighbors. One young mother keeps her hand in the musical world by teaching a crippled boy to play the piano; another accompanies on the piano who could not otherwise afford to practice her singing. Mrs. Bowen, who lives just down the block from the park, also gets the Denver women two evenings a week to let the Girl Scouts in. A number of graduate "at-homes" now work in agencies; several have become board members. The tapping of this reservoir of youthful energy and talent is a real contributon.

Denver is also doing valiant and special service in another new field: that of finding and checking board members. Time was when the work of a board member was largely limited to pricing before the monthly meeting and perusing at the annual banquet. Now a wasteful or haphazard budget gets short shrift from the Community Chest; and the thoughtful chairman, board member or president is likely to see his own time wasted through the inefficiency of others. Thus the well-run organization is now lacing to its board members. An example is the Florence Crittenden Home in Denver. When new trustees were needed recently, the home's veteran president, Mrs. A. L. Oswald, sought volunteers who were interested in "doing" as well as "being." She asked her board member for advice. Counsel. Miss Gallacher, checking her files, helped her rebuild her board. Today six of the home's twelve board members are trained civic workers with a knowledge of the community and of welfare work, as well as special interests in guidance and homemaker service to unmarried mothers. The office is now making a file of all the city's board and committee members to eliminate overwork and overlapping even in this top-flight group of volunteer workers.

Denver's boys and girls are volunteers too. Girl Scouts are registered toymakers, envelope stuffers and addressers. Several youngsters in the community center in Denver's poorest neighborhood, across the tracks, set dolls for the city-wide Santa Claus Workshop, where yearly supplies of food, clothing, toys and jewelry are "bought" by stamps given on those relief. Students from Lorena Heights College work in the community centers. Boys and girls from the Aaron Grove Junior High School social-science class redecorated a room in the City-Hill home; the kids meant to line up the walls. Eventually it is expected that academic encouragement will spread in S. L. Lewis, where an after-work is an established beat in the living room of the town, Dr. Stuart Queen, dean of Washington University's Liberal Arts College, suggested a project: the use of the sociology term paper, and Stowe Teachers College demands fifty hours' work in a recreational agency before graduation.

Few men are registered with Denver's volunteer office, although Community Chest work is taken for granted among businessmen. Three couples, however, are listed; veterans of the war work, they are serving as chaperones at community-center dances. But many who found work to do at night during the war are now idle, though willing, and it is hoped that work will soon be found for them. There will be—there is no lack of interest—recently a stenographer volunteer wanted to work at an all-day health meeting but could not find someone to stay with her little girl until another volunteer was found to baby-sit; a group of women have established a lending service for forms for high-school girls who otherwise could not take part in school dances, recitals or graduation ceremonies; and one volunteer who works at a telephone answering service, who could not otherwise afford to practice her singing. Mrs. Bowen, in town, Mrs. Bowen took a boy of woods through the airport hangars.

Work—and pleasure—is also found for the elderly. One woman of seventy-one arrived one morning before the office was open in a detective mood. She said she was mad because she knew there was so much to be done and "everyone wants to put me on the shelf." Miss Gallacher put her to work instead. A retired school teacher, she has since given several hours a week serving as a reading aide to children. Mrs. Pearson's (Illinois) 400-strong Central Volunteer Bureau is run by the Chicago Fair. Cramped by arthritis, she volunteered by phone, and has since started a clipping file for the bureau, and edited the manual. Boston has had great success with an "Are you a theory tester?" recruiting campaign. Married, notworking women who were educated to become sociologists, psychologists or other specialists are encouraged to put their skills to work.

The effect on volunteer workers of their work is as valuable to the workers as the work they give to the community. Many have volunteered because they felt a sense of obligation. "Democracy isn't God-given," one woman said. "You have to work to make it work." Miss Gallacher, in her own words, "We set up a women's council for several years of service, said that while they had started with enthusiasm, they also worked with a sense of real pleasure. "I get so much more out of working than I ever put in," was a frequently heard comment. Services for our ailing, aching, and worried the family too; children and husbands enjoyed hearing about and receiving the "good news" on the telephone. One woman got a "given up" anything in order to do volunteer work; most of friendly, sociable Denver belongs to book clubs as well as bridge clubs, and so do its volunteer workers. "It takes organization," Mrs. Clarence Aschenbrot said.

"That I think the best answer of what community work means to many families is proved by this: we in the potato club held our meeting on Saturday afternoon when our husbands are home to take care of the children."

The attitude of the businesswoman toward volunteer work was stated by Milton Berrett, president of Denver's Community Chest. "Anyone who finds himself belittling it ought to ask himself: Where would we be without it?" he said. "And this year, with the rising cost of an old school and the typical costs of the tips of the community services due to the war, the work given by volunteers is really needed—and really appreciated."

The attitude of the professional worker toward the new volunteer is also appreciative.

Kenneth Wilson, executive secretary of the chest in Denver, said he believed that it was a basic responsibility of the professional to be imaginative and resourceful in using volunteers, and to give priority to volunteer training and encouragement, just as it was the responsibility of the professional to do the work. Wilson is the volunteer director, and the returns are measurable in terms of dollars. Generosity is beyond price. Volunteer work is the recognition is the foundation upon which private social work stands. Without it, it would crumble.
Cincinnati, Ohio
April 9, 1947.

My dear Mrs. Roosevelt,

I always feel guilty when I take up your time. But I do want to tell you... I will be thinking of you very much in the next few days to come.

Some lines, both you, and our dear President, line very close to the hearts of so many.

And if I may say so, you found I associate Fala so close to the memory of Pres. Roosevelt.

I love all dogs, but Fala is Niece.
personality all of his own
with all kind good wishes

I am very sincerely yours.

(Mrs) Bee Heath
ROMISH ASPIRATION

The following is quoted from a letter by a Father O'Brien of Rochester, N. Y., and was originally printed in "La Aurora," a magazine put out by the Italian Baptist Publishing House of Pennsylvania.

"We the hierarchy of the Holy Roman Catholic Church, expect all loyal children of the church to assist the President with all our strength to see that individuals comprising the U.S. Supreme Court shall obey the President's injunctions. And, if necessary, we shall change, mend, or blot out the present Constitution so that the President may enforce his, or rather, our humanitarian program and all phases of human rights as laid down by our saintly Popes and the Holy Mother Church.

We elected our worthy President by the greatest majority ever recorded in history. We are going to have our laws made and enforced according to the Holy See, and the Pope's and the canon law of the Papal throne. Our entire social structure must be built on that basis. Our educational laws must be constructed on that and that atheism, the red peril of totalitarianism, communism, socialism and all other of like ilk and stump be driven from this fair land.

The cross was planted on our shores by staunch Roman Catholics. This land belongs to us by every right. Long enough have we compromised on every important question. Now we demand what is really ours, and we are going to have it. We will support our President in every way to obtain it, peacefully, honestly, if we may. If necessary, we are ready to fight and die for it.

We want as Cabinet Members children of the Holy Mother Church holding important positions in the entire structure of our government.

"We control America and we do not propose to stop until America, or Americans, are genuinely Roman Catholic and remain so. God help us."

The Roman Catholic Church has martyred 100 million men, women and children faithful in the Fundamental doctrine of our blessed Old Bible, and because they refused to renounce their faith and believe their apostate pagan religion.

"Have we lost our Protestant protest to Roman Catholicism, that which is our rightful heritage? The foundation on which this country was built is beginning to crumble. It was built on the Word of God by men and women who chose to worship God in the liberty of conscience, and the Bible in every respect was the example and precedent of its very law and Government. This is being ripped and blotted to pieces by compromise. There is a challenge in Communism and Catholicism. We are not righting people but systems, they are both out for world domination, and a domination that excludes our God and our Bible only in the light of their dictatorship. They have a pattern worked out and they are carrying it. Bishop Sheen of New York says: 'Some, there will only be two governments on earth, Rome and Moscow, and Protestants will have to make their choice.' (Western Value, Englewood, Colorado).

"Our only hope is for a one hundred per cent Protestant American party standing in one solid body for 100% Americanism: Americanism, Or Romanism Which? The battle is on...we face the conflict of the ages...Rome or America...Christianity or paganism. Will we allow the pope to rule America? Roman Catholics believe the pope is God on earth and his laws...are the laws of God Almighty, binding on every Catholic, with pain of eternal hell fire to disobey them...and it is the will of God to exterminate all heretics (Protestant) Church and State. In case of a conflict between the papal church and the state, every Roman Catholic is duty bound to defend the pope and his church, or lose his soul in hell forever.

This diabolical hell invented law caused the murder of Lincoln, Garfield, McKinley and made a murderous assault on Roosevelt. It caused the murder of President-elect Oregen of Mexico. It is time for Protestants to awaken, unite and act quickly. Vote this Roman curse out of the Government before our liberties are gone forever and we are burned at the stake. What Rome did when she had the power, she will do again. She has the same religion now that she had when she shot, hanged, poisoned, robbed, stoned, impaled in dungeons, beaked in ovens, buried alive, roasted on gridrons, starved, suspended by the hands, feet and hair, stuffed, blown up by powder, bored with hot irons, hanged with saws, scalped, pulled out tongues, cut eyelids off, poured boiling lead in ears and throat, tore out fingers and toe nails, tore out women's breasts with an iron hand machine, stretched them from limb to limb, locked and starved 400 men, women and children in the Tower at London, and other atrocities too numerous and numerous to mention here. Oh God, wake up the Christians." (Rev. E. D. Bailey, Presbyterian Minister, Indiana.)

Lawrence Rigdon, Sr.
Chattanooga, Tenn.
Father! Hans Schmidt Dies In Electric Chair, New York, What For? Forbidden To Speak, Sectarians Of Demons.—Reprint From Book "House Of Death and Gate Of Hell"—Evang. L. J. King, Toledo, O.

Just a few years ago (1948) Priest Schmidt stationed at Denver, Colorado, applies for a housekeeper. A poor widow with a 15 year old daughter offers her assistance. The foxy Bachelor priest said, "I will give your little daughter music lessons for your pay;" the widow slaved for the priest and delighted that her little hunchback child would receive benefits from her training. In due time a baby was born. The mother reports to the court. She tells the Bishop and demands justice or she will kill the holy priest. The court proceeds, the Bishop overrides the judge, the priest is turned over to the Bishop and is put in a monastery for six months. Poor Bishop told the court he had a weak vein and a few months under penance he would be cured, but salt peter, alum, soap crackers and sleeping on thorns don't cure this priest disease. He was removed and stationed at Louisville, Ky. in charge of a large Polish Church and convent there. School rooms crowded, and extra class is taught by a nun in a basement room back of the altar. Sweet handsome, dark complexioned little Annie Ryan is entranced by the Father priest with his sandals, etc., to loiter with him several times back of the altar. At last the trap is sprung, his beastly gratified. He ties a cord around her neck and buttocks the child to death. He puts the body in the furnace, pours oil on it and tries to burn her. God would not let her burn, he dragged the charred body out, digs a hole in the brick floor and dumps the body in its Lime and rags and the deed is accomplished, but God said in His Word, "Be sure your sin will find you out," he washed his hands as Pilot did, took his blood stained clothes and put them in the janitor's trunk in his apartment. Annie Ryan is no more. But the sequel does not end with the innocent janitor. His arrest and trial and false conviction with a long prison term is served. Meanwhile the Bishop transfers this human brute priest to a Polish Church in New York City, (the writer preached at Louisville, the court records are there.) Priest Hans Schmidt is in great New York City, in an elaborate suite of rooms playing his old game as usual. Still affected with the priest disease, penance fails to cure, (It takes the precious Blood of Jesus Christ to cure this human leprosy.) He invites his 17 year old niece to come from Poland and be his housekeeper, and take the holy veil; her parents are delighted. Sweet Annie Amueller bids her parents farewell and lands in New York harbor and her uncle meets her at the wharf and takes her to his beautiful suite of rooms. Confession follows and absolution takes place. As time goes on, two weeks before she is to become a mother the priest sharpens a long butcher knife and while in bed sound asleep he cuts her throat from ear to ear her body into six pieces, gets pillow slips from small store across the street, puts a piece of the body in each one with a weight and puts one piece at a time in a valise and gets on the Brooklyn boat and midway of the stream sitting by the rail the valise is opened and he drops the parcel over the railing, returns, and makes another trip, until on the last trip with the babe's body in the sack, with a light heart, thinking he has covered up his wicked deed is ended and wondering who his next victim will be to come under the Roman curse of forbidding to marry. "Doctrine of Devils." Timothy 4th ch. Roman Bible. A sleuth watching the actions of this Roman soldier man in disguise, grabs the beast and off to prison they go. Bushels of money was spent to save the priest but in spite of all the holy church could do and prayers to the Virgin Mary and the pleading of his superiors the case was tried, the priest convicted of the murder, was put in the electric chair at Sing Sing and cooked alive. This in spite of the canon law that a holy priest, no matter what the crime may be, must never be brought up in court of justice nor put in prison, much less much less put to death in an electric chair." Evang. King.

A few years ago while preaching in Canton, Ohio, the writer had an opportunity of meeting Mr. and Mrs. , and their little five year old daughter when the priest of a large City Church had thrice assaulted. When the mother discovered what had taken place, she bought a gun and while the priest was saying mass on Sunday morning, she shot him at the altar. The mother was exonerated by the court. (See court records in Canton, Ohio.) The whole family are now Protestant Christians. Evang. L. J. King, Toledo, Ohio.

—The Pope and Queen Elizabeth—

A brilliant Roman Catholic historian, Christopher Hollis, in his fascinating book, "The Monstrous Regiment," quotes at p. 128 a letter written by Gregory's secretary and confidant, the Cardinal of Como: "Since that guilty woman of England rules over two such noble kingdoms of Christendom and is the cause of so much injury to the Catholic faith and loss of so many million souls, there is no doubt that whoever sends her out of the world with the pious intention of doing God service, not only does not sin but gains merit, especially having regard to the sentence pronounced against her by Pius V of holy memory. And so, if these English nobles decide actually to undertake so glorious a work, your Lordship can assure them they do not commit any sin." "Your Lordship" was Philippino Sega, Papal Nuncio at Madrid.
When Pat Wilson announced his candidacy for City Commissioner he stated that he was a member of the Roman Catholic Church and the Knights of Columbus. The Roman Catholic Church teaches that we should do the things that are right and just. Pat Wilson is a man of strong principles and values. He has been a leader in our community and has always been a fair and honest man. He is the kind of person that I would like to have represent our community. He is someone who cares about the welfare of our community and the people who live here. I am proud to support Pat Wilson for City Commissioner.
Why should an American Romanist arise with such white-hot indignation to denounce the Knights of Columbus oath when it is a recorded fact that every Cardinal, Archbishop, and Bishop of the Roman Catholic Church, on taking office, takes a solemn oath of allegiance to the pope, in which occur the following words: "Heretics, schismatics and rebels to our said lord (the pope) or his aforesaid successors, I will to my utmost persecute and oppose." (Western Voice).

The Pope is considered God on earth by all members of the Roman Church, including those in America, to whose laws... common laws... are the laws of God. "Do as I say or die, and die if you say what I do." One of the canons says: Knowing the history of this state, the Catholic Church as do, the crimes they commit under the name of religion, I will take God's Word to substantiate anything I say against their Church. Jean Lucien Vinet states in his book "I Was a Priest" on page 30 the following: "We do not want to convey the impression that all priests are sex perverts. Many have escaped this tragedy due to an extraordinary will and a deep sense of brotherly love. What is the state of priests who are abnormal and sex perverts? We certainly do not know and would not risk a guess, but we will state here the estimate of a group of young priests whom we visited in a Quebec college. They thought at least ninety percent of all the priests were either sex perverts or sex addicts of some variety and degree. The Roman Church, of course, takes great pains to conceal this fact from the public. In Canada for instance, if a priest is too widely known in the town where he is stationed, he will be transferred to the East or to the West as the case may be. Priests with sex records roam the country and pervert the young as they pass." The following is from God's Word: "Therefore God also gave them up unto uncleanness through the lust of their own hearts, to dishonor their own bodies between themselves: Who exchanged the truth of God into a lie, and worshipped and served the creature more than the Creator, who is blessed forever. AMEN! For this cause God gave them up unto vile affections: for even their women did change the natural use into that which is against nature. And likewise also the men, leaving the natural use of the woman, burned in their lust one toward another; men with men working that which is unseemly, and receiving in themselves that recompense of their error which was just. Who profaned the natural use of the flesh with lust in action; they that do such things do not suffer the light of conscience: Who exchanged the truth of God into a lie, and worshipped and served the creature more than the Creator, who is blessed forever. AMEN! For this cause God gave them up unto vile affections: for even their women did change the natural use into that which is against nature. And likewise also the men, leaving the natural use of the woman, burned in their lust one toward another; men with men working that which is unseemly, and receiving in themselves that recompense of their error which was just. Who knew the judgement of God, that they which commit such things are worthy of death, not only do the same, but have pleasure in them that do them." (Romans 1:17-25). The Roman Church claims that their Church is the "Mother Church." And upon her forehead was a name written, Mystery, Babylon the Great, The Mother of Harlots and Abominations of the Earth. And I saw the woman drunken with the blood of the saints, and with the blood of the martyrs of Jesus: and when I saw her, I wondered with great admiration." (Revelation 17:5-18). The Pope claims that he is the supreme arbiter of all pastors, and all Churches, and all Governments of the world: "Let no man deceive you by any means: for that day shall not come, except there come a falling away first, and that man of sin be revealed, the son of perdition: Who opposeth and exalteth himself above all that is called God, or that is worshipped; so that he as God sitteth in the temple of God, shewing himself that he is God. For the mystery of iniquity doth already work: only he who now letteth will let, until he be taken out of the way. And then that Wicked be revealed, whom the Lord shall consume with the spirit of his mouth, and shall destroy with the brightness of his coming: Even him, whose coming is after the working of Satan with all power and signs and lying wonders." (2 Thessalonians 2:1-17). The confessional Box, Mass and Purgatory is a fraud to extort money from their members; "Thou shalt have no other gods before me. Thou shalt not make unto thee any graven image, or any likeness of anything that is in heaven above, or that is in the earth beneath, or that is in the water under the earth: Thou shalt bow down thyself to them, nor serve them: For the Lord thy God are the God of the spirits of all flesh: the Lord thy God visiteth the children unto the third and fourth generation of them that hate him." (Exodus 20:3-6). Note verse 26: "Neither shalt thou go up by steps unto mine altar, that thy nakedness be not discovered thereon." It is a known fact, and confirmed by many different preachers that have visited the Vatican, that there are 15 steps that visiting Catholics go up on hands and knees and kiss a tasseled stone at the top of the steps, say that the toe has been worn away because of the millions that kiss it each year. The Supreme Council, Knights Of Columbus, 4422 Lindell Blvd. St. Louis Mo. says "If you have been led to believe that Catholics worship idols and statues...then you have been deceived and misled." The deceit of Rome! "Who will have all men to be saved, and to come unto the knowledge of the truth. For there is one God and one mediator between God and man, the man Christ Jesus. Who gave himself a ransom for all, to be testified in due time." (1 Timothy 2:1-15).

"I hold my allegiance to the Stars and Stripes next to my allegiance to God alone." Any Protestant preacher that would protect a Catholic, Communist, liquor dealer, the movie the corrupt politician or accept money from such a source, is a moral coward and a compromising "pussy-footed." (Isaiah 56:10-12). (Romans 15:1-16). (Malachi 2:1-10).

Lawrence Higdon, Jr.
THE CASE OF BUCHANAN COMMITTEE vs EDWARD A. RUMELY

Dr. Rumely's Own Statement.

Memorandum to supporters and citizens in all walks
From Sumner Gerard, Trustee and Treasurer
Committee for Constitutional Government, Inc.

As Treasurer of the Committee for Constitutional Government, Inc., I, and my office, have had almost daily contact with Dr. Edward A. Rumely ever since the Committee and its predecessor Committee, The National Committee to Uphold Constitutional Government, were organized more than 14 years ago. Never have I seen any man who worked with such skill, so tirelessly, weekends, Sundays, year after year, as has Dr. Rumely during more than 14 years in the cause of safeguarding our form of government.

I wrote a friend and long-time supporter of the Committee, nationally known for his civic interest, his ability as a lawyer, but primarily for his research of decades into the history of human freedom, saying: "I cannot forbear from sending you Rumely's statement to the Chief Probation Officer, enclosed herewith. You will need no further proof that you and your good wife are backing a real patriot, if there ever was one."

He replied: "Thanks for copy of a letter to the Probation Officer. Dr. Rumely is certainly a man of great courage, good judgment and earnest purpose - of a sort that is rare. Many men have been famous for services to the cause of liberty, much less perilous and laborious than his, but liberty has never been known except during short intervals, remote from each other. Tyranny is the great fact in human history, and with the weakening of the Constitution, I fear our grandchildren will learn what personal government means. The country is more indebted to you and to Dr. Rumely and to the Committee for Constitutional Government than many people realize."

Between contempt proceedings against Dr. Rumely and similar proceedings against Secretary of Commerce Sawyer in the Dollar Steamship Line case is a ghastly paradox. The same Department of Justice, which took the position that Dr. Rumely was NOT ENTITLED TO SHOW THE JURY THAT HE ACTED IN GOOD FAITH AND UPON ADVICE OF COUNSEL, asserts in the Court of Appeals in the Sawyer case that no contempt charge should be laid against the Secretary of Commerce BECAUSE HE ACTED IN GOOD FAITH AND ON ADVICE OF COUNSEL.

Acting as Dr. Rumely did, the record shows that his defiance of the Buchanan Commit-
Mr. Edward W. Garrett
Chief U.S. Probation Officer
United States District Court
for the District of Columbia
Washington, D. C.

My dear Mr. Garrett:

I have before me your letter of May 4 and I am glad to reply forthrightly and immediately.

Your Mr. E. Fred Sweet remarked that since I had tangled repeatedly with Congressional Committees, did I have a pugnacious disposition and did I, when young, tend to get into brawls? I told him quite the contrary! I also told him that I had never taken the initiative with a Congressional Committee, but only had been obliged to resist what the Trustees of our Committee thought were unconstitutional demands.

Please note the attached booklet, "Needed Now," published when the Reverend Norman Vincent Peale was chairman of the Committee. You will find his statement of the Committee's purposes in the Prologue and Epilogue of the booklet. On page 12 you will find an account of our difficulties with the Black-Winton Committee. In that case, on my first day's testimony, a group of constitutionally-minded Senators sent secretaries to observe. During the recess, I received word that a majority of the Senate were strongly of the opinion that the Fourth Amendment was being violated in the demands upon me and that if I stood my ground, the Black-Winton Committee would be abolished. Exactly that occurred by cutting off further funds. My subpoena fees and travel expenses to Washington remain unpaid.

In that case I acted on the instructions of the Chairman of the Committee for Constitutional Government who had conferred widely with legal authorities.

Again in 1942 when the Anderson Committee, investigating campaign expenditures asked for the names of all who had given $100 or more, the Committee pointed out that it had never favored or opposed any party or candidate and was merely exercising its constitutional right of petition and therefore is not subject to the requirement of reporting. In that case on my second trial the jury acquitted. We, of course, had acted on the advice of the most eminent counsel.

In the present case, when Louis Little, the investigator of the Buchanan Committee, called first and read to my secretary the 26 requirements, I immediately said, "We will comply with 25 of the 26 questions but I am in doubt as to the 26th which calls for the names of purchasers of our books in quantity." I immediately called up the editor of Editor & Publisher and asked him what he thought, stating that I was in doubt whether such inquiry could be made of a publisher, legally. He said, "You are 100% right." His editorial appears on page 4 of the enclosed statement "Assault on Free Speech and a Free Press."

Mr. Frank Gannett, one of our Trustees wrote the Board of Trustees as follows:

"I agree that the Buchanan Committee has gone far out of bounds in considering the Committee's sale of books as coming under the Lobbying Act. I don't think they have any right to demand the names of purchasers of books and I hope our Committee stands firm in refusing to give out such information. I believe the Constitution protects the right to privacy in such matters."

Mr. Gannett is the publisher of 22 newspapers and at times has been spokesman for the entire newspaper world on constitutional issues.

We did not say immediately that we would not comply but, as the record of the Buchanan Committee hearings itself shows, this question was kept open until the trustees could take counsel with eminent lawyers including Thomas J. Norton, the author of "The Constitution of the United States; Its Sources and Its Application," selected by the Hon. James Beck of the American Bar Association as a model of its kind. This is a well-known fact.
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Likewise, the FBI might be informed that we are a major publisher in the field of law, and that the price of our books is $39.95, but, since our Committee has a moral obligation to uphold the Constitution even to the point of exhaustion, we hope that you will not consider this action as a sales dodge.

Last Saturday a number of Appeals on the subject of the Anderson Committee were upheld with the decision that these two were not based on the constitution.

Ninety percent of the cases in the next year will be unsuccessful. Mr. John T. Flynn, the lawyer, made the move on the 27th. Those two were successful and the other two were upheld.

As a matter of fact, the Buchanan Committee, who did not have any document against us, simply put our information in a Republican newspaper.

The booklets "Needed Now" and "American Bar Association" have both been criticized, but, since these two are being published here, we hope that you will not consider this action as a sales dodge.

"This citation is here for a reason. It happened to have been brought to your attention."
American Bar Association as the most authoritative book on the Constitution available. Only 80,000 copies had been distributed by 2 large publishers during the previous 20 years. By using the methods applied in the distribution of the Bible, where one person reading it places it into the hands of another, particularly among youth, we were able to get out larger quantities. We have put out 600,000 copies, many under the donor plan, to half the colleges and universities in the United States who asked for copies to distribute to their students. When we began distributing this book in 1940, I set for myself a goal of 1 million copies. One of the purchasers of this book was a publisher in Spokane who presents a copy to all high school graduates each year. His purchases exceed the minimum set by the Buchanan Committee. Of course, there is no relationship whatever between the distribution of this book and lobbying.

Likewise, the FBI purchased hundreds of copies for use in local branches so that their agents might be informed on constitutional questions.

We are a major publishing enterprise. Of approximately 4 million copies out, half were distributed in the 8 years between 1938 and 1946, years before the Lobbying Act was passed. The charge by Chairman Buchanan, even before my appearance, that our book sales were a "phony sales dodge" to conceal large contributions was totally unfounded but that misconception was so widely lodged that even during the trial the court remarked that if asked about our book sales as a source of income for the Committee's activities, we were obliged to give the information.

I was criticized by the Trustees because an analysis by our Chairman showed that on the first 600,000 copies of THE ROAD AHEAD sold, we had a loss of 5¢ per copy because of the low 50¢ price, or $36,000. But, we were able to distribute, in round figures, 750,000 copies.

Since our Committee is dedicated to safeguarding constitutional principles, I felt that I had a moral obligation to uphold what I regarded as a basic constitutional principle, particularly since the most eminent counsel the Committee could consult and the attorney who acted for me personally, Mr. Neil Borkinshaw, advised me that the demand of the Buchanan Committee violated the First and Fourth Amendments.

Last Saturday a leading attorney in Chicago told me, "Unless you can win in the Court of Appeals or the Supreme Court, a reaffirmation of the validity of the First and Fourth Amendments, I feel that our whole Constitution is endangered because the Constitution can only be upheld with the free and unhindered expression of a viewpoint on all sides of a question which these two articles of the Bill of Rights make possible."

Ninety percent of all newspapers that have spoken on the issue, strongly upheld the position of the Trustees of our Committee instructed me to take. Please see the attached letter by Mr. John T. Flynn and the editorials, typical of 90% of the editorial comment that has been made. Note also the marked passages in my statements made after the conviction. I added, "I am in a hot spot and I do not like to be in it."

Under these circumstances you will see why I felt myself compelled to take the stand I did on 1 of the 26 demands of the Buchanan Committee and the other 25 where no such constitutional question was involved, we cooperated as helpfully as we possibly could. Three to four investigators were given unhindered access for 3 weeks to our files and books. Almost 1000 pieces of literature and letters they requested were photostatted and turned over to them. The hundreds of pages of fine print in the Buchanan Committee hearings, more than obtained from any other source, show this far-reaching cooperation, as do the 175 pages of forthright testimony on my part, withholding only the names of the purchasers of our books.

As a matter of fact, few organizations have upheld and glorified Congress as extensively as our Committee. We dug out and told and retold to millions the story of George Washington who directed Major L'Enfant not to place the CAPITOL in the valley where the Washington Monument stands, but on the hill so that it might dominate the scene, for the legislative branch in a Republic must be supreme and control policy.

The booklet "Needed Now - Capacity for Leadership..." has on page 32 a eulogy on Congress by former Congressman S. B. Pettengill. We have printed 3/4 million and distributed 700,000 of this booklet and thousands of thousands of the Pettengill article in a separate leaflet.

I took the stand I did, not willingly in the sense of evil intent or desire to do wrong, but in response to the instructions of our Trustees in accordance with the advice of eminent lawyers whom they consulted and the advice of my personal attorney, upon which I relied, namely that constitutional principle was at stake and I was morally obligated to uphold it.

And of course I knew, as came out in the Buchanan Committee hearings that 3 of the members of that Committee believed that the Bill of Rights prevented the Committee from invading our rights as publishers. Please note what Clarence Brown, himself a publisher, said on the floor in arguing against citation.

"This citation for contempt against this Dr. Rumely and the Constitutional Committee is here for one reason and one reason only -- because a man named John T. Flynn happened to have the courage to write a book against state socialism, "The Road Ahead". Certain people have been trying to find out, if they can, who bought these books."
Why, I bought some of them myself and distributed them to a few of my friends because I believed every honest-to-God American ought to read about the danger which confronts this country."

To sum up, my attitude is that of utmost cooperation with Congress in every possible way. Probably no organization has gone so far in educating the country as we did on the basic provisions of our constitutional republic by distributing 1/4 million copies of the embossed BILL OF RIGHTS, 150,000 to school rooms with an average of 30 pupils each and more than 2½ million copies of "What American Democracy Means To Me", written by my daughter Niles Rumely Newton when she was 16 years old, in which she embodied the same tradition with reference to our form of government.

I am sorry that this letter had to be so long, but I feel it necessary to outline why I felt compelled to take the stand I did. The Buchanan Committee is out of existence and I hope and trust that I may be able to comply as I did with 25 of the 26 Buchanan Committee demands, without ever again having an issue of constitutional rights of all citizens involved.

A great philosopher said: "The tragic decisions of life must be made not between right and wrong, but between two rights -- in this case the rights of a congressional committee to investigate on the one hand and on the other the inalienable constitutional rights of citizens under the First and Fourth Amendments.

Sincerely yours,

Edward A. Rumely
Executive Secretary

P.S.—After dictating the foregoing, I again studied your letter of May 4th. You state that it has been the policy to ask persons convicted of contempt of Congress "Whether or not given the opportunity, you would be willing to reappear before a Congressional committee that subpoenaed you and purge yourself."

If wrong-doing on my part were involved, it would be wholly proper to expect that I purge myself, but in two previous cases committees of Congress were proved to have made unwarranted and improper demands; once by the Senate itself; next, by the court. I am firmly convinced that the Buchanan Committee violated citizens' rights by inquiring as to the names of bulk purchasers of books and that, ultimately, the stand taken by me will be vindicated in the higher courts.

To act otherwise than I did would require that I act contrary to convictions that have been built up by 14 years of service to the Committee to Uphold Constitutional Government -- which name was changed, in 1941, by incorporation in the District of Columbia, to the Committee for Constitutional Government, Inc.

* * * * *

TELEGRAM TO MR. GARRETT, dated MAY 8, 1951

Please add to my letter of May 7th, replying to your letter of May 4th, the following final paragraph:

If, contrary to my expectations, the higher courts do not uphold my stand on the First and Fourth Amendments as against a Congressional committee, it will be the law of the land that a Congressional committee has an absolute right of inquiry, regardless of constitutional limitations. Under those circumstances, I am confident the trustees of the Committee for Constitutional Government would feel as I should that the law of the land required our compliance with the demands of a Congressional committee.

Signed: Edward A. Rumely, Executive Secretary
COMMITTEE FOR CONSTITUTIONAL GOVERNMENT, INC.
205 East 42nd Street New York 17, N.Y.

Write for additional copies of this statement - up to 10 free, 50 or more, 2¢ each.
Our Lady
of the Cape
Queen of the Most Holy Rosary

Virgin of the Prodigy

MAY
1947
Why I Am Not A Roman Catholic

How many of you brought your Bibles tonight? I am glad for the Bibles you have brought tonight. I was going to take all the Catholic literature I received last Sunday night, and bring it here to the platform and discuss it, but I found out that when I got to going into it that if I would do that, we'd be here until next Sunday night, because there is so much. I have been reading those pamphlets all this week.

I have selected three or four and brought them to the pulpit tonight. I want to read to you tonight from a piece of Catholic literature that you can secure in any Catholic bookstore throughout the United States. It is their "Preparation for Confession," called the "Confession-Aide." This costs one nickel. If you want to invest a nickel, you'll find out whether I'm telling you the truth or not. Now I don't sell them. You have to get them at the Catholic bookstore.

I want to read just a few things tonight from this aide:

"What is the sacrament of penance? Penance is a Sacrament in which the sins committed after Baptism are forgiven."

"What is confession? Confession is the telling of our sins to a duly authorized Priest for the purpose of obtaining forgiveness."

There is no word about Jesus Christ.

"Why should we go to the confession frequently? Frequent Confession greatly helps us to overcome temptations, to keep in the state of grace and to grow in virtue."

"What is necessary to make a good confession? Five things are necessary for a good Confession:

1. Examination of conscience. We should make an earnest effort to call to mind all the sins we have committed since our last worthy Confession.

2. Sorrow for sins. We should have sorrow for our sins because sin is the greatest of all evils, greatly offends God and mortal sin shuts us out of heaven and condemning us to the eternal pains of hell.

3. Firm resolution never more to offend God. We must resolve not only to avoid sin but also the persons, places and things that may easily lead us into sin.

4. Confess our sins to a Priest. We must tell all our
mortal sins to a Priest, their kind and the number of times we have committed each one.

5. Say the Penance which the Priest gives us. The priest gives us a penance that we may make some atonement to God for our sins, receive help to avoid them in the future and make some satisfaction for the temporal punishment due to them.

Then on down here we have the "Prayer before Confession," which I want to read to you:

"O Holy Ghost, source of all light, come to my assistance and enable me to make a good confession. Enlighten me, and help me to know my sins as one day I shall be forced to recognize them before Christ's judgment-seat. Bring to my mind the evil which I have done and the good which I have neglected. Grant me, moreover, heartfelt sorrow for my sins, and the grace of a sincere confession, so that I may be forgiven and admitted into Thy everlasting friendship. Mary, my Mother help me to make a good confession. (Hail Mary, 3 times.)"

METHOD OF CONFESSING

That's the end of the prayer. Now here is the "Method of Confessing." I'll read this to you:

"When your turn comes, go into the Confessional—When the Priest opens the slide make the sign of the Cross and in a moderate, low voice—say: Bless me Father for I have sinned. I confess to Almighty God, and to you, Father. It is (how long) since my last confession. Since then I have... (tell your sins).

"Listen to what the Priest says; answer all questions. Pay particular attention to the Penance he gives you. While the Priest recites the words of absolution, say the Act of Contrition."

There you are. My friend, not one time has this said one word about Jesus Christ. The prayer was not made to Jesus Christ. It was made to Mary. "Mary, my Mother help me to make a good confession." It started out with the Holy Spirit. Christ's name was only mentioned once, where it says our sins will be recognized before Christ's judgment-seat. That's the only time Christ's name was mentioned. Now I want you to just think about that. You can get this for a nickel, if you doubt what I'm saying, in any Catholic bookstore. I'll make a few more feeble remarks about this later on, but just keep it in mind.

Now I want you to turn to I Timothy 1:5-7. Paul wrote these words to Timothy, "Now the end of the commandment is charity out of a pure heart, and of a good conscience, and of faith unfeigned: From which some having swerved have turned aside unto vain jangling; Desiring to be teachers of the law; understanding neither what they say, nor whereof they affirm."

In the last chapter of Revelation, verse eight, I read these words: "And I John saw these things, and heard them. And when I had heard and seen, I fell down to worship before the feet of the angel which shewed me these things."

Verse 19: "And if any man shall take away from the words of the book of this prophecy, God shall take away his part out of the book of life, and out of the holy city, and from the things which are written in this book."

I think verse 18 should be read, too: "For I testify unto every man that heareth the words of the prophecy of this book, if any man shall add unto these things, God shall add unto him the plagues that are written in this book."

Last Sunday night a number of pieces of literature were handed out at the close of the service. I had put into my hand twenty-two different pieces of Catholic literature. They were not ordinary pamphlets; they were well constructed, and tell a great many interesting things. Then on Monday, I saw to it that one of the Catholic bookstores was visited, and there were secured several pieces of literature that we thought would be to your advantage to hear. I have one here tonight entitled, "Catholic Faith." It is a catechism—"Book Three for Higher Classes and Discussion Clubs." I am going to use these pieces of literature for every quotation I make. I am going to let the Catholics speak for themselves. I am not going to speak for them; they shall do their own speaking. Whenever I write a book, any man is absolutely free to quote me from that book, because that book is exactly what I believe. If didn't believe it, I wouldn't have written it. Therefore, I am taking for granted that the Catechism of the Roman Catholic Church is certainly what they believe, or they would not have endorsed it and put it out. You can buy this book at
a Catholic store. I'm going to use this and show why I am not a Roman Catholic.

**SCRIPTURAL AUTHORITY**

First of all, without apology, the independent Bible-believing Churches and Bible-believers stake their all upon the authority of the Holy Book and the Scriptures of God. All men and women who call themselves fundamental and independent and Bible-believers take this Book as the final authority on all subjects. The Scriptures themselves are the Supreme Court. They are the last court of appeals. To us, the plain and unmistakable teaching of the Scripture is the end, the finality to all controversy. The Scripture settles it all. All religious error, all departures from the truth, all heresies, all modernism, all isms, asms and spasms that you may think of, if you will allow me to use an ugly association, have this common characteristic. They consist in adding to the Scriptures or subtracting from the Scriptures, or a mixture of both.

Beloved, all heresies may be put into one of these three categories—the Bible plus, the Bible minus, or the Bible with some deletions and some additions.

Now take, for instance, Christian Science. It is the Bible plus “The Key to the Scriptures” by Mrs. Mary Baker Grover Patterson Eddy Frye.

What is Mormonism? The Bible, plus Joseph Smith and the book of Mormon.

What is Modernism? It is the Bible minus certain things the Bible teaches.

What is Russellism? The Bible, plus Pastor Russell, and the “Study in the Scriptures.”

What is Pentecostalism? The Bible, plus the authority of an emotional experience, which they call the baptism of the Holy Spirit.

What is Modernism? As I have said, it is the Bible minus the supernatural Christ, the inspiration of the Scriptures, and minus everything we hold dear.

What is Romanism? The Bible, plus the authority of the church, and the efficacy of its sacramental system.

Now it is my purpose tonight to show that true Christians should not be subject either to a plus or a minus basis. I believe for myself that the authority of the Scriptures themselves is sufficient, and as far as I am concerned, I have never found anything better than this blessed old Book, and this Book alone satisfies me.

Now when I announced my subject, “Why I Am Not A Roman Catholic,” I did so with a great deal of thought. It wasn’t a haphazard method of coming to you tonight to speak on a theme. But I want you to note that term, “Roman Catholic.”

First of all that term is a misnomer. “Catholic” means universal. I agree with the Catholics when they interpret a word right. Catholic means universal. It means literally, “concerning the whole.”

We have a great many texts in the Bible that are Catholic texts. Take for instance, John 3:16, “For God so loved the world that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have everlasting life.” That includes the world; it is universal; it is Catholic. According to this interpretation, I am a Catholic. I believe in universal salvation for all men. I do not believe there is a race of men, color, or creed that cannot be saved by the precious blood of the Lord Jesus Christ. The whole world is embraced by the love of God, and “whosoever” in John 3:16 makes provision for all, and includes everyone. That is a true Catholic text.

Now Paul said, “I bow my knee unto the Father of the Lord Jesus Christ, of whom the whole family of heaven and earth is named.” That is a true Catholic text. It embraces everyone who is related to the Lord and Savior, Jesus Christ.

Now according to that kind of an interpretation, I am a true Catholic. I believe in a holy Catholic Church, but I do not believe in the Roman Catholic Church. I would not be offensive, but I do want to say to my Roman Catholic friends tonight, I refuse to believe in the Roman Catholic Church. The terms “Roman” and “Catholic” are mutually exclusive, and these two words ought not have ever been married together, and if I had the authority, I would divorce the two right now, and they would never come together again.

**ROMANISM**

Romanism, as I prefer to call it—I believe it is a better term, is basically not orthodox. By that I mean this: Rom-
anism believes in the divine inspiration of the Scriptures. No Modernist is tolerated in the Roman Church. No Modernist is instituted by the pope of Rome. When he was talking about modernism that was sweeping into the Catholic church, he ostracized the modernists from him. The Roman Church does not deny the supernatural in the character and in the life of our Lord and Savior, Jesus Christ. They admit it all. There is no disposition on the part of Rome to put a question mark after the biblical record of miracles. They believe every miracle was performed by God. It holds that Jesus Christ was supernaturally born, and that He supernaturally lived.

The Roman Church has never denied the vicariousness of the death of the Lord Jesus Christ; that is, that He died for our sins according to the Scriptures. The Roman Church never denies the reality of His bodily resurrection. They believe that Jesus Christ bodily arose from the dead on the third day.

All these great principles are believed by the Roman Catholic Church, and when denied, they are denied by certain branches of Protestantism. They are the Protestants who have lost their protest. But Romanism does not deny the resurrection and ascension of the Lord and Savior, nor does it deny the great Bible doctrine of sin. They are not slack in dealing with sin in any manner. They recognize that all men are sinners, all men need to be saved. Such denial has been left to some Baptists and Presbyterians, Methodists, vegetarians, and some of the others.

Nor does it attempt to make light of the Holy Bible or the Scriptural doctrine of future retribution. The Roman Church does not play fast and loose with the sins of its people and with the future judgment.

Now the question naturally arises, “If they believe all that, then what is wrong with Roman Catholicism?” I am going to try to show that all these truths are theoretically accepted by the Romanists; they are proclaimed theoretically by the Romanists, but still they are practically nullified in every instance because of the plus or the minus sign they put upon the Word of God. Now remember those plus and minus signs.

TRADITION AND INTERPRETATION
I have just gone through their catechism book, and have derived some statements I think you will enjoy hearing read. Now I am not a Roman Catholic tonight because the Roman Church teaches and accepts the divine inspiration and authority of the Holy Scriptures, and then it adds, according to the tradition and interpretation of the Church.

Last Sunday night, this pamphlet, “The Truth About Catholics,” was passed out in front of the tabernacle. It was printed on January 1st, 1948. It is something up to date. It has a circulation of 2,950,000. On the authority of the Scriptures on page 15 through 22, it says: “There is a great deal of misconception about the Bible. Some people think that, in some way or other, it came to us just as it is, from heaven. Others think that it was written by God Himself. Again some believe that it existed previously to the Church and that the Church rests on it as upon a foundation.”

I won’t take time to read all these pages, but that gives us an introduction. We’ll go on: “But the Bible as the Catholic Church regards it, is more than a historical document; it is an inspired record. Once you admit it is inspired, there is no need of arguing about the divinity of Christ or the Church, for that is plainly stated in the Bible, which, if inspired, is its own proof. We showed from a historical and critical investigation that the Christian foundation is true. The Catholic argument does not depend at all on the Bible as an inspired book.

“But the Bible does depend upon the Church for its genuineness as an inspired record. . . Well, it was the Catholic Church . . . that made the Bible.”

The Catholic Church made the Bible, they say. The church is not dependent on the Bible, but the Bible is dependent upon the Church. They don’t deny that it was a divinely inspired record. They merely say that the Bible is dependent upon the Church, and the Roman Catholic Church is responsible for the Bible, and that the Roman Catholic Church made the Bible.

Now the same Bible they said was inspired says in II Timothy 3:16, “All scripture is given by inspiration of God.” The inspiration of the Scriptures, according to the Bible, was not given by the Roman Catholic Church, but by the inspiration of God. “All scripture is given by inspiration of
God, and is profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness." The Bible is profitable for doctrine, the Bible is profitable for reproof, for correction and for instruction in righteousness. Why? It's the Word of God. Why? "That the man of God may be perfect, thoroughly furnished unto all good works."

Well, they say Peter was the first pope. I wonder what Peter would say about this. Let's let Peter talk. Go on over there to II Peter 1:19, "We have also a more sure word of prophecy; whereunto ye do well that ye take heed, as unto a light that shineth in a dark place, until the day dawn, and the day star arise in your hearts: Knowing this first, that no prophecy of the scripture is of any private interpretation. For the prophecy came not in old time by the (Roman Catholics), the prophecy came not by the (pope), the prophecy came not by the will of man: but holy men of God spake as they were moved by the Holy Spirit." The Holy Spirit gave the Scriptures. This nullifies that very statement. This is not the opinion of Harvey H. Springer. Here is what Romanism says: here is what the Book says. You are the judge; you are the jury. Are you going to accept the tradition of men, and the writings of men, or are you going to accept the inspired Word of God? Which shall it be? You are the jury. You vote for the Pope of Rome and the Church, or the Word of God and Jesus Christ. Suit yourself.

That is the reason I am not a Roman Catholic. I believe the Bible.

Now let me give you another one. I've got lots more quotations here, but I don't think I need to give them, but I do want you to listen to this.

From the Council of Trent in the Canons of Trent in Paris in 1562, I quote these words: "With sentiments of equal piety and reverence, all of the books of the Old, as well as the New Testament, since one God was author of them both, and also the traditions relating as well to the faith as to morals, insomuch as coming from the mouth of Christ Himself, are dictated by the Holy Spirit, they have been preserved in the Catholic Church in uninterrupted succession."

Now let me give you two articles from the Creed of Pope Pius IV:

1. I must steadfastly admit and embrace apostolic and ecclesiastical traditions, and all other observances and constitutions of the same church.

2. I also admit the holy Scriptures according to that sense which our Holy Mother of the Church has held, and does hold, to which it belongs, to judge in the true sense and interpretation of the Scriptures. Neither will I ever take and interpret them otherwise than according to the unanimous consent of the Fathers.

Now do you know what that means? It means the Holy Scripture plus the authority of the Church to interpret, and the denial of the right of private judgment. That leaves every Protestant out. It doesn't leave one in. Peter said that no prophecy of the Scripture is of any private interpretation. That means that we are to take the Word of God and compare Scripture with Scripture. That is the reason Paul said in II Timothy 2:15, "Study to shew thyself approved unto God, a workman that needeth not to be ashamed, rightly dividing the word of truth."

ATONEMENT FOR SIN

I am not a Roman Catholic because the Scriptures teach completely, finally, and absolutely that a final atonement for my sins was affected by the death of Jesus Christ. Now Rome teaches, according to their catechism, "Catholic Faith," book three, page 210, the following. This should put some of you to chewing on your doorknobs.

"What is the Holy Eucharist? The Holy Eucharist is Jesus Christ Himself under the appearance of bread and wine.

"Why did Jesus Christ give us Himself in the Holy Eucharist? Jesus Christ gave us Himself in the Holy Eucharist: (1) to be offered in the Sacrifice of the Mass; (2) to unite us with Himself in Holy Communion; (3) to live among us, on our altars; (4) to be our Viaticum on our journey to eternity.

"When did Jesus Christ institute the Holy Eucharist? Jesus Christ instituted the Holy Eucharist at the Last Supper, the night before He died.

"What is this change of bread and wine into the Body
and Blood of Jesus Christ called? This change of bread and wine into the Body and Blood of Jesus Christ is called transubstantiation.

"What is the Mass? The Mass is the Sacrifice of the Body and Blood of Jesus Christ under the appearances of bread and wine.

"Why did Jesus Christ give us the Sacrifice of the Mass? Jesus Christ gave us the Sacrifice of the Mass to leave to His Church a visible Sacrifice which continues His Sacrifice of the Cross until the end of time.

"How does the Sacrifice of the Mass continue the Sacrifice of the Cross? The Sacrifice of the Mass continues the Sacrifice of the Cross because in the Mass Jesus Christ in an unbloody manner offers Himself to God as He once offered Himself on the Cross.

"Why does Jesus Christ continue to offer Himself as a Sacrifice in the Mass? Jesus Christ continues to offer Himself as a Sacrifice in the Mass because He desires: (1) to unite us with Himself, (2) to let us share in the graces of His Death on the Cross, (3) to give us a gift worthy to be offered to God.

"Is the Mass the same Sacrifice as the Sacrifice of the Cross? The Mass is the same Sacrifice as the Sacrifice of the Cross."

I am not a Roman Catholic because my Bible teaches that Jesus Christ died once for all. You don't crucify Him afresh, every day of the week, every week of the month, and every month of the year, and on, and on, and on. He could only die once. He could only pay the supreme sacrifice for my sin once—not twice, not Sunday morning at Mass, not at every Holy Day Mass. He died once. Don't take my word for it—again, take the Word of God.

Don't you see the Roman Catholic Church says it is the blood of Jesus Christ, plus the bloodless sacrifice of the Holy Eucharist and Mass. It is a plus.

God bless you, John said, "Behold the Lamb of God that taketh away the sins of the world." John 1:29. Paul said, "I declare unto you the Gospel how that Christ died for our sins, according to the Scriptures."

I want every Roman Catholic to get this. I'm reading from the 6th chapter of Hebrews, the 4th verse: "For it is impossible ... if they shall fall away, to renew them again unto repentance; seeing they crucify to themselves the Son of God afresh, and put him to an open shame." To crucify the Son of God afresh is to put Him to open shame.

Go on over to Hebrews 9:26, "For then must he often have suffered since the foundation of the world: but now once in the end of the world hath he appeared to put away sin by the sacrifice of himself." Once, not twice. Once!

I am not a Roman Catholic because I am not going to be guilty of crucifying the Son of God afresh. He died once for all. He died for every man once. That was enough. It satisfied Paul. God help us to be satisfied.

ONE MEDIATOR

Listen friend, I want to be your helper; I want to be your neighbor; I want to be a blessing to you. I am not a Roman Catholic because there is one mediator between God and man. One!

Well, let's go back to this other book, "Instructions on Catholic Beliefs." This will blow your fuses out. I don't have time to read all these other books. I wish I did have time to do it, but I don't. I just want to read this to you. I'll throw it in and it won't cost you anything extra. I'm not going to say a lot about it. I'm talking now about Jesus Christ, one mediator between God and man.

Now listen: "What sins are we bound to confess in Confession? We are bound to confess all our Mortal Sins, and to tell the number of times we have committed each sin."

"If we are not guilty of any Mortal Sins, what sins do we confess? We confess our Venial Sins and imperfections, especially any habitual faults.

"What is meant by the Penance which the priest gives us in Confession? The Penance is usually certain prayers, to be said after the Confession, which help to satisfy for the 'temporal punishment' due for our sins.

"What is meant by Temporal Punishment? It is punishment we must suffer for a time, as distinguished from eternal punishment; this temporal punishment must be borne either in this life or in the next life in Purgatory."

That's a new word for me. I never read that in the Bible. You'll forgive me.
WHY I AM NOT

"What is an Indulgence? An indulgence in the release, either in whole or in part, from the temporal punishment due for sin, granted by the authority of the Church."

Jesus Christ can't do it. The church has to do it.

Well, let's go on here. I'll read again from the catechism, "Catholic Faith," page 81.

"What is the Holy Catholic Church? The Holy Catholic Church is the supernatural and visible society which Jesus Christ founded while He lived on earth and when He called His Church." 

THE CHURCH AND THE POPE

"Why did Jesus Christ found His Church? Jesus Christ founded His Church (1) to continue His teaching and His example, (2) to apply the fruits of His Sacrifice on the Cross to all men until the end of time.

"Whom did Jesus Christ make the first Bishops of His Church? Jesus Christ made the Apostles the first Bishops of His Church.

"Who is the true Head of the Church? Jesus Christ is the true Head of the Church. He invisibly governs her and unites her members to Himself in His Mystical Body.

"Which Apostle did Jesus Christ make the Head of His Church on earth? Jesus Christ made Saint Peter the head of His Church on earth.

"Who is the successor of Saint Peter? The Pope is the successor of Saint Peter. He takes the place of Jesus Christ on earth.

"What power has the Pope over the Church? By divine right the Pope has supreme and full power in Faith and Morals over each and every Pastor and his flock." 

You talk about a hierarchy.

"Who are the successors of the Apostles? The Bishops of the Catholic Church are the successors of the Apostles.

"How can we know the true Church of Jesus Christ? We can know the true Church of Jesus Christ by the marks He gave her: (1) she teaches the same doctrine to all; (2) she is holy; (3) she is catholic or universal; (4) she is the Church which Jesus Christ founded on His Apostles."

A ROMAN CATHOLIC

Now they don't give any scriptures for that. They're just traditions of men. I just had to throw that in. I talked to one of those Catholic men last Sunday night, and asked him why they made the Pope Jesus Christ on earth. He said, "They don't do that." He's a liar, according to the catechism of the Roman Catholic Church. It says, "The Pope takes the place of Jesus Christ on earth." That's on page 81 of his own catechism.

Now, to me, that's the first step of blasphemy. I don't believe there is a man or woman on this earth that is fit or ever will be fit to take the place of Jesus Christ.

Thank God, I don't have to have a man over in Rome, who is just as big a sinner as I am and you are, who needs to be saved by the precious blood of Jesus Christ, just like me. I didn't have to have him to be a mediator between me and my God. Brother, I've got one mediator—Jesus Christ.

I don't have to go to a hole in the wall. They call it a slit in the wall. I don't have to go to the slit in the wall and say, "Holy Father..." What was it I was supposed to say? I don't have to go over there and say, "O Holy Ghost, source of all light, come to my assistance and enable me to make a good confession. Enlighten me, and help me to know my sins as one day I shall be forced to recognize them before Christ's judgment-seat. Bring to my mind the evil which I have done and the good which I have neglected. Grant me, moreover, heartfelt sorrow for my sins, and the grace of a sincere confession, so that I may be forgiven and admitted into Thy everlasting friendship. Mary, my Mother help me to make a good confession."

I don't have to go to the hole in the wall, or the slit in wall, or whatever you may want to call it, to some other sinner behind it, and probably he should make as many confessions to me as I should make to him. I don't have to go to him. I have a High Priest sitting at the right hand of God making intercession for me, and I don't need Mary, I don't need any of the saints (Brother, they've got a saint for every special day, and you're supposed to pray to these saints, you're supposed to pray to the guardian angels, but I'll go into this later on), but I'll tell you frankly, I don't need them. I have a High Priest, the Lord Jesus Christ, who is making intercession for me. I don't need them, and you don't need them either.
Did I ever get over to Page 95? No. Here it is:

"To whom did Jesus Christ give the power to forgive sins? Jesus Christ gave to the Church the power to forgive sins."

"How do we obtain the forgiveness of our sins? We obtain the forgiveness of our sins: (1) in the Sacraments of Baptism and Penance."

They say baptism is essential to salvation. Don't you see, beloved, it's add to, add to.

"In what other way can we obtain the forgiveness of venial sins? We can obtain the forgiveness of venial sins by our prayers, penances, and good works, provided we are sorry for our sins."

FREEDOM OF WORSHIP

I didn't bring it with me tonight, but they gave us a book entitled, "Freedom of Worship," and they tell in their own book how the Catholics act in Catholic-dominated countries, and the Protestant people do not have a right to worship. They have civil rights, but no religious right, because the Catholic Church says, "We are the only church. There is no other." Therefore they have passed a law to deny your God-given liberty. And they say in the United States, "We are only one-sixth of the population in the United States, and in the United States it is better to have religious freedom." They become in every nation just what they have to become.

The Catholics are gaining a tremendous power in this country.

The very fact that millions of pieces of literature are being circulated free of charge—look at this one. It is well put up, three colors on the cover. It is very readable. It is written very cleverly. The people don't understand. The Jesuits, the Monks and the people in every country who dedicate their lives to nothing but study and writing are paid out of the missionary fund of the Catholic Church. That tract may have taken a year to write. Every word is prepared so cleverly that it deceives thousands of Protestants and brings them under their yoke of bondage.

The Knights of Columbus have been running ads in the paper, and according to the "Catholic Register," they have taken in over 20,000 members; that is, they are receiving Catholic instruction. If the Protestant people do not wake up, you can write "Ichabod" over your door post, your glory has departed, your freedom has been taken away, and the message I have preached tonight will never be heard again. Beloved, the time has come to awaken.

Somebody says, "Preacher, you're crazy." They said the same thing when I went after the Federal Council of Churches. They said the same thing when I jumped on Communism. You remember how Walter Winchell got on the radio and screamed for my blood, and they were coming out to get it, but I survived it. Bless your old heart, I'm going to survive this one, too. Don't ever forget that. I know what God has called me to do, and I admit to you that I am not the ordinary Protestant preacher, because God didn't call me to be. God gave me a vision when I was first converted, and I have never departed from that plan. I've gone right down the line, as God has laid it on my heart.

And God has laid this thing on my heart as He has never laid any other conviction on my heart. I'm going into it with my whole body, my whole soul, and my whole mind. And I don't believe there is any prejudice. The only prejudice I have is for the Lord and Savior, Jesus Christ. It is not enough to stand before a group of people and expose error. We must give a positive message.

Jesus Christ, and Christ alone, was made God in the flesh, walked amid the temptations you and I have in order that He might satisfy the justice and the demands of the holiness of God and bring to naught that which alienated us from God by our sins. Jesus Christ, not the church of Rome, not Mary, the Mother of Jesus, not the saints, nor any other power can do this. "There is no name under heaven given among men whereby we must be saved," aside from the name of Jesus Christ.

The Philippian jailor looked up to Paul and Silas, and said, "Sirs, what must I do to be saved?" Paul said, "Go get baptized by the pope of Rome." Paul said, "Go down and make your confession, have your holy eucharist, attend Mass, and you'll be saved."

Not on your life! Listen to the Scriptures:

"Sirs, what must I do to be saved?"
"Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ, and thou shalt be saved, and thy house."

"But to as many as received him, to them gave he power to become the sons of God, even to them that believe on his name." But to as many as received him, not the Church, not the Pope, not the bishop, not the priest, not baptism, not the sacraments, not the holy eucharist, but to "as many as received him, Jesus Christ, to them gave he power to become the sons of God."

My message tonight is that we need the precious blood of Jesus Christ to wash away our sins. If you don't have His blood, you'll die and go to Hell—not purgatory, but hell; And because of His righteousness, not mine, not my good works, but because of His righteousness, I shall inherit eternal and everlasting life, and I thank God for it. It doesn't make any difference whether or not I am baptized. Now don't say our church doesn't believe in baptism. We've got a baptistery here where we really baptized them. We don't throw a little water on their heads and call it baptism. We don't take a pitcher and pour the water on and call it baptism, but we take them down into the water grave. They are buried with Christ in the watery grave, and raised in the likeness of Christ from that watery grave. We believe it, not as a part of salvation, but in obedience to Christ.

Christ and Christ alone can save your old sin-sick heart.

Now let me ask you something? Don't listen to me; Don't listen to the Roman Church, or any other voice, but the still small voice that is speaking to your heart. That's God's Holy Spirit. When God's Holy Spirit speaks to your heart, "You shall know the truth, and the truth shall make you free."
HAVE YOU EVER WONDERED?

Why confession to a priest is such a necessary part of Roman Catholicism
What pressure is exerted to open the innermost secrets of the soul in the confessional?
Why more time is spent in the confession of women and young girls?
What thoughts are placed in innocent minds by suggestive questions of the priest?
What holds the priest has on a penitent whose very thoughts and temptations become his property.

WOULD YOU LIKE YOUR QUESTIONS ANSWERED BY SOMEONE WHO KNOWS?

Lucien Jean Vinet was born of French Canadian parents at St. Pierre, Manitoba, Canada, April 13, 1902. His parents and ancestors for generations back were Romanists and had supplied the Papal system with numerous priests and nuns.

Educated by a religious order, knowledge limited to that which would serve the dark system of Babylon, Vinet was destined to be drawn into the priesthood. He was ordained in 1933, served at St. Jean and Morris, Manitoba; Lac de Bonnet, Manitoba and as a Roman Catholic Chaplain in the Royal Canadian Air Force during World War II.

Not only during his training for the Priesthood but as he served the various parishes Vinet became acquainted with the abuses and abominations of the vile system. Convicted of the error of Romanism "Father" Vinet voluntarily left the priesthood in 1941. He was also instrumental in helping several other priests to the light of the Gospel and they too have come out of her.

ANSWERING YOUR QUESTIONS?

Despite threats of bodily harm and death, Vinet has written an account of sensual, pagan, idolatrous Roman Catholicism as he saw it, from the inside. He has called his book, "I WAS A PRIEST."

In 14 Chapters, 140 pages he gives in detail an account of not only the "confessional" but many phases of Roman superstition and ceremony.

"I Was A Priest" should be read by every Protestant. It will make you appreciate anew your heritage in Christ who makes you "free indeed." The book was originally printed in Canada but could not be mailed in quantities to the U. S. A. Catholic authorities were apparently able to have it stopped at customs.

The Protestant Information Bureau has secured exclusive rights for publication and distribution of the book. We certainly want you to have a copy to read and pass on to your friends.

The U. S. edition has been bound in heavy paper, two-color cover to place it in a price range that all can afford. We can now mail it to you for only one dollar, postpaid. We know you will not be disappointed when you have read this sensational testimony.

PROTESTANT INFORMATION BUREAU
Box 90, Englewood, Colorado

Be sure and order this book soon. It is worth 5 times the price of $1.00
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Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, I rise to announce my support of the Wherry resolution, providing that the Executive may not send troops to Europe without approval of Congress.

I am supporting the resolution because, with the Cordert resolution in the House, restates an essential principle of representative government—that Congress is responsible for deciding the purposes for which all public money is to be spent. The resolution is a test of our devotion to government by law. I urge all my colleagues to vote for it on constitutional grounds, as well as those of foreign policy.

The Wherry resolution does not, however, go far enough. We hear everywhere of the great debate, but there is no debate.

Former President Hoover spoke out in warning and prevented the administration from quickly putting through its clever plans for an American army in Europe—but the Republican Party has not followed through. Why? We have fallen again into the Fair Deal's propaganda booby trap.

We debate the Fair Deal policies; we argue whether the proposals are good or bad, but we are always talking about their policies. Thus we serve as a sounding board to help sell the plans the Fair Dealers have decided on and intend to carry out regardless. This "great debate" is silly, foolish. The program has been decided upon. The administration knows what it is going to do, and will carry out its plans regardless.

Every proposal made by the administration experts in guile is a propaganda booby trap. It is like the old-fashioned tanglefoot flypaper. The fly which gets caught in the mucilage may struggle and struggle, but the more he struggles the more he is enmeshed. Every word the Fair Dealers use is carefully picked for its sticking properties. If we debate the Fair Deal's carefully contrived proposals—if we use even one slanted word or phrase—we get completely tangled in their association mesh. We prove their case by using their slogans.

I have been in the Senate 4 years, and it has always been the same story. They set up a thoroughly unsound policy. They bait us to oppose it. Thus they get our attention. Then we get the attention of the public. They phrase the question so it will be very difficult to put forth any alternative. If the talk lasts too long, they come in with a weasel-worded resolution that says all things to all men. That is what the pending resolution would do. How many different opinions in the last 2 hours have been expressed upon the Senate floor as to what the resolution means. They always do what they intend to do and we sink deeper into frustration and despair.

Suppose a policeman is sent to arrest a housebreaker entering a peaceful home with a gun in his hand. The housebreaker would like nothing better than to engage the policeman in a great debate on whether housebreaking is a good thing; what is the philosophy underlying the law against housebreaking and why the law is no longer valid because we are in a great new era of technological progress that requires social division of the national product.

We do not make any excuse for the policeman who lets himself get entangled in such a debate, to make sport for the bystanders. But every time we in Congress are diverted from our course, to talk about troops to Europe or recognition of Red China, or any other Fair Deal policy, we are betraying our oath as the policeman would betray his oath if he were inveigled by the housebreaker into a great debate on habeas corpus.

The American people do not want us to debate the Fair Deal foreign policy. They debated it last October and decided in November. They debate it every time they get a letter from their sons, husbands, and sweethearts in Korea—every time they hear of another friend or neighbor on the casualty lists.

The American people told us in no uncertain terms, on election day, that they wanted a total change in our foreign policy.

The people know what they want—they want us to get them out of the war we are in, and they want us to do it now—before the political gangsters in the seats of power do any more damage to our country.
The whole responsibility for an honest, realistic American foreign policy in this fantastic, fear-ridden world, rests on the Congress. Congress is the law-making arm in our form of government. It decides, as the agent of the people, how much of the money is to be given to Government, and for what it is to be spent.

We believe in government by law. Congress lays down policy, by law; and the President is supposed to carry it out. If the President can make whatever policy he likes, we are governed, not by law, but by the whims of one man and the sycophants and the betrayers who make up his entourage.

We, in Congress, cannot delegate or evade the responsibility that rests on us. Between elections the whole sovereign power of the American people rests here under the dome of the Capitol.

The people spoke on election day, and they will speak again in 1952. But for every hour and every minute of the next 21 months, the entire burden of finding a sound American foreign policy and imposing it on lawless administrations falls on us.

The people have given us their power—of—attorney. We are trustees for them. We must act or fail; we have no alternative.

It is a cold and lonely eminence on which we stand from now until November 1952. The country looks to us for leadership, and we can look to no one but ourselves. We cannot tell the executive agencies what they must do unless we know what we want. We must decide where our national interests lie. There is no one else to do that for us, no one to whom we can turn, and no time to lose.

It is not the Members of Congress to debate with their eyes over their shoulders, watching to see what the people applaud. The task of Congress is to formulate a clear, simple, realistic foreign policy, in the great tradition of American foreign policy, write it into law, and then tell the Fair Deal officials to operate under it—or operate without public funds.

**Collapse of the Truman Defense Program**

It is time for the responsible Members of this body to face one simple fact: The Truman administration has no plan for our defense, no foreign policy for the benefit of our Nation.

We dare not be fooled by the way Fair Deal officials run about in every direction, calling for billions and billions, in the delusion that they have a program for the benefit of our country. They do not have one, and they never will. By the way, I understand in the next several weeks they will have a new one coming up, called Operation Cosmic.

I know that a large percent of people in Government are patriotic. Most of them are men and women trying to do a job. They are willing to do it, but they are not permitted to.

They are ruled and directed by a small inner cabal, which plans all the moves. That cabal cannot ever make a policy we can trust, because that is not their purpose. They have another purpose, a hidden purpose, which is first in their minds: They want to remain in power.

This administration is going to be in office for the next 21 months. Even impeachment would not touch the real difficulty.

Our problem is not the tired titans from Missouri, the cold, clever, ruthless men about him.

Every step we take to guard against the danger from Russia must be taken by the Fair Deal officials fill the top executive offices. Congress must solve that problem—or none.

We would like to inaugurate a program of psychological warfare. I have heard it discussed here by many Members of the Senate.

But to whom would we give it—Acheson or Marshall? To ask the question is to answer it.

The Congress must find the way to make a sound foreign policy and a sound military policy, because we cannot trust the executive branch of our Government to do it. We cannot entrust the future to those who have betrayed the past.

We must see the Fair Deal policy as it is. We must rip away the propaganda which envelops the Fair Deal. We must show the people what is really there.

We can no longer afford to consider the many separate proposals of this administration, as if by carefully studying each one we could amalgamate them into one good policy.

We cannot introduce bills after bill, hold hearings, spend hours and energy, and write thousands of letters to our constituents in answer to the Fair Deal propaganda, when there is not the slightest bit of hope that the measures will be good, anyhow.

We have worked on lend-lease, then on the UNRRA, on Greek-Turkish aid, on the Atlantic Pact without military aid, then on the Atlantic Pact with military aid; and there is always point 4.

Each time we went through these steps we wasted our time, helped to build up the Fair Deal propaganda, and came out with what? A bigger bill to spend our money, to tie more people to the Fair Deal, or get more involved in managing Europe and Asia, and to carry us farther than ever from our national security.

We must look at the Fair Deal program as a whole, and must test it by only one rule, namely, What does it contribute to American security?

President Truman has tried to glamorize his war. He has proclaimed that we are now in a crisis. His cohorts have used all the standard circus tricks to make the crisis atmosphere seem real. But we are not going to glamorize this war.

The American people are terribly upset about our security. They are fully aware of the extent of Soviet hostility and want the Fair Deal officials to fight this war.

We want the Fair Deal to fight the cold war. We want them to be reduced to the facts of the situation, and to do their job as they were elected to do.

The American people are looking to someone to tell them what can be done. We, the Congress, are that someone, Mr. President.

Our young men cannot be drafted to fight in wars or police actions in which they do not believe.

It is cruel enough to draft men when their country is in danger, to take them from their families and their schools, from their wives and little children, to protect our homeland.

It is even more cruel and immoral to draft men in a war that pretends to be for defense, but is manipulated by those in power to serve their ends.

But it is far worse if we draft our young men under the present rules of national defense and for wars and threats of war, when they cannot even have illusions about them.

All their privations and sufferings will be made a thousand times worse because there is no pride, but only cynicism and disillusionment.

My colleagues know what is going on in the administration.

We must draw up, against the Executive, an indictment so clear and so precise that all the people in the country will know and will understand that no hope can be expected from that quarter. We cannot not be caused by the very richness of the proof.

It is not unimportant that White House stenographers get $9,500 mink coats. It is important that 250,000 American youths are tied down in Korea in a police action.

It is not unimportant that the Fair Deal political machine has contacts with gamblers in Florida, in Illinois, in Missouri, and elsewhere, but it is more important that our economic arteries have been cut and the lifeblood we will need if we are plunged into a global war is dripping away.

The administration's latest plan for the defense of Europe is ill-conceived, futile, confused, and completely shaped to fit domestic politics. Senators have seen it evidenced here today.

Make no mistake about it.

It is not a threat to communism—it is like that. We are on a mission of plans to end all plans that we have put before us every year since 1945. Mr. President, on the very subject which was debated here this afternoon in the colloquy, I asked a certain distinguished Senator on this side of the aisle whether he had intended to vote for ratification of the North Atlantic Pact in 1949 and, if so, why. He said that he had, because it was not necessary under it to send troops. I asked, "Why do you say that?" He took a letter which he showed me. It was a letter from Secretary of State Acheson, stating that there was no commitment to send troops. But are we debating here today? What is all this? We dare not rely on this new Truman program for stopping the Communists and protecting our security.

First, it is a lie. Second, it does not oppose communism. Third, it does not give us allies. Fourth, it does not provide for our security as a Nation. Fifth, it does help us spend ourselves into bankruptcy.

Sixth, it does keep the Fair Deal in power in 1952.
Seventh, it leaves us totally unprotected if the real Soviet strategy is to get us wound up in a fast-moving war economy, and then pull the rug from under us by a genuine peace move, while they watch the depression spread—and wait.

WE HAVE NO MILITARY PLANS

The administration does not have any plan for the defense of Europe. Why are we talking about sending troops to Europe? There is no plan for the defense of Europe. There is no plan for the defense of Asia.

There is no plan for the defense of Iran and the Middle East—there is no plan for the defense of Alaska or the Panama Canal.

I do not doubt for a moment that we have professional military men competent to make those plans and willing to sacrifice their lives to carry them out. I say they will not be permitted to make them.

Our professional, nonpolitical military men were not permitted to make the military decisions about Korea. They were permitted to decide about arming the South Koreans, when we left Korea first.

They were not allowed to decide about entering the Korean conflict. They were not allowed to decide whether to cross the politically nonexistent thirty-eighth parallel, to parallel their airmen.

They were not even allowed the right of pursuit to release Americans taken prisoners by the Communists.

How many brave American fighting men now listed as missing were driven northward into China or Russia, while the United Nations—including the U. S. R. at Lake Success and debated whether our American armies could cross the line Russia drew to divide Korea? Think of it.

How many American marines, soldiers, and airmen are now rotting in Soviet work camps in the Arctic, or being exhibited to the Chinese people to show them we are "white imperialists"?

Our military men were not allowed to make the plans for our defense in China.

MacArthur, Chennault, and Wedemeyer had to go on a tour in the East to Communist sympathizers in the State Department who got their ideas of our military needs from America.

Our real military men were not allowed to make the plans for our participation in Formosa.

Promptly the Korean Communists attacked—according to President Truman issued his mysterious order that Chiang Kai-shek was not to attack the Communists, even in the country of which he was the head.

So Mao was able to move half a million men from South China to the Yalu River to turn against our men there.

Do you believe our real military leaders would give the Communists a clear field to attack our men when an ally stood ready to harass the enemy's flank?

That is so close to treason that only the political generals, the puppets whose strings are held in the State Department would dare do it. But it was done.

The State Department has its obedient, political generals, its stooges in battle dress, whom it has moved into top positions.

They impose total silence on the professional military men. Mr. Acheson makes our military plans, just as Harry Hopkins used to make them.

The Senate from Ohio [Mr. Taft] has exposed the confusion underlying the Eisenhower mission. He said:

Before General Eisenhower's return, I had supposed there was a definite plan. But nothing was ever announced except a plan to plan. In all my experience in Washington, I have never seen an important program so confused and uncertain.

Anyone who has been long in Washington knows that means confusion indeed.

If our real military men were not allowed to make the military decisions on Korea, China, or Formosa—I know the Senator from California is interested in this point—why do we think they will be allowed to make the military decisions on the rearmament of Europe?

Think that over. We must judge the future by what has occurred in the past.

Can Congress write another blank check for sending troops to Europe, give it to the State Department's obedient political generals, let them fill in whatever terms they like for their newest global adventure?

Mr. President, we have no anti-Communist program.

Some Members of this body have gone along with the administration proposals because of the threat of communism, and they were told the proposals were anti-Communist.

But we cannot accept that myth any longer.

We cannot sign a blank check for any Fair Deal proposal because of its anti-Communist label alone.

The Truman program is not anti-Communist.

We squared gifts on Britain, France, and the rest of continental Europe, and now one is proposed for India.

I understand there is coming up in a couple of days, another new one, the Eisenhower plan, for the whole world.

But Britain has in her cabinet, ministers who are or recently were Communist sympathizers.

She had until recently a Communist spy high in her atomic energy program.

Do we know how the Communists and the neutralists may corrupt British policy in the next few years?

France had a Communist as head of her atomic energy program.

Do we know how deeply the Communists have moved into the military leadership in Europe?

If we send troops to Europe, how long will it be before some of our men are fighting under leaders whose secret loyalty is to the U. S. S. R.?

The distinguished Senator from Maryland [Mr. O'Connor], certainly a Democrat of unquestioned party loyalty, has had to conduct a continuing investigation of the treasonable traffic in war-potential goods between ECA countries and the U. S. S. R. and her satellites.

Only a few days ago, the Senator from Utah introduced into the Record the story of factories in Italy, equipped by ECA, rushing orders for power plants and electric cranes to the Soviet Union.

The countries of Western Europe are old and tired and war weary.

They look at what we do, not at what we say—and what do they see the administration doing at home?

They know of Communist connections of some of the advisers to the State Department, of the officials who rose rapidly to high places in the period of growing Communist power after 1937.

They know of the Communist influence in our schools, in our publishing firms, in our magazines, in radio and moving pictures.

They know the Fair Deal is beholden to Communist sympathizers who helped reflect it in 1940, 1944, and 1948.

This is only the beginning.

We have heard the story of the past many times from our colleagues in this body.

But what can we expect in the future?

Who are guiding the administration's anti-Communist programs?

The Secretary of State still has not turned his back on Alger Hiss.

The Secretary of Defense was the chosen instrument for the sell-out of Free China to the Communists, which meant the collapse of our Asian front against the Soviet Union.

The Secretary of the Treasury was a man of experience and moderation but his views more and more reflect the views, and sometimes even the words, of Leon Keyserling, whose ideas conform to those of American Action and their collectivist allies.

The Secretary of the Interior has been charged, here on the Senate floor, with close connections with the Communists.

His only answer is, as the Senator from Kansas [Mr. Schoepe], said, was to use his office as a platform for ringing denials and very little more.

The Secretary of Commerce seems like a hard-headed man, but he inherited a Department which was staffed with Communists by Henry Wallace, who was told by his political "gurus" to demand that job because it was a key spot for espionage and distortion of policy. I wonder how many who were under Wallace are still there? I think Remington is out.

The Attorney General was recently head of the Democratic National Committee which is controlled by those who have under control of the fair deal, the PAC, and its Communist allies.

Then we have the President, himself.

We all know Mr. Truman is anti-Communist—when he understands the issue.

But we know he received his education in social welfare from Max Lowen-
We know there are millions of overseas Chinese in Asia, Africa, and the Americas. They sent men to fight for the freedom of China under Sun Yat-sen, and they would gladly do so again if they could get arms. The Communists know of the importance of these overseas Chinese, and they send their agents to win them over or threaten reprisals on their homes in China, but we do nothing.

We cannot send American soldiers to Europe as part of a bad plan when this administration refuses the preferred aid and equipment. It is not even a plan for the defense of Europe. If we intended to counter the threatened Soviet attack on Europe, or on us, we would never begin there.

The ground-troops-for-Europe plan is the Maginot Line on a continental scale. The Soviet plan of attack is the Nazi mobile column carried to its ultimate in the military, the political, and the economic fields. It penetrates deep into the opposition battle areas, at any unguarded opening. We are falling into the same trap that defeated the armies of France in 1940 and for the same reason, because confusion and decay at home make it impossible to see the military problem clearly.

**World Garrison State**

Militarily this plan, Mr. President, sets up a world garrison state, in opposition to the Soviet garrison state. It sends the people of Western Europe, like ourselves, to a generation or more of continuous struggle to supply the war machine, without any hope that their efforts will make life easier for themselves. Let us not delude ourselves, Mr. President. The garrison state is not defense. The regimenting of a people is not defense. Putting all the manpower of a nation under government control is not defense. Eliminating the whole army of a nation to government is not defense.

Representative BURVET of Nebraska, has recently reminded us that every nation which resists to peace-time conscription and regimentation has lost its wars. Seldom has a long historical record been so clear, the evidence so pre-
dominantly on one side. In modern times, Napoleon, France, Germany, modern France, Russia, and Italy have resorted to conscription and lost their wars.

Not only does this plan fasten the people of Europe firmly into a garrison state for years to come. General Eisenhower and General Marshall tell us to get ready for a period of 10, 20, or perhaps 30 years—but the political controls of this new shadowy state are lost in the mists of the stratosphere. We are told that the North Atlantic Pact nations are going to have a joint military planning body. They are going to have a joint economic planning body. But who is to manage the planners?

The North Atlantic Pact is a new political body. It has a political head, but we do not know who he is. Is it the Foreign Ministers, elected by no one? Or is it the Secretary of State of the United States? Or is it some hidden policy makers in our own Government, who make all our plans? The only thing we know, Mr. President, is that the political heads of this new state will not be this Congress, or the elected representatives in the legislature of any of the member states.

We have already been told the new body was going to plan the economic program of the pact. When this economic plan is set up, far above the elected officials of our own country, what will happen to the economy of our country? How much will have happened before we are allowed to know what is going on?

IT ALL FITS THE BLUEPRINT FOR OUR DESTRUCTION

We have talked about what the new European defense program does not do. What does it do?

"It seems to me," the Senator from Ohio said, "that there was a definite plan, but that the administration is deliberately concealing its nature because Congress will not consider the detailed program as desirable.

Only one thing about this plan is clear. It fits exactly the Fair Deal pattern. It is the same kind of spending, the same kind of regimentation, the same simple, literal, childish kind of defense.

With this plan and the other pieces of its defense program, the Fair Deal can send its astronomical budget figures even higher.

The Armed Forces are buying clothing and supplies enough for an army of 10,000,000 men. In January, according to the Senator from Virginia (Mr. Byrd), the Military Establishment hired three civilians for every four men taken in the January draft. Mr. DiSalvi is hiring thousands of agents—I read today in the press that he had taken on 33 new top advisers—to enforce price control regulations, although the administration's actions are providing little protection against the regulations. Materials have been cut back and we are swamped by small manufacturers who write in or come in asking us for help, so that they can keep their people at work.

We have put our productive system into a street-jacket. We are about to put our families into a consumer street-jacket. We are probably all made to put our manpower, civilian and military, men and women, into a street-jacket.

We are to sip off all the excess purchasing power of inflation to the Government through taxes. Our families, our cities, our industries, our banks, are to be left with the empty shell of prosperity, with no reserves, no margins for experiment, no leeway for error.

We are doing this, not for one year or two years or until the end of the war. We are frankly told that we may have to keep up that rate of spending far two generations.

We know that this can be done. But we also know that if it is done it will mean that the every man's wealth and income will be stripped away. American family, every firm, every school and hospital, every city and State government, every farm and industrial enterprise. We shall be a people almost without capital, living on our muscle, again, like the poorest people of Europe.

The American people are willing to do even this if it is necessary for the defense of our homeland. But I say that we dare not, in accordance with our oath, permit this to happen if it is not necessary, if it will not lead to the successful defense of our country.

If all this destruction of the American way of life, of the freedom and enterprise of Europe, are not needed to implement a sound defense program, what are they needed for?

Of course the new war spending provides a nice campaign fund for the administration. The plans are Mr. DiSalvi's and others are carefully picking the pockets of men who can get the approval of the Democratic Chairman Boyle. But I am going to pass over that—the RFC, the deep freeze, the 5 percenters, and so forth. Apparently they are not really too important. However, they are very important. To me it is much more important that this program fits so precisely the rule laid down by Lenin, that "every United States is to be induced to spend itself and its strength in bankruptcy.

The plan conforms too much precisely to the Soviet strategy of inducing our people to regiment themselves, and particularly to regiment our production, the one thing the Soviet Government knows it cannot meet.

I wonder, Mr. President, if we do not already see the shape of the ambush. Suppose we go forward with the administration's plans for all-out mobilization of everything, stripping faster and faster as we go. Then suppose the Soviet Union make a peace offer, a genuine peace offer. What will happen to our spurious war economy? It will grind to a quick stop. Firms will be without orders, workers without jobs. The Government will have no income to meet the crisis except printing press money. Can we not see the masters of the Kremlin watching the chaos spread? A depression is what they have been waiting for. A depression following an all-out war economy would go deeper.

Is it their real plan to set us spinning at high gear, and then pull the rug from under us? I say, Mr. President, that, if there were no other reason, that is reason enough why the Congress cannot blindly follow the administration plans.

THE SUMMING UP

Mr. President, I was elected to this body in 1946. Since that time, I have watched the unfolding of the secret agreements of Tehran and Yalta. I have seen betrayal of our allies in Europe, the loss of central Europe to the Soviets, the surrender of the Kurile Islands to Russia, the open invitation to the Communists to invade Korea and the coddling of India.

I have seen our Government let its wartime arms contracts like Great Britain sell off in the sun before they made sure Soviet Russia would disarm. I have seen our own Armed Forces ordered to smash airplanes, tanks, jeeps, cameras, watches, piled up in great heaps in Europe or Asia.

Someone gave orders to destroy material enough to equip 80 divisions. We are told that orders had been issued to ship much of that material to Free China, and that those orders were suddenly countermanded just before the Communists began their attack on Asia.

I saw a beginning of military resistance in aid to Greece and Turkey, and I voted for federal aid. I asked for military assistance for Greece and Turkey. Soon, however, that was transformed by some unknown means into another fantasy welfare scheme, the Marshall plan.

Who suddenly abandoned the idea of military aid to the nations in the shadow of the Soviet arms and embarked instead on a grandiose plan to raise their standard of living by the light of the United States in the years of all-out war production? Who sold our Government that idea?

While the U. S. R. was rearming on their borders, how could the European countries do what our country did in the peaceful atmosphere of the 1920's? How could we possibly provide the capital for them to do it after 15 years of the New Deal, the Second World War and the Fair Deal spending orgy? Why should we, if we could?

The fairest thing we could have done to Europe, if we did anything, was to carry out the plan for strictly military aid proposed for Greece and Turkey. Someone, somewhere, subtly changed the Truman doctrine for containing communism by military means into the Marshall doctrine for stopping communism with do-gooders.

I do not believe it was accident, and I do not believe it was stupidity. The change was too subtle, too perfectly timed, too quietly carried out, to be accidental or stupid.

How could the American people and the American Congress be so easily persuaded to change from hard military aid to soft Marshall welfare aid? The people were persuaded, and the Congress was persuaded, by a gigantic propaganda campaign, engineered from Washington, but carried into every labor organization, every church organization, every women's organization, every newspaper and magazine and radio network in the country.

Mr. President, I suggest that Senators go back and read in the light of these hearings on the Marshall plan. Let Senators remember how many able Americans came here to speak before
them and warn them that they were only
setting the table for Stalin. Let them
remember how many able Members of
this body, and of the House of Repre-
sentatives spoke out at the time of the
folly of stopping tanks with wet nurses.
Senators will be shocked, I think, to
see how well their hearings and the ques-
tions by their committee members
brought out the truth. Then they will be
shocked, as I was, that the plan passed
in spite of the clear evidence that it
would not prevent war, it would only
make war more likely, as we fatten the
sooze for Stalin to kill.

Then they will be shocked, as I am, at
the skill and the finesse with which some-
one, somewhere, planned and carried out
a propaganda campaign sound enough to
fool the Congress, fool the American
press, fool the American people into
believing the Marshall plan was good, or
fool them into believing that opposition
was hopeless. It makes no difference.
Either works equally well.

What did we fail to see about the
Marshall plan? We failed to see, Mr.
President, that it conformed perfectly
to two requirements of Soviet military
strategy. The Marshall plan fitted
perfectly the design to make us spend
our own resources into bankruptcy. It fitted
perfectly the Soviet design to delay re-
armament, to keep Europe and the
United States defenseless. It was part of
the plan which included dissolving the
American Armed Forces right after
VJ-day. It was part of the plan which
included smashing and burning and
sinking billions of dollars worth of mil-
itary supplies which we had on the
ground in Europe and Asia.

I say, Mr. President, it is time we
stopped looking at the pieces and begin
to look at the whole story. I say that
we have deluded ourselves too long with
the picture of a little babushka faced
with a task much too big for him, be-
wilderder by the pressure, and making
mistakes because of it.

I say, Mr. President, that what I see
does not look to me like bungling. What
has happened since 1945 does not look
like stupidity or accident. It looks like
precision planning. It looks as if some-
one, somewhere, knew exactly where we
were being led.

We are being governed by people
who have a blueprint for our destruction,
and we are right on the timetable.

I say that every one of these emer-
gency programs which descended upon
us, year by year, UNRRA, the British
loan, the Marshall plan, military aid,
point 4, was each and all a gigantic
camouflage designed to confuse and de-
lude us while the destruction proceeded
undetected.

Of course, they helped us spend our-
selfs into bankruptcy. Of course, they
helped keep open and unhealed the cuts
in our defense arteries through which
our economic lifeblood was flowing.
Of course, they delayed the Europeans
from arming themselves. But their
most important role, I believe, was to pull
the wool over the eyes of the American
people and especially the American
Congress, so that no one would see the
blueprint behind our apparently ran-
dom mistakes, so that if anyone should
see it and speak out, as I have done
many times, no one would believe him.
He would be called an isolationist, and
be brushed off. Like Samson, eyeless
in Gaza, we could be taken over by
power-mad weaklings only if we were
prevented from seeing the truth.

I suggest that Senators ask them-
selves this question. If they were sit-
ing as members at the table where the
Soviets' master plan met, and heard the
reports, year by year, of the dissolution
of our armed forces, the arms controls,
the persecution of defense officials who
wanted us to rearm, of the silencing of
our generals and admirals, of the be-
trayal of China, of the subversion
of military aid to Greece and
Turkey into welfare spending in
the rest of Europe and the
world, of the mysterious melting
away of our defense
funds, fifty-some-odd billions
of dollars, of the
abandonment of Korea, of our sudden
reentry into Korea, of the orders to
Chiang Kai-shek not to fight the Chi-
inese Communist armies on the main-
land, would they have thought it was
a good news or bad? What more would
members of the Politburo have asked for?

Furthermore, Mr. President, we had
the slow, unceasing increase in public
debt, or perhaps we should say the slow,
unceasing replacement of the reserves of
our banks, of our insurance companies,
of our colleges and cities, and of our
families, by Government bonds based on
unpaid debt—in place of the savings of
generations.

What would you think, Mr. President,
if you were in the Politburo, if you heard
that Mr. Truman's only cure for this
hopeless mess was sending our troops to
Europe? Would you be frightened, or
would you think it was more of the same
thing?

I ask you again, Mr. President, to
condemn this strange perfec-
tion from a distance, so you can see
the perspective. I ask my colleagues to
stand off and look at it so that we can
free ourselves from the clever propa-
ganda which surrounded each part of
that program, and made the bits and
pieces look plausible.

Like Ulysses listening to the sirens
song, we must close our ears so that we
cannot hear the dulcet sounds. We must
save ourselves and those who depend on
us from the fate that awaits us.

I say, Mr. President, that the U.S.S.R.
has one only objective, and that is the
destruction of the United States. I say
it is time wasted to debate whether So-

eviet Russia is going to attack Asia first
or Europe first. She is going to attack
either first, or both, or neither, depend-
ing only on what move she needs in the
great chess game she is playing with
the United States.

The Soviet leaders know that if they
can destroy the United States, they have
the world. It is winner take all. They
will take any chances, pay any price,
wait for any period of time, if only they
can destroy us. Then the rest of the
world will fall into their lap.

I say to you, Mr. President, that we
have only one problem. That is, as for-
mer President Hoover said, the defense
of the United States.

We have only one problem because the
defense of our country is the best de-

cision we ever made. I am not tallking
about our retreating behind some imagi
nary wall and hiding from our enemy.
No such idea was ever proposed by Mr.
Hoover or by the Senator from Ohio
[Mr. Taft], or by any other reasonable
person. No such idea would be counte
nanced by the American people.

We say that our country's first duty to
the world is to make herself strong in
every way—politically, militarily,

economically. We must put aside, not
the latest plan proposed by the Truman
administration, but every vestige of the
proposal ever made by the Truman
administration. We must cast aside their
military programs, their foreign policy,
their fiscal policies, their domestic-wel-
fare policies, every policy which has been
inaugurated in the United States since
the administration began.

I say the United States is being led
into an ambush. I say we are being
guided by men who are leading us to a
massacre. I do not know who they are.
I do not need to know. But I do know
their traces. It took only one Alger Hiss
to make the UN the monstrosity it is. It
would take only two or three unknown
Alger Hisses in key positions to plan
the strangely precise and detailed blueprint
which the Truman administration has
followed with such perfect consistency
and such tragic results.

We cannot let the armed power of the
United States be used up in whatever
plans the President chooses to make if
he will not seek out and dismiss the hid-

den traitors in his official family.

If a general in Indian fighting in the
West had scouts whom he trusted, but
who were planning to betray him to the
Indians, he would not be allowed to
jeopardize his men. Everyone in the
Nations, from the President and the
Secretary of War to the smallest drum-
mer boy, would try to protect our armies
and our country from such an ambush.

If President Truman will not, or can-
not, find the men who have made this
strange blueprint for our destruction,
then I say that we in Congress cannot
authorize the sending of American troops
to Europe. We cannot authorize the,
or any other blueprint that fits the pattern
of our administration. Congress must get

TOWARD A TRULY AMERICAN FOREIGN POLICY

I do not propose that we take over
the executive function. The problems
before us are legislative, not executive. We
have failed to do our own duty. That is
why the executive power is out of hand.

Our task is to put the ax to the root
of the tree—to cut down all the growth
of waste and extravagance and foolish

ness. We work with Mr. Taft and Mr. II, so that we can
see what the executive power is doing,
and make sure that no fifth column can be
hidden there.

First, we must cut down the budget,
cut down the bureaucracy, wipe out the

ests of the propagandists, and limit the

arial danger of economic bloodletting.

Second, we must formulate the
principles for a sound American policy for
security of the homeland and for relations with other countries. When we have written the legislative program, we can deal with the problem of making the Executive obey the law. The more our military policy is simple, the less we have the desire to conquer or attack any nation. Our only purpose is to keep any potential enemy far from our homeland. The principle is permanent. Its application changes from time to time, as inventions change the means by which our enemy would attack us. In the days of sailing ships, the 3-mile limit was a safe protection against offshore cannon. With the rise of steam power, an enemy could injure us from a greater distance. The danger zones grew and so did England and France, who set up bases for conducting her steamships and guarding against sudden attacks. We formulated a theory of sea power and added Puerto Rico, Hawaii, the Canal, and the Philippines to our defense areas. Today our military problem is attack by air. The danger zone is wider. We need to define the area which, in the air age, corresponds to the earlier danger zone for steam power.

We need to lay out a defense plan, resting, let us say, on unsinkable aircraft carriers in Libya, and in Japan. Then we can find out what we need to defend that area or to counterattack if necessary. To do that we do not need to turn our own country into a garrison-state. We do not need to lead a world coalition armed to the teeth for generations. American foreign policy, like our military policy, rests on the fact that we do not want to conquer anyone.

We have a magnificent American foreign policy for keeping peace and stability in the area necessary for our security, without infringing on the freedom of any other nation in that area. That is the Monroe Doctrine.

In 1820 European dictators threatened to invade the best of government on the newly freed republics of Latin America. At the same time, the Russian Empire was laying claim to the west coast, as far south as California. In his message to Congress on December 2, 1823, President Monroe said:

The occasion has been judged proper for asserting as a principle in which the rights and interests of the United States are involved, that the American continents, by their free and independent condition which they have assumed and maintained, are henceforth not to be considered as subjects for future colonization by any European power.

He added:

We should consider any attempt on their part to extend their system to any portions of this hemisphere as dangerous to our peace and safety.

President Monroe also said:

Our policy in regard to Europe, which was adopted at an early stage of the wars which have so long been the subject of our nation, has been, and remains, the same, which is not to interfere in the internal concerns of any of its powers.

Before President Monroe announced his new doctrine, he submitted his plan to Thomas Jefferson. Jefferson saw at once that this was a new kind of foreign policy, a truly American policy of security without conquest. He said:

The question presented by the letter you have sent me is the most momentous which has ever been offered by my contemplation since that of independence. That made us a nation; this sets our compass and points the course which we are to steer through the ocean of time opening up on us.

It should be noted that as soon as we departed from that truly realistic American foreign policy we got into trouble, and we have been in trouble ever since. We fought World War I. We departed from that policy of making the world safe for democracy; and, before the smoke of battle had cleared, there was less democracy in the world than there had ever been before. We then fought World War II, again departing from that realistic American foreign policy. We fought World War II to make the world safe for the four freedoms and, after the din of battle had died away in that war, we had turned loose upon the face of the earth the most ruthless, atheistic doctrine the world has ever known. On abetter, we handed, and placed under the domination of, 800,000,000 followers of that atheistic cult, almost a third of the world's surface. We are now getting ready to go into World War III, it is said. For what? Pray God it never comes, but, Mr. President, if we have to fight another war, let us fight one for our own country's interest.

Jefferson's spirit was elated at the vision of our freedom from the wars of Europe. He said:

Our first and fundamental maxim should be, never to entangle ourselves in the broils of Europe. Our second, never to suffer Europe to intermediate with cis-Atlantic affairs. America, North and South, has a set of interests distinct from those of Europe and peculiarly her own. She should have a system of her own, therefore, separate and apart from that of Europe.

He rejoiced at the news that England might join with us on the declaration, because it would detach her from the European concert and ally her with the free world. "Not," said Jefferson, "that I would purchase even her ally at the price of taking part in her wars."

After the Civil War, Lincoln reestablished the principle in his note firmly requesting the French dictator, Napoleon III, to state to us that he would remove his armies from Mexico. Again, in 1899, we faced another world crisis. European powers in search of land that partitioned Africa and took over Siberia, India, and the East Indies.

The great powers saw a chance to divide up China as Africa, and give each a piece of the carcass. Again, the United States spoke out. Secretary John Hay pronounced the famous open-door policy, a restatement of a treaty of friendship we had made with China in 1887.

We said the United States would not countenance the dismemberment of China. The rise of strong industrial powers, exploiting the labor of the Chinese, and engaged in constant wars, was both immoral and a threat to our security as a Pacific power.

From 1789 to 1917, Mr. President, this was the policy of both parties and of all the peoples in the United States. We were as strong in what we did not attempt as in what we tried to do. We did not interfere with any other nations. We did not attempt any more than what we could perform. Because we laid down a program we could carry out, no one dared molest us. We had abandoned our great tradition, as I said, we sent our young men to Western Europe "to make the world safe for democracy." Not satisfied with sending men and arms, President Wilson sailed to Europe and took part in a long and bitter tug-of-war with the other powers over the partition of Europe. He undertook to remake the map of Eastern Europe to give "self-determination" to every little racial bloc.

We were infected with the first germs of the new American Imperialism, even earlier, under Dewey at Manila Bay. The caution we had learned from hard experience in the great European wars of the past faded away.

We have found that as for almost 50 years. They have led us from a world of peace and plenty to the hideous world of today when American youth are taken from their homes and sent halfway round the world to destroy with flame-throwers, the little grass huts of Korea. What a picture. We are on the wrong road. We must turn off and find our way on the road followed by the great leaders of our past—Washington, Jefferson, Madison, Monroe, the Amadas's, Lincoln, John Hay, Elihu Root and Charles Evans Hughes. No people ever had a roster of greater names in foreign policy.

We cannot make a sound American foreign policy until we put aside in toto the global "welfarism" that leads inevitably to flame-throwers. It is time to turn back to the modest, thoughtful, constructive American foreign policy that we followed so successfully for over a hundred years.

I am not proposing that we abandon Europe or that we cease to be good neighbors. I say that we were not a friend to Europe when we gave her our global WPA. We gave Europe a crutch. We trained her to depend on crutches. We told her in the years just before the Korean "police action" that she could forget all about arming herself against Russia and dream of raising her standard of living. We told her to forget about her problems of over-population, to forget about the need for pioneering in Africa, to forget her great tradition of enterprise and daring.

I believe what we can do for Europe is to let her alone.

Take the crutch away from her; let her learn to walk again and be willing to fight for freedom without General Eisenhowers. We have followed the path of self-determination" to every little racial bloc.

We were infected with the first germs of the new American Imperialism, even
Our chief contribution to European defense today is our stockpile of atomic bombs, the production lines of Detroit, Akron, and Indianapolis, and the courage of our fighting men in Korea. They protect Europe today. They can protect her as well tomorrow.

The only objective of the Kremlin is to destroy us. Our purpose must be to protect ourselves. Our survival is the best insurance Europe has.

The world of the Monroe Doctrine was not a world of weakness but of strength. It did not encourage war, but discouraged it. It did not turn the nations under its protection into a circle of garrison states; but it protected them against the need to arm at all. We are proposing to make a garrison state of Europe for at least two generations.

We do not have to look ahead to two generations of war preparation, war economy, and curtailment of our liberties. We can do better than that.

The first Monroe Doctrine brought peace and liberty to Latin America. They had local quarrels, and even wars, but our hemisphere was outside the cockpit of the European struggle for the world.

The second Monroe Doctrine, the open-door policy, brought freedom from foreign control to the great continental area of China. China had local wars, it is true, but she was spared the horrors of devastation by modern armed forces and the greater horrors of a war between yellow and white races.

Under the third Monroe Doctrine we can look ahead to a world in which each great region of the earth will defend itself against those who set out to destroy it. In Asia, the free Chinese, the free Koreans, the Filipinos, the Japanese, and other antiaggressor nations can unite their forces, drive the Communists back, and set up a barrier at the borders of Siberia beyond which the most maniacal Soviet leader will not dare to hurl his men. A revitalized Europe can set up a barrier the most desperate Soviet leader will not dare to cross. In the Near East, Persians, Turks, Arabs, and Jews can work together to erect a southern barrier against which the maddest Soviet leaders will not care to move. Every sea that washes the shores of Europe or Asia will be protected by the ships and planes and submarines of our Navy. At bases in—let us say—England, Japan, and Libya, the United States will have its air armadas ready to strike in any direction, against the industrial heart or the transportation arteries of the Soviet Union. Guarded by the ring of fortresses of sea and sky surrounding the Soviet Union, the Europeans, the people of Asia, of Africa, and of the Americas can abandon their hated war economy, their plans for a permanent garrison state.

It is not part of this plan to abandon the people of Russia to permanent slavery. The Russian rulers are sitting on bayonets, and must feed their people an unending stream of conquests. Once the conquests are ended, they will begin to crumble from within.

We can begin now to draw over to our side the people in Russia or her conquered satellites who want to come over. We can by every means in our power induce the Russian people to rise up and throw off the yoke that binds them, as the Japanese people did in the midst of war. The fear of war with Russia today comes from a few men in the Kremlin. Of course, we know there are many causes, but these men have taken possession of one country and turned it into one vast slave factory to build up their power to threaten war. It is fantastic to think of the will and courage and resources of the people of Europe, the people of Asia and Africa, the people of the Americas, and the people of the USSR itself, are not enough to dethrone this wicked gang and let us return to the pursuits of peace. The American people cannot afford any longer to follow the example of European militarists and rely on force and regimentation.

We cannot entrust the future to those in our country who have betrayed the past. I thoroughly dislike seeing the nations of Europe turn themselves into a continental garrison-state, when I know that that is the last way to achieve real defense, when I know that much better means are at hand. I dislike more, Mr. President, to see my country take the lead in urging them to do so.

Our country cannot lead the world in a return to barbarism. There is a better way, and we here in Congress must find it. We must return to our own great tradition. Only then will we be able to give the rest of the world the kind of leadership they really trust—the example of a people strong, confident, and free.