

## “Let’s Put America First”

William Ezra Jenner, a Republican Senator from Indiana, gave the following speech as he addressed the Dallas Public Affairs Club and the Committee of One Hundred at the Bakers Hotel in Dallas, Texas, on February 14, 1955. His speech came seventeen days after Congress adopted the Formosa Resolution, which secured an American commitment for the defense of Formosa, present day Taiwan. In this speech Senator Jenner praised this resolution, yet spent a significant portion of it warning his listeners of the influence of Communist sympathizers in the U.S. government. Senator Jenner pointed to the fact that, “the problem lay in the divided authority in the formation of our [America’s] foreign policy between the constitutional and the pro-Communist.”<sup>69</sup> He claimed that this could cause the United States to appear “futile and ineffectual.”<sup>69</sup> Throughout this speech William Jenner warned his audience of the need to “prevent the sellout of Formosa.”<sup>70</sup>

Address By The Honorable William E. Jenner (R-Ind)

BAKERS HOTEL, DALLAS, TEXAS – 12:00 Noon, February 14, 1955.

Sponsored by the Dallas Public Affairs Club and The Committee of One Hundred

### LET’S PUT AMERICA FIRST

It is always a pleasure for me to leave Washington and travel to one of our great states, to meet with the people there and to discuss our national problems. I believe fervently the strength of our nation resides not in the capital but in the vast expanse of our country. Empires are represented by, as they are governed by, their capital cities. Free countries are not divided into a capital city and the provinces, which are ruled by it.

It is a special pleasure for me to come to Texas because in my State of Indiana we still believe the United States is a union of sovereigns, and our state is in every respect the sovereign equal of the Federal Government. There is no deference in Indiana to the glamour and show, which are now so evident in Washington. We believe that we, the people, govern the country, and Washington is the front office, part of the administrative headquarters. I am sure that doctrine will sound right and proper in the State of Texas.

It is a favorite argument of the collectivists that foreign policy is something remote and abstract, which can be understood only by experts who have spent years in the precincts of the State Department or on the staffs of certainly [sic] daily papers. Congressmen, who have not had the benefit of long indoctrination in the mysteries, and you, who do not even breathe the air of Washington, are

---

<sup>69</sup> Michael Paul Poder, *The Senatorial Career of William E. Jenner: A Dissertation* (Michigan: UMI, Dissertation Services, 1976), 302.

<sup>70</sup> Poder, 304.

supposed to sit patiently and wait until the great minds have handed down what you may know.

Americans never accepted such nonsense. Our greatest diplomatic achievements were the work of laymen, who had spent most of their years in private life. In the last few years we have been bewildered and bemused by foreign relations experts in Washington offices, but the moment has come when the American people need to decide what kind of foreign policy they wish to stand for, and then tell our government to follow it.

### PRESIDENT EISENHOWER'S COMMITMENT TO THE FREE NATIONS

President Eisenhower's message on defense of the Nationalist stronghold on Formosa<sup>71</sup> will certainly be a landmark in American foreign affairs, but what kind of a landmark it will be is not yet certain.

First let us look at the documents themselves – the message of the President, and the resolution of Congress supporting the President's position.

In the words of the message and the resolution, the United States reaffirms its close ties with its loyal ally, the Nationalist government of China, and makes a commitment to defend the Nationalist stronghold with American military power if the Communists carry out their threat to attack it.

This statement does not solve all the problems of our foreign policy in the Western Pacific. There is no good reason why it should. We have had twenty years of mismanagement of our activities in Asia. It is not reasonable to ask that any single statement clear away all the confusion.

The message is significant because it deals with the most important question. We have announced that we shall tolerate no new retreat in Asia. The Red Chinese<sup>72</sup> will not be permitted to breach the frontiers of the still free world. We make it clear that we shall meet Communist military action with military action, the only argument the Communists understand. We will not start the shooting, but if the Communists choose to start a war, we will finish it.

A foreign policy carefully worked out in many conferences, publicly stated on the authority of the Chief Executive, and supported by Congress and both parties, should be firm as a rock.

But I say to you – what you know well – that the foreign policy established in the Formosa papers is not firm at all. The fact that it is clearly stated in a Presidential message, and formally approved by the legislative branch, may mean nothing. It is wholly possible that we shall follow the opposite policy of appeasement of the Communists, surrender of our advantage, and a sell-out of our loyal allies in Asia.

Why am I so certain that the wishes of the American President, the American Congress, and the American people, may be flouted?

---

<sup>71</sup> Current day Taiwan in East Asia off the coast of mainland China.

<sup>72</sup> Communist China, the People's Republic of China (PRC).

## TWO AMERICAN FOREIGN POLICY CENTERS

The reason is – briefly – that we have two lines of authority in foreign policy-making. One is the line of responsibility laid down in our Constitution and followed by all those who believe in our Constitution. The other is a network whose members deliberately disregard our Constitution, our President and our Congress, and act as a law unto themselves.

The sad fact is that no public document, no formal commitment, no legal mandate, can determine American foreign policy today. Our fluctuating foreign policy is a tug-of-war between these two forces. It is an unsettled question which group will be triumphant in the struggle to shape our nation's destiny.

We have seen again and again in the last two decades, that the foreign policy put forward in our public statements, is not the foreign policy carried out by our government.

This is not because the American government has suddenly become untrustworthy. That would be a most inaccurate statement of what has happened.

The reason is that the American is a two-headed monster. It is led by two different organizing centers. The never-settled question of which center is to determine our foreign policies has kept us in constant turmoil, and made us look futile and ineffectual before the world.

This conflict between two heads of our government will not end until one or the other is wholly defeated, uprooted and destroyed.

For years now our government has been pulled in two opposite directions in making its decisions.

## ONE CENTER IS PRO-SOVIET

The hearings of the so-called Tydings Committee<sup>73</sup> disclosed clear evidence, in spite of the whitewash, that a powerful and ruthless group were [sic] guiding our decisions to the advantage of the Soviet Union. This was not news. Committees of Congress had been making the same charge for years.

The Russell Committee, which investigated the dismissal of General MacArthur,<sup>74</sup> and investigations by the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee,<sup>75</sup> showed that a secret faction in our government had worked out its own foreign policy, to suit its own ends, and had by infinite skill, patience and ruthlessness, put it into effect, regardless of the legally established foreign policy set by

---

<sup>73</sup> The investigations of loyalty within the State Department were put under review by this subcommittee. The subcommittee was authorized in 1950 to look into the charges made by Senator Joe McCarthy regarding a list of individuals in the State Department that he claimed to be known members of the Communist Party of the United States.

<sup>74</sup> President Truman dismissed General Douglas MacArthur from command in 1951 for publicly disagreeing with his Korean War Policy.

<sup>75</sup> The subcommittee to investigate the administration of the Internal Security Act of 1950 as well as the enforcement of laws related to espionage, sabotage, and subversive activities in the United States.

Congress and by our President.

Throughout all of 1951 and 1952 the Congress, especially the Senate, was engaged in a Great Debate<sup>76</sup> to turn the light on this secret foreign policy and destroy its influence.

You know the achievements of this secret group.

After the defeat of Japan in World War II, our official foreign policy was to defend and strengthen the Nationalist government of China. But the secret faction in our government was determined we should support the Chinese Reds. In the name of the United States government, they insisted on a “united front” government in China, with the Communist rebels retaining their own armed forces. Our representative gave the Reds a long cease-fire by which they could rest and re-equip their armies, and he set up an embargo on American bullets for the guns of the defenders.

Since 1950, we have had two policies for the Nationalist government on Formosa. Our official policy was to support the legal government and help rearm the Nationalist forces. Congress voted the money again and again as proper for our own defense. But the hidden faction in our government intended that we should “disengage ourselves” – as the polite phrase goes – from the Nationalists. Their real policy for Formosa parallel the famous advice of Owen Lattimore,<sup>77</sup> to let Korea fall but not let it look as if we pushed her. In December, 1949 – five years ago – our State Department even issued instructions to its personnel abroad to show no regrets when the government on Formosa fell – according to plan.

During the war in Korea, we were ostensibly fighting to defeat the Red Chinese attackers. Our military leaders, our people, and I believe most of the members of the administration, were loyal to that objective. But the invisible group had a different policy. They were determined to prevent military victory over the Reds. They intended to return by force the Chinese prisoners of war who did not wish to go back to Communist China, as they returned the hopeless refugees in Europe after 1945. They intended to leave North Korea a wasteland, occupied by Red troops who could infiltrate South Korea at will and descend at a moment’s notice on Free Korea, with armies rested and reequipped.

The secret group won every objective except the return of the pitiful prisoners-of-war, who were saved by the insistence of Congress and the unremitting determination of our military leaders.

The same double purpose can be found in our German policy, in Austria, in Italy, in Greece, and in the tragic surrender of all Eastern Europe to the Soviet Union.

The public policy of the United States, which has in almost all instances denounced conquest and supported the independent peaceful nations, has faded

---

<sup>76</sup> The Great Debate referred to the various subcommittees in the early 1950s that brought increasing focus on the foreign policy in Asia.

<sup>77</sup> Owen Lattimore, an author, scholar of Central Asia, and professor at Johns Hopkins University; he was accused of being a Soviet espionage agent by Senator Joseph McCarthy in 1950.

away. The secret policy of the faction so friendly to the Soviet Union has in almost every instance been triumphant.

Our public policy of resisting Communism has succeeded only in Turkey, and to a limited extent in Greece. But Secretary of Defense Forrestal,<sup>78</sup> who was determined to block the Communist advance, and who won over President Truman, was driven to an early grave. His hard policy of armed resistance to Communism was replaced by the soft policy of economic aid to Europe.

From 1945 to 1952 the power of the Soviet Union spread east and west, until it covered one-third of the world and put millions of people in bondage. The conflict between freedom and slavery was not lost in Asia or in Europe. It was lost in Washington, because the little group in our policy-making, which favored the Soviet Union, was stronger than the people who believed in a pro-American policy.

### IT'S [sic] PROGRAM IS DEFEAT OF THE FORMOSA POLICY

I say to you that the Eisenhower policy, for defense of the perimeter of the free world where it is threatened in the Formosa Strait,<sup>79</sup> will be undermined, eroded, covered up, twisted and made over into a policy favoring Red China, unless we learn our lesson, and deal with the realities of politics today.

Already erosion is apparent. We constantly hear it dinned in our ears that it is all right for us to defend Formosa, but very wrong to defend Quemoy and Matsu.<sup>80</sup> That is as if the UN should say to the United States, "You will reduce tension with the Soviet Union if you give up Alaska, which is nearer the Soviet border than it is to the United States. The Soviet Union says Alaska belongs to it. It does not matter if you need Alaska for radar information, weather information, and early warning of threatened attack. You must give up Alaska to the Soviet rulers so their tension will be lowered."

Another form of erosion is hidden in the warnings that Formosa really belongs to Japan, and so it is all right for the United States to intervene, but Quemoy and the Tachens<sup>81</sup> belong to China, and therefore, if we defend the coastal islands, we are threatening Red China. That argument omits the minor fact that we are not threatening the Reds. They are threatening us. They cannot get the coastal islands except by conquest. They have already tried and failed. It is they who talk of new conquests, not we.

A third form of erosion is the attempt to get a cease-fire in the United

---

<sup>78</sup> James Vincent Forrestal, Secretary of Defense in the Truman Administration from 1947 to 1949.

<sup>79</sup> Also called the Taiwan Strait, it was 180 kilometers wide and is located between mainland China and the island of Taiwan (Formosa).

<sup>80</sup> Islands located in the Formosa Strait. The islands were held by Nationalist Chinese forces after they were forced to flee to Formosa in 1949.

<sup>81</sup> The Tachen Islands were an archipelago consisting of 29 islands and covering 14.6 square kilometers. The islands are located in the Gulf of Taizhou, Zhejiang, off of the mainland of China.

Nations. A cease-fire would tell the Nationalists they could never win back their own country. That would be like telling George Washington he could have a cease-fire if he would remain in Valley Forge, but make no effort to reconquer New York or Philadelphia or Yorktown.

A cease-fire would free the Red armies for a new attack on Indo-China.

A cease-fire would give further recognition to the Red Chinese. It would tell the desperate people on the Mainland they had no hope. It would tell the people of Poland, the Balkans and East Germany, that the United States had no interest in their fate.

Other pitfalls are the proposals to establish two Chinas, and sooner or later to put Free China under a UN trusteeship.<sup>82</sup> We know where that will lead. After Red China is safely installed in UN as a “peace-loving” nation, it will bring up the demand that Formosa be surrendered to it, and cite the Cairo Declaration as proof we have already agreed to the proposal.

Perhaps the most serious threat of all is the recent report that our government intends to ask other members of the UN to help us patrol the Formosa Strait. That would end all pretense of either a pro-American or an anti-Communist policy. It would mean another “victory” like Korea.

#### THE UNITED NATIONS MAKES NO COMMITMENTS TO FREEDOM

Whatever you make of UN in general, it should be possible to get agreement among all good Americans on a few facts. The Soviet Union is a member of the United Nations. So are her satellites. She has a permanent seat on the Security Council, with the veto power.

The UN has no commitments to support freedom. For every obligation to the free nations it has corresponding obligations to the Communist nations. Its staff includes a proportion of open Communists, but it also has a substantial number of secret Communists. The UN recently awarded large damages to some American Fifth Amendment Communists on its staff, who were dismissed only because of hearings held by the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee.

The UN is in the middle, see-sawing between the free world and the Communist world.

The most favorable policy to us, which the UN can adopt, is neutralism. It is nearer to downright co-existence.

This is the minimum of undisputed fact about UN on which all Americans can agree. The UN is an agent of both Communist, anti-Communist and neutral nations. It has no justification for favoring the side of the free. It has never pretended to do so. Nowhere in the vast outpouring of documents that flows from the UN is there any commitment to freedom. The UN works for “peace,” for welfare, for One World. It does not pretend to work for liberty.

---

<sup>82</sup> UN Trusteeships were put in place to help ensure that occupied territories or dependent countries were administered in the best interest of the inhabitants and of international peace and security.

## PRO-COMMUNISTS CANNOT BE STOPPED BY PAPERS

Why do I say that these proposals to soften up the Formosa resolution<sup>83</sup> – so dangerous to the interests of the United States, so shameful a breach of our moral obligations, - will probably prevail, in spite of the solemn commitment by the President and the Congress to a true American line of action?

The reason is this. A group of gangsters cannot be stopped by a written contract. A power group in government cannot be stopped by a state paper. A revolutionary junta, whose purpose is to take over the sovereignty, cannot be stopped by a resolution of Congress. The only answer to a ruthless political action group, determined to destroy the honor [of] America, is a political action group determined to support American political ideals and defend the men in government who are loyal to them.

We have talked loosely and superficially about this rival power system. But talk is no longer good enough.

We have called the product the Acheson foreign policy. This dual control of foreign policy was operating in our government as early as 1940 under Harry Hopkins.<sup>84</sup> It operated under Dean Acheson,<sup>85</sup> but it has operated just as effectively since he left. We have no reason whatever to think this group lost its hold because Mr. Acheson resigned. Everything we know indicates the contrary.

Who then are the people we are discussing? Where do they operate? On what foundation does their power rest?

## THEY DO NOT OPERATE CONSTITUTIONAL RESTRAINTS

Part of our confusion comes from the fact that this group does not operate along Constitutional lines at all. Our legal foreign relations staff works in the State Department, under the direction of the President, and within the policy framework laid down by Congress. But the extra-legal foreign policy-making conspiracy operates all over the lot. Like a cancer growing wild, it ignores all the restraints inherent in a healthy well-balanced organism. This collectivist machine operates, in part, in the State Department, in part, in the White House Secretariat, in the super-Cabinet agencies of national defense, in the Foreign Operations Administration, in the CIA. But a substantial part of it operates outside government. It may be found in the press, in the parties, in the colleges, in labor unions, in business, in the United Nations. The important point is that all the parts of this political machine are coordinated. They operate, as one, from some control tower we cannot see.

We have tried to blame our Presidents, the State Department, the party in power, for our failures in foreign policy. I am convinced we shall never recognize

<sup>83</sup> A bill enacted by Congress in 1955 that secured an American commitment for the defense of Formosa against invasion by the People's Republic of China.

<sup>84</sup> One of President Franklin Roosevelt's closest advisors, he was the chief diplomatic advisor to the President in World War II as well as a key policy maker.

<sup>85</sup> He was Secretary of State in the Truman Administration from 1949 to 1953. He played an important role in defining American Foreign Policy during the Cold War.

the octopus we have to fight until we realize it is not part of the legally established government at all. It is a revolutionary junta, operating within our government, and through our government, but not for our government, our Constitution, or our nation.

What keeps this cabal in power, under Democratic and under Republican administrations? Why has it been impossible for three Presidents and many Congresses to demolish it? That is a long story but it can be summarized in three p's, pressure groups, propagandists and pelf – that is, big spending.

You are going to ask me whether this group is entirely Communist directed. I doubt if our problem is that simple. This group has, we know, included Communist Party members and Communist agents, and may still include them. It includes Socialists, collectivist one-worlders, ambitious individuals greedy for power, willing in time of trouble to advance themselves at the expense of their country. It includes trimmers and collaborators who believe they can make deals with the unscrupulous, who think they can get votes or power or contracts or publicity, from the Communists, and then cast aside their tempters. It includes the innocent and the simple-minded, who love big words that have no meaning.

I do not know what proportion of these people are Communists, but I know for certain that everything they do is of benefit to Moscow, because it is directed by Moscow. The Soviet leaders are the most skillful people in the world today in the new political arts of propaganda, brainwashing, camouflage, and what I have called revolution by assembly line. We can save ourselves a great deal of time and thought if we realize one fact. As conditions are today, the Communist world revolution will control and use all the bits and pieces of collectivism, one-worldism, centralism, internationalism and all their variations. None of them will be helpful to us.

How are we going to redress the balance, and give the strength to the vast majority of true Americans, so they can manage their own government?

We must give up our reliance on legalism.

The pro-Communist, internationalist, collectivist foreign policy, with its favoritism for everything, which helps the Soviet Union, has triumphed again and again because of the energy, intelligence, and determination of self-directed elite. We fight this advancing army with statements, promises, papers and laws. We will never win until we oppose the collectivist political faction with resolute political action by men determined to put America first.

The pro-American group within our government today is more numerous, abler, stronger, more devoted, than the collectivist group. It is supported by the vast bulk of the voters of both parties. Its weakness is that it is trying to win a debate under the rules of American political life. It should be fighting for victory over opponents who know no rules.

### PRO-AMERICANS ARE UNDER ATTACK

We must know first the names of leaders of the pro-American group. You can find our [sic] who lead the American branch of our two-headed government



by the enemies they have made. The left-wing press and the collectivist collaborators are always ready to attack Secretary of Defense Wilson. They center much of their fire on Admiral Radford.

Kruschev<sup>86</sup> [ ]<sup>87</sup> speaking in Red China last fall, violently denounced Admiral Radford, and bracketed him with the Communist-hated Senators Knowland<sup>88</sup> and McCarthy. Isn't it significant that left-wing American columnists today follow exactly the line spoken by Kruschev four or five months ago?

You remember this bloc did not exactly like MacArthur. They denounce the Senators who support the free nations of Asia. They criticize President Eisenhower if he dares cooperate with Republicans they have not recommended.

The collectivist press has not yet started to attack Herbert Hoover, Jr.,<sup>89</sup> who is now our Under-Secretary of State, but it is a rule of theirs never to call attention to good people on our side until they have to. Assistant Secretary of State Robertson<sup>90</sup> has escaped their attack for the same reason.

Today pro-American officials have not one moment's security. They are constantly under attack, mostly by moves they cannot see. If you need a blueprint of how the collectivists keep dangerous anti-Communists under constant pressure, I suggest you analyze the series of moves which they employed to destroy Senator McCarthy, from the day in Wheeling, West Virginia, when he tore down the curtain of censorship hiding the Communists in our State Department.<sup>91</sup>

I tell you just such a subtle, complex, perfectly timed, secret campaign is already under way against the mean [sic] who dared advise the President to resist the Chinese Reds. The strategy is worked out, and broken into steps. It will arise, "spontaneously," from all directions. It will be echoed in all quarters of the world. The "line" is already apparent in the inspired British press and that of the Continent.

From a well-informed left-wing magazine I learn the shape of coming events. Once the UN is well in the picture the plan is to "build up enough pressure to

---

<sup>86</sup> Nikita Khrushchev served as the First Secretary of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union from 1953 to 1964.

<sup>87</sup> Section was omitted from original document.

<sup>88</sup> William Fife Knowland, Republican Senator from California. He was Senate Majority Leader (1953-1955) and Senate Minority Leader (1955-1959).

<sup>89</sup> Herbert Hoover, Jr., was Under-Secretary of State from October 1954 to February 1957.

<sup>90</sup> Walter Robertson was the Assistant Secretary of State for East Asian and Pacific Affairs from April 1953 to June 1959.

<sup>91</sup> Speech given in 1950 in which Joseph McCarthy claimed that he had a list of Communist sympathizers and party members working within the State Department.

make imperative the gentle liquidation of Chiang Kai-shek,<sup>92</sup> and the establishment of true self-government for the Formosans under UN trusteeship.” But, my friends, the Nationalists are not Formosans. Self-government will give the island to its pre-war inhabitants. Can you see the Nationalist armies, driven from Formosan soil by a demand for “neutrality”, wandering like a ghost army about the world, as helpless as General Anders valiant Polish fighting men?<sup>93</sup> Next we are told “binding multilateral agreements for the reduction of armaments are imperative.” These agreements will bind us but not the Communists. Finally we are told “Then the gamble that the President has taken will start paying off. The greater his success, the more likely he is to acquire the freedom of action he needs to (and I urge you to note) shed his most troublesome aides.”

### ONLY POLITICAL ACTION WILL SAVE US

The bloc which intends to destroy the true Americans in our government is in action. Is there a bloc to defend the true Americans and drive out the secret enemies of our country? I am not urging you to help our friends in Asia. I am urging you to prevent the humiliating defeat of our country and everything it stands for.

You ask who are the leaders of the collectivist bloc. Who is taking Acheson’s place today?

I can guess but I have no legal proof. Remember, the physician cannot have proof that his diagnosis is correct. He can get that only from the autopsy.

But I want to point out one significant fact. We are never going to have legal proof, about the most dangerous enemies of our country. We will not be able to use what proof we have when the culprit is close to the top. Attorney General Brownell<sup>94</sup> and J. Edgar Hoover<sup>95</sup> told us how FBI reports on Harry White,<sup>96</sup> for example, were sent to President Truman, and his Cabinet officers again and again. We know President Truman and his top Cabinet members opposed promoting Harry White to the International Monetary Fund, in view of his record. But he was promoted.

Who could tell the President of the United States he must promote a known Communist collaborator? I have been told who was the person responsible but I have so far no proof. Shall we sit and do nothing, when we have political proof

<sup>92</sup> Served as the Generalissimo of the Republic of China (ROC) from 1928 to 1975. He became the President of the ROC in 1948 under the 1947 Constitution of the Republic of China

<sup>93</sup> General Wladyslaw Anders served in the Polish Army after it was resurrected in 1918-19. At the onset of World War II, the army was weak and could not hold against the German and the Russian forces. It was therefore helplessly trapped between two aggressors.

<sup>94</sup> Herbert Brownell, Jr., was the Attorney General under President Eisenhower from 1953 to 1957.

<sup>95</sup> John Edgar Hoover was the Director of the FBI from 1924 to 1972.

<sup>96</sup> He was an American economist and U.S Treasury department official who was accused of engaging in espionage activity for the Soviet Union.

that some of our officials are selling out our country, merely because we have no affidavits of what was said in their secret conferences?

One thing we know. The Communists and their collaborators push their best men close to the top, because that is the safest place to be. No one could remove Dr. John from his job in Germany though more than one person knew he was disloyal. We may get the little traitors by assembling legal proof. We will never get the big ones, except by political counter-attack.

The pro-Communist attack on our political institutions is political action. We must use political action to remove from public life every man or woman who is beholden to the Communists, or committed to a philosophy alien to our Constitution. We cannot wait until we see a party card.

### POLITICAL ACTION WILL BRING ABOUT AN AMERICAN POLICY

We must also know American policy. It is all very well to know Communist policy, but it is more important to know American policy.

We must have a clear American foreign policy and a clear American military policy before we enter any conference with other nations in the United Nations or outside.

There is no harm in conferring with foreign governments, inside or outside of UN, so long as we put America first.

Nationalist China has perhaps half a million men eager to fight for their independence.

Korea has courageous soldiers ready to fight on their own soil. Indo-China can provide others, with American training. Altogether Free Asia can furnish millions of troops eager to guard their sectors of the frontier of freedom.

Can we guarantee that no one in our State Department or FOA<sup>97</sup> will hamstring the funds Congress has voted to arm them? Can we guarantee that agencies or our government will not conspire to undermine Chiang Kai-shek or Syngman Rhee<sup>98</sup> or Vietnam? If the great brains, who have abandoned newspaper work for pontificating, sow planned confusion or attack our pro-American leaders, are we ready to meet them with better newspapers, better writers, better radio and television programs, or, if necessary, by mimeograph machines in every block?

The Chinese Communists have started four wars in Asia in the last ten years, with no penalty. The Red Chinese know they can never put down the Chinese on the Mainland, while the Chinese on Formosa have an army. They will never be satisfied with less than total destruction of that army. They must destroy the armies of Korea and of Indo-China. They count on the aid of their supporters in our councils.

Support of the armies of Free Asia is American policy, as destruction of these armies is Communist policy.

<sup>97</sup> Foreign Operations Administration.

<sup>98</sup> President of South Korea from 1948 to 1960.

The Communist regimes are weak and their people rebellious. The only strength they possess is the faction within the American government which puts the Soviet Union first.

We must deal first with our own dual government. If we will organize political action, to support the pro-Americans in our government and in public life, the world conflict will soon be over. We can win true peace for all the world if we will gird ourselves to defeat the enemy within.