



HUTCHINS *to investigate* COMMUNISM?

By J. B. Matthews

THE Fund for the Republic — Robert Maynard Hutchins presiding — has launched an investigation of “the penetration of Communist influence in American life.” The project has been allocated the sum of \$250,000, to be expended over a two-year period and to result in the publication of ten volumes.

The Fund for the Republic, let it be noted, is an offshoot of the Ford Foundation, the two-fold purpose of whose origination was the now-familiar ends of (1) tax dodging and (2) the retention in family hands of the control of a vast industrial empire.

The Fund for the Republic was put afloat — destination uncertain — on the waters of so-called public service, powered by a grant of \$15,000,000.

The assets of the Ford Foundation have been estimated at one-half billion dollars, a calculation based on the presumption of continued sales of Ford automobiles at the current rate. As long as automobiles and profits roll from the Ford empire’s assembly line without serious curtailment as a result of Plymouth competition, ample finances will be available for the Fund’s and the Foundation’s projects, however

whimsical or devoid of public interest and necessity the latter may be.

By virtue of the legislative provision for tax exemption, all the funds of such foundations as Ford's assume a quasi-public character. The people of the United States have a legal right, no matter how poorly or indifferently exercised, to know for what propagandistic ends — if any — the moneys of these and other foundations are expended. If the Fund for the Republic turns out to be a super-super-propaganda *Nautilus*, whose upkeep adds to the already excessive burdens of American taxpayers, these usually silent, brow-beaten, and apathetic contributors to the public till have a right and a duty to know all about it.

ROBERT MAYNARD HUTCHINS lustily disapproves — to put it mildly — of legislative inquiries into the subject of "Communist influence in American life." These duly and responsibly authorized investigations of Communism and its conspiratorial operations have frequently caused his blood pressure to rise noticeably. Now, with a quasi-public till of \$15,000,000 into which he may dip irresponsibly and at will, his own investigation of Communism will show what he can do.

Fifteen million dollars is nothing to sneeze at; but it's something to play with, and Bob Hutchins, president of the Fund for the Republic, is a playful fellow.

When Hutchins quit the chancel-

lorship of the University of Chicago four years ago, *Life* magazine headed the story of his resignation, "Chicago Loses Its Boy Wonder." The appellation, "Boy Wonder," has stuck to Hutchins — solely as a result of his own ideological prankishness — through the quarter of a century since his election, at the age of thirty, as president of the rambling university on Chicago's South Side. Let us say that he is intellectually frolicsome, while bouncing from the Rockefeller to the Ford millions on his semantic pogo stick.

If there is anything Hutchins likes better than having millions to play with, it is to play with words. It's a dull day for Bob when he does not hand the public one of his own special brand of epigram. Literalists beware!

Speaking obliquely on the question of Communists' teaching at the University of Chicago or at other institutions of learning, Hutchins expressed himself in the following manner: "No faculty member can ever be fired except for rape or murder committed in broad daylight before three witnesses."

Inasmuch as rape is never — and murder rarely ever — committed under the conditions prescribed by the chancellor as grounds for dismissal of a faculty member, Hutchins said, if taken literally, that his faculty members had unrestricted license to commit all the lesser felonies — kidnapping, etc. — without jeopardizing their academic status.

Hutchins did not, of course, mean what he said, which is often the case. He was still the boy wonder, indulging in an infantile exaggeration to make it indubitably clear that Communists would not be fired from his faculty because they were Communists. Never having outgrown the first, a second childhood is one of the mortal infirmities to which Bobby Hutchins will never be heir.

Six years ago, Hutchins was interrogated before the Illinois State Legislature with reference to the Communist infiltration of the University of Chicago. In the course of the questioning, he was asked: "Is there any doubt that the Communist Party is a conspiratorial fifth column operating in the interest of a foreign state?" Hutchins' reply under oath was as follows: "I am not instructed on this subject." He might have added that he had played hooky when millions of Americans were being taught the facts about the Communist conspiracy in the United States.

Now, however, as president of the fifteen-million-dollar Fund for the Republic at the age of 55, but still in his ideological swaddling clothes, Hutchins has authorized a large research project allegedly to determine the nature and extent, if any, of the Communist penetration into various institutions of American society, including the colleges and the universities.

Once at least, Mother Goose in-

dulged in a bit of sarcasm which suggests a question for Hutchins:

A diller, a dollar, a ten-o'clock scholar,

What makes you come so soon?

You used to come at eight o'clock;

And now you come at noon.

If one neglects instruction on the subject of Communism in his earlier years, it is better to take it up at the age of 55 than never. The question naturally arises whether, in view of his supercilious and mocking attitude toward the menace of Communism over the long years of his chancellorship at Chicago, Hutchins now intends seriously to receive instruction on this subject. Is the real objective of his present investigation the exposure of the Communist conspiracy *or* the discrediting of anti-Communists?

The project of investigating the penetration of Communist influence in American life has been divided according to areas and investigators, as follows:

Communism in Government — Earl Latham, chairman, Department of Political Science, Amherst College.

Communism and American Literature — Daniel Aaron, Professor of English, Amherst College.

Communism in the American Labor Movement — Daniel Bell, labor editor, *Fortune* magazine.

Communism in the Mass Media — Moshe Decter, co-author *McCarthy and the Communists*, magazine writer.

Communism in the Arts — Don-

ald D. Egbert, Professor of Art and Archaeology, Princeton University.

Communism and Religion — Ralph L. Roy, minister, Union Theological Seminary, and Paul A. Carter, instructor in history, Columbia University.

Communism in Opinion-Making Groups — John P. Roche, Associate Professor of Political Science, Haverford College.

Communism and Science — Donald Fleming, Assistant Professor of History, Brown University.

Communism and Education — Robert Iversen, Assistant Professor of History, Drake University.

History of the Communist Party in the U.S. — David A. Shannon, Assistant Professor of History, Teachers College, Columbia University.

The director of the entire project is Clinton Rossiter, Professor of Government at Cornell University.

AT A PRESS conference on January 14th, Professor Rossiter explained that the aforementioned investigators were not chosen because they had "any knowledge of Communism," but because they had established reputations for scholarship in their particular fields.

In some cases, there may be serious doubts about the scholarship of the investigators who have been selected by the Fund for the Republic, doubts based upon their previous performances. Professor Rossiter told the press, "We can only try to be as objective as we can be." That state-

ment, it will be observed on careful analysis, is far from being a promise of objectivity. As objective as Robert Maynard Hutchins? As objective as Clifford Case (now U.S. Senator Case) who preceded Hutchins as president of the Fund for the Republic? As objective as Clinton Rossiter?

In their writing and speaking about anti-Communists, Hutchins, Case, and Rossiter may have *tried* to be objective. Either they didn't try hard enough, or objectivity is beyond their reach. Loud claims to objectivity are the customary ideological pitchman's introduction to his selling-talk for a fraudulent bill of goods.

If Clinton Rossiter exercises any editorial influence or restraint over the investigators under his direction, the end result may be predicted with certainty. Rossiter is on record.

The Cornell University professor is the author of a new book entitled *Conservatism in America* (released March 21, 1955, by Alfred A. Knopf). On the day preceding publication, both the New York *Times* and the New York *Herald Tribune* carried highly laudatory reviews of Professor Rossiter's book. That alone meant two strikes against it. The reviewers were none other than Professor Arthur M. Schlesinger, Jr., Harvard University, and Professor Robert K. Carr, Dartmouth College.

For a long time, it has been necessary to distinguish classical liberalism from the spurious, totalitarian

brand of modern times, by speaking of *fake* liberals. We are now, it would appear, entering the era when fake conservatives, rather than fake liberals, will inaugurate a reign of political and ideological confusion.

INASMUCH as Professor Rossiter has pilfered the label *conservative* for his New Deal Republicans, the only designation he has left for the genuine variety is *ultra-conservative*. To him, the ultra-conservatives are those "Americans whose political outlook is an extraordinary mixture of sober conservatism, timid stand-pattism, and angry reaction—a mixture rendered even more extraordinary by a careless penchant for radical methods."

Professor Rossiter's ultra-conservatives are represented by U.S. Senators John W. Bricker and George W. Malone, George Sokolsky and Fulton Lewis, Jr., the Reverend James W. Fiffeld, Jr., and Rabbi Benjamin Schultz, John T. Flynn and William F. Buckley, Jr. Of the "publicists, who are especially popular among ultra-conservative Americans," Rossiter lists the following: "James Burnham, John Chamberlain, Harold Lord Varney, Max Eastman, Donald Richberg, Westbrook Pegler, Chesly Manly, Samuel B. Pettingill, John Hanna, Taylor Caldwell, Louis Bromfield, Victor Lasky, Ralph de Toledano, Freda Utley, Garet Garrett, and J. B. Matthews."

At the rightest extreme of the ultra-conservative spectrum, Profes-

sor Rossiter places Rabbi Benjamin Schultz, H. L. Hunt, and Allen Zoll as belonging to a group "so harsh and malevolent as to be fellow travelers of Fascism" and which is "a small but ear-splitting fraction of the American people." Does anything more need to be said about Clinton Rossiter's objectivity? What about smearing?

Rossiter has a category in which he finds men whom he calls *liberal conservatives*, among whom are Earl Warren, Ralph Flanders, John McCloy, Paul Hoffman, Clifford Case, Charles P. Taft, and Thomas E. Dewey.

"The great foundations," like the Rockefeller which subsidized the Institute of Pacific Relations, Rossiter finds to be "powerful instruments for imaginative conservatism." The New York *Times* and the New York *Herald Tribune* are, according to Cornell's youthful professor of government, "organs that hold the respect of most of the nation." How does he know what 51 percent of the American people think about the *Times* and the *Herald Tribune*? By professorial intuition which passes for scholarship, of course.

In his recent book, Professor Rossiter has written that he believes it possible "to predict specific attitudes on current issues in four cases out of five," that is, the specific attitudes which a given individual, once he has been put in a general category, will have on questions of foreign policy, the Bricker Amendment,

Communism, etc. In his belief I concur wholeheartedly; and, I predict, it is a four-to-one shot that the net result of Professor Rossiter's published reports on the penetration of Communist influence in American life will be the largest pile of mis-educational printed matter on Communism ever to roll from the presses in this country.

LET US consider some of the individual investigator-authors who are working for the Fund for the Republic under the direction of Professor Rossiter.

John P. Roche, of Haverford College, has been assigned the area of Communism in Opinion-Making Groups. Professor Roche is the author of an article entitled "McCarthy Issue," in *Current History* of October 1954.

Professor Roche writes: "While no one in his political senses could deny the threat that Soviet imperialism constitutes to the free world, it is interesting to note that Senator McCarthy shows little concern for this aspect of the problem." This statement is a bald falsification of the record. Anyone who is even slightly acquainted with Senator McCarthy's speeches knows that he has devoted major consideration to the Communist conquest of China and its effect on the fortunes of the Kremlin's global conspiracy, and that he has been the outstanding American leader in the campaign to stop the trade of certain European

powers with Mao's Red regime.

Professor Roche's opinion of the importance of the Communist movement in the United States is reflected in his assertion that Senator McCarthy "devotes his efforts to the internal menace of Communism in the United States, and has successfully made a mountain out of a dunghill." If Roche thinks that the Communist menace in this country is comparable in importance to a dunghill, why does he bother to investigate one small piece of that dunghill?

Professor Roche could hardly go farther in belittling the importance of Communist influence in opinion-making or any other groups than he does when he writes: "Space does not permit an examination of the history of Communism in the United States; suffice it to say that the bumbling, F.B.I.-ridden Communist Party U.S.A. has long been the laughing-stock of the international Communist movement." How Professor Roche knows this is far from clear.

In an article entitled "Memoirs of a 'Subversive,'" in the left-wing *New Republic* (January 24, 1955), Professor Roche pokes bitter sarcasm at the Jenner Committee's report on Communist infiltration of the wartime Army Information-Education Program. This gives a definite clue to Roche's attitude toward the subject which has been assigned him in the Fund for the Republic project. He is probably ig-

norant of the fact that Communist organizations like the National Negro Congress and the International Labor Defense reprinted, by permission of the top brass of the Army Information-Education Program, hundreds of thousands of copies of *Army Talk*—a fact which makes sense only on the assumption that these issues of *Army Talk* were considered an aid to the Communists.

In what appears to be a grim determination to have himself put in the category of the anti-anti-Communists, Roche writes: "By the application of retrospective omniscience the seizure of Eastern Europe by Stalin and the conquest of China by Mao have been credited to treasonous actions by American policy-makers, thus supplying the American people with an almost infinite number of scapegoats." If this extraordinary sentence means anything, it means that American policy-makers played little or no part in the betrayal of Poland and China, and, if they did, that the record should be suppressed. Roche's plain implication is that an hysterical craving for an "infinite number of scapegoats" begat the fiction of "treasonous actions by American policy-makers." Professor Roche's entire approach to the subject of Communism fits snugly into the framework of Hutchins' self-proclaimed ignorance and well-known anti-anti-Communist prejudices. He should have no difficulty in pleasing both Hutchins and Rossiter.

DANIEL AARON, of Amherst College, has been assigned the area of Communism and American Literature. We need only a single quotation from Professor Aaron's book, *Men of Good Hope* (Oxford University Press, 1951), to get some idea of his political and ideological orientation. He writes: "But looking back to the Rooseveltian era and judging it by progressive standards, one might say that the New Deal was not radical and far-reaching enough," etc.

With respect to the so-called intellectuals of the 1930's, Professor Aaron holds that "the propagation of Marxist ideas invigorated our universities, stimulated scholarship and teaching." If that sounds like a pro-Communist evaluation, it should be emphasized that Aaron is not in any sense of the word a Communist.

Moshe Decter, co-author of the smear tract entitled *McCarthy and the Communists*, has been assigned the area of Communism in the Mass Media as his field of investigation for the Fund for the Republic.

Decter's method of smearing is use of the dirty innuendo. After pointing out that Senator McCarthy's friends and advisers include some prominent Jews, he observed: "It is of course conceivable that McCarthy's demonstrative 'philo-Semitism' is merely a pose, a cynical maneuver designed to mislead citizens in whose eyes a leader's manifestation of religious bigotry would instantly discredit him." This not-too-sly in-

situation exceeds the limits of the contemptible.

As a case study in hypocrisy, Decter is highly instructive. Among his ten points by which he thinks all political controversy should be guided, he includes the following: "‘It is not impossible’ is a preface to an irrelevant statement about human affairs." The statements, "it-is-not-impossible" and "it-is-of-course-conceivable," are identical in import. If the former is a preface to an irrelevant statement about human affairs, so is the latter. It was the latter which Decter used as a cowardly device to avoid making a positive assertion. He himself invited judgment by his ten-point code; and I have accepted the invitation.

Among the selections of investigator-authors for the study of Communist influence in American life, Moshe Decter's is the most laughable. In listing the *Jewish* aides and advisers of Senator McCarthy, he included as *Jewish* one of America's most renowned publishers who is an *Irish Catholic*, a fact which he could have ascertained in an instant by reference to *Who's Who in America*. This is a commentary on Decter's competence as a researcher. Such errors, to say nothing of his outright lies, may be found throughout his book on McCarthy.

THE Reverend Ralph Lord Roy, of Union Theological Seminary, has been assigned the area of Communism and Religion, as member of

a two-man team, the other member being Paul A. Carter, an instructor at Columbia University.

Mr. Roy's competence in research, as well as his basic prejudices, is in evidence in his book entitled *Apostles of Discord* (The Beacon Press, 1953). In a chapter entitled "The Hammer and Sickle Behind the Cross," he incorporated a large amount of accurate information on the Communist infiltration of the ranks of the clergy. But he handles this information mechanically, just as though he had lifted it from files with which he was unfamiliar; and the chapter which contains it is notable for its lack of deep insights, for the gratuitous whitewashing of some of the most culpable among the clergy, for its gross distortions, and above all for its omissions.

An example of Mr. Roy's gross distortions involves a book by Jerome Davis entitled *Behind Soviet Power*, twenty-two thousand copies of which were sent free of charge to Methodist clergymen by the Board of Missions and Church Extension of the Methodist Church. A letter accompanying the book was signed by Bishop G. Bromley Oxnam and the Reverend Dr. R. E. Diffendorfer.

Mr. Roy describes Oxnam and Diffendorfer as "two churchmen who have a clear understanding of the dangerous nature of Communism." A cloudier understanding than that of these two clergymen could hardly be found. Mr. Roy did

not, of course, have the benefit of Bishop Oxnam's testimony before the Velde Committee on July 21, 1953, when he wrote *Apostles of Discord*.

Mr. Roy failed to tell his readers that the Oxnam-Diffendorfer letter recommended the reading of a pro-Soviet pamphlet by Vera Micheles Dean, a pamphlet which was on the recommended reading list of the National Council of American-Soviet Friendship. The NCASF, cited as Communist and subversive by the Attorney General, would hardly include anything but pro-Soviet works in its recommended reading list.

Mr. Roy writes correctly that Jerome Davis' *Behind Soviet Power* was "considered by many to be a glorification of Russian Communism"; but he fails to associate himself with that opinion. That may have been an oversight. In this connection, a statement by the Reverend Dr. Daniel A. Poling is relevant. In his testimony before the Velde Committee, Bishop Oxnam said that the Jerome Davis book "is recommended" by Daniel A. Poling. After noting this Oxnam testimony, Dr. Poling wrote the Velde Committee, in part, as follows:

"It is true that I recommended this book and that my words of commendation were widely published. I have also expressed publicly my deep regret at having done so. Also I have confessed that I spoke in commendation of this book without even reading the manuscript. When

my long-time and highly regarded friend, Dr. Diffendorfer, wrote to me of the book and told me of plans to circulate it widely, and assured me that it was a manuscript I would wish to support, I supported it. It was some years later that I actually read the book and found it to be, in my opinion, a belittling of and an attack on American freedom and the institutions of our way of life. I am not to be excused for my endorsement of the Jerome Davis book. But I learned my lesson well. I would not care to have Bishop Oxnam's statement appear in the record without this explanation." Where does that leave the Reverend Dr. Ralph E. Diffendorfer?

MR. ROY failed to note or did not know when he wrote his book that the reverse side of the Oxnam-Diffendorfer letter which went to 22,000 Methodist clergymen carried two highly laudatory appraisals of the Jerome Davis book, one by Walter G. Muelder, Dean of the Boston University School of Theology, and the other by W. J. Hutchins, the father of Robert Maynard. These two commendations of the book, printed right on the back of the Oxnam-Diffendorfer letter, dispose of the Oxnam and Roy claim that the book was sent to the ministers for the sole purpose of helping them understand "the appeal Communism had to many people." Dean Muelder wrote, in part, as follows: "If Mr. Davis' theses are right, then Amer-

ican foreign policy needs fundamental revision. We are inclined to believe that he is essentially correct." Dr. W. J. Hutchins wrote, in part, as follows: "Your book [obviously a letter from Hutchins to Davis] is thrillingly interesting. One sees the long, pathetic, epic struggle of a great people. Your knowledge of the language, your long and varied experience in Russia, your acquaintance with the spiritual vernacular of the people fit you admirably to serve as interpreter."

Mr. Roy will undoubtedly use a recent editorial from the Reverend Guy Emery Shipler's *The Churchman* (March 15, 1955) as evidence that he struck effectively at the whole array of ecclesiastical fellow travelers. There was, indeed, no whitewash of Shipler. In his recent editorial, Shipler says that Roy's chapter, "The Hammer and Sickle Behind the Cross," is "compounded of half-truths, outright lies, innuendoes and backstair gossip . . . an example of inexcusable, wicked and depraved witch-hunting." Congratulations, Mr. Roy!

Mr. Roy assails many informed and effective anti-Communists as "apostles of discord," including the late Harry Jung, Walter Steele, John T. Flynn, George Washington Robnett, Edgar C. Bundy, and Verne Kaub. If Roy ever gets to know a small fraction of what these men know about the Communist infiltration of the churches, he will be on the way to becoming an expert.

When he wrote *Apostles of Discord*, Roy was either so abysmally ignorant or so steeped in prejudice that he falsified some of the best-known facts about Communism. On page 247, he writes that the American Committee for Protection of Foreign Born "eventually became a Communist front." (Italics Roy's) In the kindergarten of anti-Communism, one learns that the ACPFB was an auxiliary of the Communist Party from the day of its inception. He writes that a certain dinner on April 17, 1943, was "allegedly sponsored" by the ACPFB. There is absolutely no doubt about the sponsorship of the dinner; it *was* sponsored by the ACPFB, and none of Roy's crawling can change the fact.

DANIEL BELL, of *Fortune* magazine, has been assigned the area of Communism in the American Labor Movement.

For a period of at least seventeen years, Mr. Bell has had more than casual knowledge of the Communist movement in the United States. His credentials are authentic; his insights, profound; and his competence, beyond challenge. His first published article, some 16 or 17 years ago, was an exposure of the Communist domination of the American Student Union. On that basis alone, he qualifies as a veteran Red-baiter.

In his early days, Bell was a militant Socialist. Next to the Trotskyites, the Socialists have been among

the best experts in spotting the Moscow-line Communists. In later years, according to some of his acquaintances, Mr. Bell's socialism took on the pinkish hue of the Norman Thomas-New Deal brand. Extensive research has failed to show that he has ever disavowed socialism. From 1940 to 1944, he was managing editor of the *New Leader*.

ONE of the commonest fallacies is that which holds that extreme poverty is the breeding ground of Communism. In the *Jewish Labor Committee Outlook* (Autumn 1954), Bell smashes that fallacy: "Communism does not arise where there is poverty. Communism arises out of a disease of modern capitalist society, particularly in the intelligentsia."

Continuing with that thesis, Bell writes: "The Communists are always concerned with winning over the intellectuals, the opinion makers of society. Why is it so important to win over these people, even more important than to win over the trade unionists? . . . In a country like ours, where it is impossible, given the social structure, to have a mass Communist movement, the intellectual becomes extremely important as a means of spreading the party line. . . . What it comes down to is the need to set up echo chambers around the country, so that certain notions can enter general currency." A basic and refreshing insight, indeed!

Bell almost took his professional

life in his hands when he wrote in the *Saturday Review* (December 20, 1952) that clergymen were "the prime dupes in the late Forties and Fifties," that is, as "signers of 'front' statements." It will be noted that Bell wrote this some six months before I wrote the same thing in different words.

It is to be hoped that Mr. Bell will bring to bear that same degree of competence and astuteness upon his assigned field, Communism in the American Labor Movement. If one may be allowed misgivings, they are whether Mr. Bell will correctly assay the role of John L. Lewis, Philip Murray, James B. Carey, and Walter Reuther in giving the Communists their foothold in the CIO. The Communists did not *surreptitiously* gain entrance into the American labor movement; they were invited in, and welcomed with open arms. This may be hard for Mr. Bell to say under the auspices of the Fund for the Republic; but, at least, he has the insight and information to say it.

Many Americans may have hailed with great expectations the announcement that the Fund for the Republic had launched this important project of investigation of Communist influence in American life. This essay is an attempt to trim such expectations down to their reasonable fulfillment. The net result, excluding a few possible exceptions, will — I predict — be a grievous disappointment, a fraud financed out of quasi-public moneys.

SOON TO BE ERECTED

By
WES BAILEY

GEORGE AUGUSTUS PAPOVICH was a lively, likeable White Russian. I met him casually in a Shanghai café, soon after the Japanese surrender. George was a correspondent for Tass, the official Russian news agency, but during the war years — when Japan held most of China, and Russia was conveniently “neutral” until *after* the U.S. atomic blast — George had lived the good life in Shanghai’s night spots. The son of refugees who had escaped the Red Terror when they murdered the Czar, George was not the irresponsible truth-twister of the Ilya Ehrenberg stripe.

Besides being a jolly person to know, I found him an excellent tipster for the newsweekly I represented, and since most of his stories stood up when checked against the original source, I often encouraged him to talk.

It was while we were having dinner one rainy night at the Mandarin Club that George told me the Great Bomber Story.

“You will recall, Vassily,” my friend began, stimulated by several vodkas, “that during the war, one of your B-24 bombers, while on a training flight, crashed into the Empire State Building in New York. This was a most unfortunate affair, of course.” The melancholy Slav in George set him quietly brooding.

“Well,” he added, “you remember

the story as well as I do. Later I read the truth in a magazine that was smuggled in to me, and that sent me back to my Tass files to check the story as I had originally received it on the wire, and as it undoubtedly appeared in *Pravda*. And so, tonight, I bring you a copy of that dispatch. Do not use it for a while, tovarich, or — zzzt!” George made one of those melodramatic passes across the throat he had seen in the movies, and rolling his eyes and suddenly dropping his head and going limp, he re-enacted faithfully the liquidated role.

Long since, George has left China, and so have I. He may be somewhere in America now, for he skipped to Hong Kong before the Bamboo Curtain rang down. And so, because the tragedy is dim, and because George is safe from the humorless men of the MVD, I reprint here, for the first time, the copy of the Tass dispatch he handed me that night.

To all papers, via Tass:

Moscow, July 29 — Today in New York a B-24 bomber of the United States Army crashed into the Empire State Building in a heavy fog, killing three crew members and several persons in the building.

The Empire State Building is the second tallest building in the world. The tallest building in the world is the Palace of The Soviets, soon to be erected in Moscow.