

DANGER AHEAD!

MORE CULTURAL EXCHANGE!

A PROPAGANDA CIRCUS—AND WE'RE THE CLOWNS

by Eugene W. Castle

UNDER the fraudulent umbrella of "Cultural Exchange" the Kremlin has scored massive propaganda victories within the United States and throughout the world during the present year.

Nikita Khrushchev, who never overlooks an opportunity to reiterate that Communism will bankrupt and bury us, has succeeded in softening up and brainwashing tens of millions of trusting Americans on a scale that staggers the imagination.

And it is incredible that the arrogant and uncompromising Red Hitler and his Kremlin serfs have been aided in their evil crusade by President Eisenhower, Vice-President Nixon, former Governors Averill Harriman and Adlai Stevenson, nine U.S. Governors presently in office, the domestic and foreign facilities of the U. S. Information Agency and the "soft on Communism" cell that exerts such a powerful influence within our Department of State. Also, Khrush-

chev has been aided by hopeful U. S. Senators and a score of headline-hunting Americans, most of whom have journeyed to Moscow to receive the "Red carpet" treatment and Khrushchev's biggest smile and self-serving propaganda tirade. Invariably, these misguided and publicity-seeking Americans issue statements praising the loveliness of the "Red Paradise" while at the same time they tell us, and the world, how laggard and decadent we are!

Khrushchev never had it so good! And this has all happened while the Un-American Activities Committee of the U.S. House of Representatives, the American Legion, the Veterans of Foreign Wars, F.B.I. Chief J. Edgar Hoover and a few far-sighted patriotic Americans both within and without our Government have warned that Communist infiltration within the United States is growing at an alarming rate and that our danger has never been greater.

Russia's Red-Flagged publicity circus on Columbus Circle and our counterpart at Sokolniki Park in Moscow have come and gone. A pathetic sight at the Red Fair in New York was the "brainwashing act," staged throughout by Soviet guides imported from Moscow. These hand-picked stooges to promote world Communism huddled with groups of American youths and recited "fairy tales" about the Soviet paradise. They also openly argued that "capitalism was decadent" and would soon become a museum piece throughout the world. Capitalism, they contended, exploits the masses while Communism's blessings bring joy and hope to all. Tragically, some of our well-fed and well-shod American youths seemed impressed with this "cultural exposure" from the Kremlin.

FOLLOWING a personally-escorted "Red carpet" visit and inspection of the Soviet Exposition in New York City, Dr. Milton Eisenhower said:

"The exhibit should mark the beginning of a much greater effort in cultural exchange.

"Certainly, if the people of Russia and the people of the United States come to know one another better, it might provide great things for the future, and certainly cannot be harmful."

Khrushchev, Mikoyan, Koslov and the Red Ambassador in Wash-

ington, Menshikov, unquestionably will applaud this expression from Dr. Eisenhower.

The Soviets need and urge expansionist programs such as "Cultural Exchange" to enable them to exploit and export their brand of despotism. Otherwise they would be isolated. If isolated, they would be faced with grave difficulties, including growing unrest within the satellite countries.

Unfortunately, Dr. Eisenhower, one-time office companion of Henry Wallace in the New Deal Department of Agriculture, exercises an almost "hypnotic" influence over his brother, the President, in matters concerning propaganda and "cultural exchange." Indeed, the Doctor-Professor provides the "words and music" that have resulted in our propaganda failures throughout the world. Tragically his new formula is more of the same!

Admittedly, the Russian people are no better nor worse than any other people; but the ruthless slave-masters who hold them in their police state grip are of such low-order and so unreliable that no people who have any claim to decency should seek to expand and perpetuate "cultural exchanges" with them.

Most of our politicians, once exposed to the sights, smiles and "staged demonstrations" during their escorted tours of Red Russia, come home to urge and recom-

mend that we must cuddle up to our great friends, the Soviet people! However, they fail to explain how this is to be accomplished in a land where the government controls the minds, hearts and allegiance of all the people from the time they are born until they die without the final blessing of God's ministers! Actually, what culture are we to exchange with the Soviet slave citizens? Are we to exchange our American way of life with the human exploitation that prevails throughout Red Russia?

For exploitation is written in the unhappy faces of the Russian peasants who perform the work of animals on their collective farms.

It is written in the pathetic, poorly attired rabble that forever surges along Moscow's Gorky Street.

It is written in the miserable wages and living conditions of the Soviet worker.

It is written in the exploitive prices charged at the State owned and manipulated stores.

It is written in the savings of the people confiscated by inflation and official decree.

To urge broader and deeper cultural "penetration" of these slave citizens is simply political hoodwinking and, worse still, it is a dangerous deception of the American people by those whose sworn duty it is to preserve our solvency, security and integrity, both for ourselves at home and for the benefit of the free world.

IT SHOULD have been evident from the first that we could never win an "I'm-bigger-than-you" boasting contest with the Russians. William S. White stated it lucidly when he observed that in such a competition, the Russians have us beaten from the start, because they play the game by a different set of rules. Instead of softening up the Russians, the net effect of the exhibitions has been to be softened ourselves.

What we failed to foresee was that the holding of the exhibition was only a clever propaganda ruse of the Russians. Americans were presented with a spectacle of Russia, not as it is, but as the Kremlin would like us to believe it is! But the primary Russian purpose was to blanket the American and world press during the period of the Geneva Conference with favorable Soviet publicity which would divide American public opinion. In this they spectacularly succeeded. The American publicity lineage for Russia from the New York Coliseum show alone, if purchased at commercial rates (assuming it could have been purchased) would have cost Khrushchev a billion dollars. Little of it was critical.

In contrast, the Russian press coverage of America's exhibition at Sokolniki Park within the Soviet Union was sour and heavily censored. To set the tone, the *Agit-prop* of the Russian Communist Party launched an official campaign of abuse on the opening of

the fair. *Trud*, the Moscow labor daily, directed a vitriolic attack on Vice President Nixon when he arrived. In an attempt to distract interest, the Russians staged two rival trade exhibitions in Moscow during practically the same period as the American exhibition. An atmosphere was whipped up in which Russian visitors to the U. S. Fair openly disbelieved the genuineness of what they were witnessing.

BUT the Russians had no reason to doubt their success in New York. The Soviet propagandists took New York on a grand scale. The Coliseum exhibition turned out to be only a part of their giant publicity pitch. While crowds of the curious poured into the Coliseum, New York's second largest gathering place, Madison Square Garden, was engaged for a two-week Russian Festival. With the aid of the USIA's movie director, Turner Shelton, a Broadway theater was leased for 42 days for a showing of the propaganda-laden "Kinepanorama," glamorizing Russia. Earlier, with the help of American impresario, S. Hurok, Russia staged a nationwide tour of the Bolshoi Troupe, which grossed \$2 million in American cash. Simultaneously, television's David L. Wolper announced plans for a 90-minute spectacular news-film, "The Race for Space," glorifying Russia's scientific achievements.

The Coliseum Exposition provided a ready-made springboard for a heavily press-agented tour of American cities by First Deputy Premier Frol R. Koslov, selling the Soviet line of "peace, friendliness and trade." So eager were the White House and State Department to make the Koslov tour successful that they flew his team mate, Soviet designer Andrei N. Tupolev, to the Pacific Coast in a new American jet airliner for a virtually unrestricted tour of America's nuclear production centers including the production line of the Thor missile plant in Santa Monica, California. As David Sentner, Washington correspondent of the Hearst Newspapers, put it: "This must be a special tour arranged for Soviet industrial espionage." Admiral Rickover's later experience at the Leningrad shipyards and the Soviet refusal to allow Vice President Nixon to visit a Russian Missile plant, indicated the deep freeze which always greets American engineers when they seek similar inspection courtesies in Russia.

Literally, the past months can be described as "America's Red Summer." Not since the days of the war-time alliance with the Soviets has Russian praise and slanted pro-Soviet publicity been so extensive over broad reaches of the American press.

The Soviet Exhibition in New York City was scaled at the "capitalist" admission price of one dol-

lar per person! The United States Exhibition in Moscow cost the Soviet citizen one ruble (worth about 10¢) to see.

MEANWHILE, how was the \$3,-600,000 United States exhibition in Moscow faring?

The official State Department propaganda to sell this undertaking to the American people has always been that more than 3,000,000 Russians would see the exhibition with a resultant softening of Russian attitudes toward the United States. The attendance forecast was correct, but if USIA Director, George V. Allen and his staff really believe they were showing the American exhibits to a typical cross-section of the Russian public, they are bigger fools than anyone has ever charged. The Russians who saw the exhibition were very often handpicked government-groups, shepherded by the hardened core of the dyed-in-the-wool Communist Party zealots. An example of this was the buying up of tens of thousands of tickets to the exhibition by Soviet agencies. It requires little imagination to know who received these tickets. What USIA Director Allen conveniently overlooked is the fact that Russia is a police state. The Russian public does not spontaneously engage in any public action; it is a manipulated public. The chances of winning goodwill for America among the crowds which shuffled through

the exhibit corridors at Sokolniki Park were almost mythical. The Russians came to scoff, not to be wooed.

To lessen the odds in its favor, the State Department was so careless in its preparation of the exhibits that, in at least one department, notorious Communists, who are outspoken disbelievers in the American way of life, had their works displayed.

One of the "American" paintings exhibited at Sokolniki Park was a lugubrious horror lampooning our generals by Jack Levine, whose record shows that he has been affiliated with at least 21 Communist fronts. This painting reflected the United States so unfavorably that even President Eisenhower commented that it was more "a lampoon than art." Another exhibit with anti-American implications was the picture, "American Miner's Family," by Minna Harkavy, a former teacher in Red schools. Yet another was "Street Corner," by Philip Evergood who has invoked the First, Fifth, Ninth and Tenth Amendments in his refusal to tell the Committee on Un-American Activities whether he has ever been a Communist Party member.

It is inconceivable that the Russians would permit anti-Communists to provide the art for their portraiture of Russia at the Coliseum. And yet, with an irresponsibility which is frightening, our cultural exchange "experts," who

organized the Moscow show, have actually permitted Communists to interpret America to the Russians.

In view of the recklessness and lack of propaganda know-how with which the Moscow exhibition was put together, it would seem that the best bet for America would have been to confine itself to a showing of Walt Disney's "Circarama" which had been the hit of the Brussels Exposition in 1958. In 18 minutes, "Circarama" revealed more of America's impressive greatness and creativeness than all the dismal Sokolniki Park exhibits put together. It revealed the real America.

One man who came out of the Moscow fiasco with general discredit was USIA Director Allen. At Brussels, in 1958; Allen had permitted a distasteful exhibition of badly selected American modernistic art. When he visited Brussels, he got himself off the hook by stating that he knew nothing about such exhibitions. But one year later, at Moscow, he committed the same mistakes. This, despite the fact that he assured the Senate Foreign Relations Committee on March 3, 1959, that the Sokolniki Park showing would not be top-heavy with rock'n' roll and modernistic paintings.

Actually, the whole concept of the Moscow exhibition was wrong, if there were any hopes that it would do the United States any good. Mr. Allen and, hard-work-

ing exhibition manager Harold C. McClellan were committed to the concept of a "soft sell." A hard-hitting exhibition of America's industrial might—which even Stalin once applauded—was conspicuously lacking. Instead the emphasis was upon the luxury side of American life, while the Russian spectators were asking about the industrial and technical might not on display.

The futility of both the New York and Moscow fairs was that neither displayed saleable products. And yet the traditional purpose of fairs is to stimulate trade in each other's goods, with ordertakers watchfully on hand to do business. In Moscow we offered nothing that the Soviet citizens could purchase. The Russians in New York displayed no saleable products and exhibited interest only in buying complete plants for tire making and chemical production, the sale of which would be contrary to American security. Both fairs were conceived solely to sell propaganda.

A SOUR NOTE in the American exhibition was that, only a few days after the opening, the cement floors began to pulverize under the tread of the visitors and clouds of dust began to cover the exhibits. Soviet pranksters got a grim pleasure in writing scornful words with their fingers in the dust. When the responsibility was sought, it was discovered that the Russians,

doubtless with this fiasco in mind, had talked the American contractors into using cement instead of dustless asphalt. Americans were thus publicly advertised as incompetent builders. The episode was symbolic of the stupidity which marked the whole affair.

But if the Moscow exhibition has disappointed as a portraiture of the real America, it has accomplished one purpose. It has given a field day for aspiring American politicians to hit the front pages of American dailies over a Moscow date-line.

The No. 1 publicity-snatcher has been Vice President Richard M. Nixon, although—unlike some preceding American visitors—he used his headlines to sell Americanism rather than blind praise of Russia.

President Eisenhower announced Nixon's selection to open the fair on the same day that the late Secretary Dulles' resignation was announced. He commented at that time that he believed he had handed ambitious Dick a "political bonus." It remained a mere publicity stunt until some time later, when it was announced that the Nixon trip was to take on an important diplomatic meaning. First, Dr. Milton S. Eisenhower was added to the Nixon party. Then (the most reassuring step) blunt and brilliant Admiral Hyman Rickover was added. From this point the party ballooned up into a formidable body of 70 persons, including

such surprising guests as Jinx Falkenburg.

NIXON'S VISIT, despite the widely reported and discussed drama of his personal clash with Khrushchev, now known as the "summit meeting at the sink," did nothing to strengthen America's position with Russia. Indeed, it weakened it when Nixon, declared at Sverdlovsk that he favored a face-to-face meeting of Khrushchev and Eisenhower. Subsequently, Nixon repeated the implied assurance that Khrushchev would be invited to Washington. This, of course, is what Khrushchev has been seeking since the beginning. That Richard Nixon, who was catapulted to the Senate and subsequently to the Vice-Presidency upon the issue of unsparing opposition to the Communists, should be the messenger who delivered such an abject kowtow to the Kremlin, is an astounding political somersault. Nixon further stultified his position by urging a tremendous broadening of the perilous "Cultural Exchange" pact between the U.S.A. and the USSR in these words:

Both the exchange of persons and the Cultural Exchange programs should not only be continued but sharply expanded. Most important of all, we need a much greater exchange of information between our two countries so that misconceptions which they have about you and that you have about us may be removed."

He was frequently treated with cold discourtesy while in Russia, although surface amenities were observed. On his arrival, only 200 Soviet citizens, in addition to the official party, greeted him at the airport. His colloquy with Khrushchev at the exposition was unreported by the Moscow radio and was distorted in Khrushchev's favor by the Russian press.

HAD THE organizers of the Moscow exhibition had any sense of realism, they would have anticipated that Khrushchev's pledge that the discourse with Nixon would be printed in full would be cynically disregarded by the Soviet newspapers. The version printed in *Pravda* (the official Communist organ), was a "complete falsification," reported the Stockholm newspaper, *Dagens Nyheter*. "The Russian version, apart from ignoring most of what the Vice President said, aimed at presenting him as a feeble and defensive debater in the face of a righteous and ram-bunctious Mr. Khrushchev," said the *London Daily Telegraph*.

In view of the full and honest press coverage of the visits of Deputy Premiers Mikoyan and Koslov in the American press, the dishonesty of the Russians stands out in bold relief. But those who understand the Communists would have known that this would happen. The whole incident was a painful commentary on the trustfulness

and gullibility of the Washington crew who are promoting Cultural Exchange.

But if Nixon has been the heaviest beneficiary from the Moscow junket, his Democratic rivals have not been far behind. A standardized Moscow formula has now been developed for visiting American political headline hunters. It includes an arranged interview with Khrushchev, a statement to the American press extolling Russian progress, and a defeatist warning that America is falling behind. So helpful have these interviews been to Russia that Khrushchev and company are willing and ready at all times to lend themselves to such unabashed American politician press-agency.

The most successful of these Moscow dateline-seekers has been Senator Hubert Humphrey, whose marathon interview with Khrushchev projected him at one leap into the Democratic Presidential race. Humphrey's principal contribution to Soviet-American cultural relations was to inform Nikita that America would give the Soviets more aid in medical research.

Not to be outdone by his rivals, Adlai Stevenson faithfully worked the Moscow publicity goldmine. His ostensible mission to Russia was to recover the royalties which the Red Government has filched from American authors. In this quest Stevenson dismally failed, but he did strike it rich as an au-

thor. His heavily paid syndicated stories out of Russia, in both the American and European press, added new fog to the Western confusion over Russian policy.

Next there was W. Averill Harriman, aged 70, who has never quite abandoned his Presidential hopes. Harriman, with the front pages of *The New York Times* open to him, made an extravagant contribution to the myth of Russian progress. Khrushchev, reading the Harriman quakings, must have executed a wild dance with his vodka bottle.

But after Humphrey, Harriman and Stevenson, politicians began going to Khrushchev-land in clusters. Thanks to the grants of the Rockefeller Brothers Fund and the Sloan Foundations, nine Governors took a de luxe trip to Russia. Each Governor was exposed to the Khrushchev smile, shown the the showcase exhibits which are always flashed before open-eyed American visitors, and then treated to the real objective of the tour—an interview with the American correspondents and a shot from the TV cameramen. By this gesture, Russia secured nine separate American headlines importantly in the press of the nine represented States. Only one dissenting voice was heard, that of Governor George B. Clyde of Utah, who described the Sokolniki Park exhibition as “terrible.”

A group of New York Univer-

sity professors handled the tour for the underwriting foundations. So pleased with their results were the professors that they announced plans for a vast extension of the present exchange of visitors, especially in the middle and local level of government officials. If this happens, we may soon witness a continuous conveyor belt between the United States and Moscow carrying American national, state and local officials to Russia and returning them to the United States, thoroughly impregnated with admiration and sympathy for Russian Communism. The appetite of the American politician for Russian-dated publicity is becoming so insatiable that the Soviet propaganda apparatus will soon be able to sit back on its haunches and let the Rover Boy American visitors write their blurbs for them.

IF OFFICIAL STUPIDITY can sink any lower, the American people would like to know it.

Following their return from the tour of the Soviet Union, the nine junketing Governors were received, with appropriate publicity, by President Eisenhower. The Governors visited the President to render a “report” of their tour and more especially to recommend and aid in “preparing” the American people for the “cultural” visit of Nikita Khrushchev to the United States. Simultaneously, our Government was consulting with our

Allies regarding the "advisability" of the visit.

On the same day that the Governors were promoting the "Red Carpet" for Khrushchev here, he visited the airport in Moscow to inspect the type of jet plane that, in his own words, will carry him to the United States (he hopes) "at the proper time." And while Khrushchev was sampling American rye whisky inside the 707 jet that brought V. P. Nixon to Moscow, Mr. Nixon was continuing to urge that the Red ruler be invited to come here. Indeed, with the details of his schedule announced, he will have arrived before this article appears in print!

One of the first to speak out against inviting Khrushchev to come to the U.S.A. for official honors, tours and receptions was Richard Cardinal Cushing of Boston who said:

"In behalf of the millions of people in Russia and in the countries held in bondage and slavery under the tyranny of Khrushchev and company, who cannot speak for themselves . . .

In memory of the martyrs of Poland, Hungary and East Germany and other countries, murdered by the men of Moscow . . .

In honor of our American boys killed in Korea, shot out of the skies and suffering in prisons, I raise my voice against the proposed invitation to Khrushchev to visit our country and I call upon others who share the same sentiments to do likewise."

Likewise, Senator Styles Bridges (R., N.H.) probably expressed his bitter opposition to inviting Khrushchev to the United States.

Luckily, not all Washington officialdom is singing the praises of "Cultural Exchange." Democratic Majority Leader, Congressman John W. McCormack of Massachusetts, has denounced "pilgrimages" by high-ranking Americans to Moscow and has sharply rebuffed the idea that Khrushchev should be invited to come here. Democratic Congressman, William Jennings Bryan Dorn of South Carolina, has declared that it is "tragic to vote our money abroad, ostensibly to stop Communism, while 'officially' encouraging Communist propaganda in America." Republican Representative Glenard P. Lipscomb of California, criticizing the Tupolev tour, declared it is "rank foolishness under present circumstances to escort high Soviet officials and their entourages of scientists and Communist intelligence men around to atomic research facilities, to nuclear power plants . . . and to other strategic areas." Such legislators are not deceived even though the Allens, the Laceys, and the Milton Eisenhowers are.

AN UNHAPPY ASPECT of these incessant visits is the low estate to which American Ambassador Llewellyn Thompson is being reduced. In Moscow today Thomp-

son is the forgotten man. He trails around in the wake of the VIP visitors in a role hardly more important than that of an interpreter and social secretary.

The Russians do these things more intelligently. Soviet Ambassador Menshikov was in the forefront of all the Mikoyan, Koslov and Coliseum exhibition functions. He was obviously acting in the full confidence of his superiors in Moscow. In contrast, Cultural Exchange has shriveled the importance of our regular diplomatic representatives to the point where they are fast losing both their dignity and effectiveness.

Presently, Mr. Thompson has little more influence at the Kremlin than does the head janitor at our Embassy there. "Cultural Exchange" and the resultant parade of publicity seekers to Moscow is largely responsible for this deplorable situation.

In the light of its abject failure, it would be expected that Washington's enthusiasm over Cultural Exchange would be at an extremely low ebb. The contrary is the case.

In the wake of the Governors, a veritable stampede of American-organized delegations to Moscow is under way. The USIA has announced proudly that 170 delegations have already made their pilgrimages to Khrushchev-land. Now, arrangements are in progress for tours by delegations of business executives, trade union lead-

ers, scientists selected by the U. S. Academy of Sciences, professors selected by Harvard and Columbia Universities, and a long list of professional groups. All this will be grist to the Soviet mill. Khrushchev's men realize that if only a minority of the American visitors to Russia return to praise it, they will have set up widening pools of pro-Soviet discussion in the United States which profoundly will color American public opinion.

Aptly has Bill Cunningham written in the *Boston Herald*:

"In this silly, one-sided square dance with Russia we are merely being promenaded as a nation of Mortimer Snerds for propaganda use all over the world.—Our loss will be great, and it could be fatal, if we don't see the entire performance clearly for what it is."

WHILE the present "Cultural Exchange" program was revealing itself as an almost unrelieved publicity failure for America, State Department patsies were already busily at work seeking the extension and widening of the program. The present two-year agreement with Russia expires January 27, 1960. William S. B. Lacey, bumbling State Department aide who supervises the "Cultural Exchange" program, has already held talks with Soviet Ambassador Menshikov, seeking its renewal for another two years. That Russia warmly desires such a renewal is

readily understandable: they are on the receiving end of the deal. But why official America should show any urgency for such a losing policy is a question which defies rational conjecture.

Like so many other indefensible programs, we were eased into "Cultural Exchange" without fully comprehending the treacherous ground upon which we were stepping. The genesis of "Cultural Exchange" occurred at the first ill-fated "Summit Meeting" at Geneva in 1956. Its parents were Dr. Milton S. Eisenhower, Nelson Rockefeller and Harold Stassen. Temporarily shelved, because of Soviet atrocities in Hungary, it was revived by the President at the urging of Brother Milton and protracted conferences between the U. S. Ambassador and the late Soviet Ambassador, G. N. Zaroubin. The arrangement was completed on January 27, 1958, and a two year pact was signed. This took place at almost the same time that Khrushchev was boasting to the world that our grandchildren would live under Communist rule. It is this unfruitful pact which it is now proposed to renew for another two years. If our nation were ruled by sound self-interest instead of by wishful thinking, we would be looking forward eagerly toward the abolition of "Cultural Exchange" instead of to its extension.

One thing is certain. America's obsessed pursuit of "Cultural Ex-

changes" is gradually destroying all confidence in our good faith on the part of the 90 million people of the captive nations behind the Iron Curtain. When Vice President Nixon, in his Moscow speech, praised the Soviet Union for its "great achievement and progress," he delivered another blow to the millions of non-Communists behind the Curtain who are longing and praying for the day when Communism will collapse in Russia.

IF OUR "CULTURAL AMBASSADORS" do not realize the central importance of the Captive Nations in the Cold War, there is no question that Khrushchev does. His declaration to Nixon that the Congressional Resolution which set aside the third week of last July as "Captive Nations Week" was "direct interference in the Soviet Union's internal affairs" shows that Khrushchev is keeping his eyes intently on the greatest weakness and danger confronting the Kremlin. These unreconciled 90 million people are the Achilles' heel of the Communist regime. It is tragic that official Washington is emphasizing "Cultural Exchange" and coexistence with the Kremlin in place of liberation.

With Khrushchev's naked threat, "We will bury you," ringing in our eardrums, the present would seem to be a particularly unfortunate time to whoop up friendly emotion for Russia. Instead, the logic of his-

tory calls for a hardening of our attitudes to meet the coming rigors.

As Robert Strausz-Hupe has pointed out in *Protracted Conflict*:

"Only rarely has a great nation been destroyed by one dramatic blow. Defeat was preceded nearly always by a slow erosion of the will to resist aggression from without, followed by a weakening of its own people's sense of common purpose."

TWELVE YEARS AGO the United States embarked on a Cold War with Soviet Russia. We have not yet won that war. On the contrary, we have lost some of its most strategic battles. We shall never win unless we have the political intelligence and courage to recognize

boobytraps like "Cultural Exchange" for what they are—Communist-inspired schemes to entice the American people out of their anti-Communism. Any further journeying by Americans into this treacherous terrain will surely lead us to Armageddon.

Unless the "Cultural Exchange" pact with the Soviet Union is scrapped when it expires in January 1960, we can expect a further weakening of our fight to win the Cold War, both at home and overseas. "Cultural Exchange" offers great opportunities for Khrushchev while assuring further dangers and possible eventual defeat for the freedom-loving citizens of our country.

Don't Abolish the HUAC

For many years the House Committee on Un-American Activities has been a major target of the Communist conspiracy and its vocal, influential allies. With the present new Congress, which took office in January, leaning farther yet to the left-wing, anti-anti-Communist side, the Communist conspiracy has stepped up this attack on the House Un-American Activities Committee.

This Committee's exposure of the Communist conspiracy's activities in the United States has been such a problem to international Communism that attacks have been made on it by Radio Moscow from time to time.

Among those exposing the current Communist drive against the House Un-American Activities Committee was Representative Wint Smith of the Kansas Sixth District. He said: "The opening of this Congress brought forth, as usual, the tirade, condemnation and antagonism against the Committee on Un-American Activities in the House.

"This is the Committee that, for the past twelve years, has waged a relentless war against the Communists of America. This Committee always gets all the brickbats thrown at it by the Americans For Democratic Action, Communist front organizations, and other international left-wing groups and many other organizations that should know better.

"These groups seem to believe . . . that with all the new liberal members elected . . . they have a better chance to abolish the Un-American Activities Committee."—*Christian Crusade*

Another Moral Defeat for America **Red Carpet for the Red Hangman**

by Harold Lord Varney

IN INVITING Nikita S. Khrushchev to visit the United States as the guest of the American people, our leaders in Washington have sunk to an all-time moral low. All Americans must feel soiled and debased by the decision.

Khrushchev is the personal embodiment of everything which the United States detests and abhors. He is the symbol, in the American mind, of political perfidy, of godlessness, of inhuman terrorism. In his own words, he is out to "bury" America.

To invite such an apostle of political evil to the United States is as unthinkable as to have invited Adolf Hitler as a national guest 25 years ago. That the American people complacently accept such a decision on the part of their Washington leaders is a sign of the steady moral deterioration of this nation in the last quarter of a century.

David Lawrence well expressed it

when he wrote in the *U.S. News and World Report*:

"A convict who returns to society rehabilitated in mind may or may not be received by his community as an equal. But Nikita Khrushchev would be coming to America unrepentant, arrogant, dictatorial, and without abandoning a single one of his threats to our safety."

One good American who is determined to do something about the situation is Richard Cardinal Cushing of Boston. Cardinal Cushing has recommended a crusade of prayer for all Catholics in his diocese during the period of Khrushchev's visit. Each day "the Rosary and prayers to our Lady of Sorrows and our Lady of Mercy will be offered for the ruled and the rulers of Russia, for nations in bondage, for the sorrowful languishing in prisons and refugee camps, for suffering people everywhere and for universal peace, the fruit of justice."