

# ALAN CRANSTON

## The Shadow In The Senate

Gary Allen, a graduate of Stanford University, is the author of several best-selling books, including *Communist Revolution In The Streets*; *Nixon's Palace Guard*; *None Dare Call It Conspiracy*; and, *Richard Nixon: The Man Behind The Mask*, the definitive study of the ambition and conspiratorial activities of our current President. Mr. Allen, a former instructor of history and English, is active in numerous humanitarian, anti-Communist, and business enterprises. A film writer, author, and journalist, he is a Contributing Editor to AMERICAN OPINION.

■ THE United States Senate is often said to be "the world's most exclusive club." It has welcomed the membership of great statesmen, profound thinkers, and magnificent leaders. It has also served as a base for demagogues, rogues, and rascals. Occasionally the fates have even amused themselves by sending to the Senate a *bona fide* screwball, a man whose skills as a leader qualify him for little more than haranguing the indifferent pigeons in Pershing Square. It is a tribute to the sagacity of the Founding Fathers, and to the system of checks and balances they wrote into our Constitution, that the American Republic has survived not only its election of rogues and rascals but also its occasional embrace of demagogues and screwballs.

Consider the case of the man his colleagues call "the accidental Senator." He is Alan Cranston, senior Senator from California, the most populous state in the Union. In 1968, Cranston was considered by professional politicians to be a "throwaway candidate" — a man cam-

paigned, for personal or ideological purposes, with little chance of winning. Then State Superintendent of Education Max Rafferty defeated Senator Thomas A. Kuchel in the Republican primary. It was a contest in which more blood was spilled than at the Battle of the Marne, with the result being that the Kuchel supporters defected to Cranston. That year the Republican Presidential candidate swept the state and the Republican candidate for Senate took the political gaspipe. By the time the smog cleared, Max Rafferty was on his way to political oblivion and the man derisively nicknamed "The Mortician" had become the "accidental Senator." It was one for Ripley.

### The Legislative Record

Alan Cranston has been a very energetic Senator. A study financed by the National Taxpayers Union has found that only six other Senators have voted to spend more of the taxpayers' money than has Cranston in his freshman term. The problem is that our government has been running enormous deficits which are being financed by the printing presses, reducing the value of our money to such an extent as to produce a suffocating inflation. As a chief architect of deficit spending, the California Senator has contributed mightily to the rising cost of living, or "the inflation tax" as it has been called. In the six years of his term, deficit programs that he has supported have been responsible for twenty-five percent of our entire National Debt — every nickel of it bidding up the prices we must pay for everything we buy.

Rather than vote to bring runaway



government spending under control — the only way to stop this inflation — Senator Cranston became a vocal advocate of wage and price controls. He cheered when President Nixon fastened dictatorial controls on the economy, producing widespread shortages. And he has gone right on voting away the buying-power of our dollars by supporting one deficit program after another.

Fortunately for consumers and taxpayers, many of the big spending bills Senator Cranston has supported have not passed, otherwise the Budget would have been doubled — doubling inflation or taxes. Cranston was a sponsor of literally scores of big-spending bills which mercifully did not get out of Committee. If all of the money he has sought to spend were actually appropriated, Joe Taxpayer would be working fulltime for Big Brother from January to September (instead of merely to May) just to pay taxes.

Some "Liberals" believe that the move in only four years from the nation's first \$200 billion Budget to our first \$300 billion Budget is worth the cost in inflation, taxes, and controls. Honest, if deluded, they say so openly. But, in *Current Biography*, Senator Cranston actually describes himself as "a conservative in fiscal matters." If Alan Cranston is a fiscal conservative, then Billy Jean King is a male chauvinist and Tiny Tim a baritone. That the seventh biggest spender in a spendthrift Senate would describe himself as "a conservative in fiscal matters" befogs the mind. It also casts doubt on the man's credibility about *anything*.

Cranston's problem is that Californians are weary of being had by the Big Brother programs he has consistently supported. He has therefore adjusted his rhetoric if not his commitment. "You know, I just don't believe government has to be in every aspect of your life," Senator Cranston told an interviewer for *Nation's Business*. "It needs to help where help is needed, but it doesn't have to be in everything." In practice, however, it has

been very difficult to find any area of human activity where Alan Cranston has not voted to expand government by spending ever more of our taxes. The single exception is national defense, the main legitimate expense of government. Here he is thoroughly duplicitous. Speaking at California defense plants, Senator Cranston tells workers that the United States must be kept "militarily and technologically strong." That is campaign talk. When not campaigning, Alan Cranston is a member of the board of trustees of the United World Federalists, which openly advocates our complete disarmament and surrender of American sovereignty to a World Government.

Just to list those aspects of our lives in which Senator Cranston has actively urged that the government interfere would require a book the size of the Los Angeles telephone directory. Here are a few typical examples:

Alan Cranston wants to spend \$400 million to put the federal government in the population-control business. He favors spending millions to permit the federal government to involve itself in the activities of our local police departments. He has sought substantially to raise your taxes to provide a "guaranteed college education" for all. Cranston also wants to tax you to provide federal "underwriting of local property taxes," assuring federal control of all town and city expenditures, including the schools. He wants more federal money to force racial balance in schools. He wants to eliminate the practice of offsetting earnings against Welfare payments. Alan Cranston says he wants the *federal taxpayer* to guarantee a job for everyone. He supports legislation which would virtually do away with the constitutionally guaranteed right to keep and bear arms. Cranston even wants federal money to construct and control local sewer systems. He has introduced a bill which would put the federal government in the business of establishing national adoption laws, claiming control of



#### Senate Internal Security Subcommittee Report, 1954

At another point, he discussed the part he played in the production of Army Talks, which have been shown above as the fountainhead of pro-Communist indoctrination in I. and E.

Dr. Schreiber not only approved of the pro-Communist indoctrination of American troops during World War II but he still approves of it.

The record shows that as late as April 1949, Dr. Schreiber was a speaker at the notorious Scientific and Cultural Conference for the

Senator Alan Cranston denies that he played schoolboy Lenin in Mexico as early as 1935, but the photostat below indicates otherwise. He next toured the revolutionary fronts of Europe, later explaining he was an I.N.S. correspondent, but I.N.S. denied it. Back in the U.S., Cranston became the protégé of identified Soviet spy Louis Adamic, by whom he was employed. Named to head a section of O.W.I., he employed a known Soviet agent as chief of his Italian desk and chose as his own top assistant one David Karr, an important Communist editor for the *Daily Worker* and *Party Organizer*. David Karr still contributes to Cranston (below right). Under fire by Congress and the F.B.I., Cranston joined the Army and worked for confessed Communist Julius Schreiber (see above) writing Red propaganda for the troops which was reprinted in the *Daily Worker* and distributed by Communist Fronts.

#### Special Committee on Un-American Activities, 1943

Mr. MATTHEWS. Who sponsored you in your position with the Office of Facts and Figures?

Mr. KARR. Alan Cranston, Chief of the Foreign Language Division of the Office of Facts and Figures.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Did he personally invite you to take the position, or did you apply for the position?

Mr. KARR. I never applied for any position in the Federal Government.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Did he personally invite you to take the position?

Mr. KARR. Yes, sir.



Soviet spy Adamic

San Francisco Examiner  
July 19, 1935

## STANFORD 'UPRISERS'

### Two Reported in Garrido Revolt

Two Stanford University seniors were reported yesterday as "boy revolutionaries" off to the wars in Tabasco, Mexico to overthrow the dictator, Garrido Canabal.

The two "insurrectos" were Alan Cranston of Palo Alto, quarter-master on the track team, and John Alderson of South Pasadena, pole vaulter.

The uprising revolves around the protest of University of Mexico students against the murder of five of their fellow undergraduates who had gone home to vote against Dictator Thomas

Garrido Canabal.

Universal Service quoted Cranston in a Mexico City despatch as exclaiming:

"We stand with the University of Mexico, even though we're only summer school students. Down with Dictator Garrido Canabal! What a lark!"

Sacramento Bee  
February 13, 1974

WASHINGTON — Sen. Alan Cranston, a congressional champion of public financing for federal elections campaigns, is relying heavily on big contributors from wealthy supporters in his own bid for reelection this year. . . .

#### Bankers Give

John J. Peters, chairman of the California Financial Corp. in San Jose, has given \$3,000. Officers of United California Bank donated \$750. M. David Karr, an investment banker in Paris, sent \$2,500.



children as a federal right and calling for a "Cabinet-level post" on children.\* And Senator Cranston proposes spending an additional ten billion dollars on federal "make work" projects like the old W.P.A.

Cranston usually defends such extremism by saying he is only doing what the people want. What he is doing is attempting to combine the support of hundreds of special-interest groups to assure his re-election. The theory goes that if a politician will cater to every pressure group he will get the votes of each even when all are displeased by most of the other things he does.

One instance where Alan Cranston has voted contrary to the clearly expressed wishes of his constituency is on capital punishment. Cranston voted against a Senate bill designed to overcome the 1972 Supreme Court decision which abolished the death penalty. Another such area is the energy crisis. When it comes to ecological overkill, Alan Cranston is the champion of the bug and butterfly set.

Everyone is for common-sense solutions to pollution, but reasonable people are opposed to destroying the economy in the name of ecology. Cranston consistently voted for the bills which created the gasoline shortages Americans suffered this spring. First he opposed the construction of the Alaska pipeline, despite the fact that every reasonable precaution had been taken to prevent accidents. Then he led the fight to stop offshore oil drilling, despite the fact that there had been only four major spills out of eighteen thousand offshore wells drilled. He next voted to force auto manufacturers to apply anti-pollution devices of doubtful efficiency, increasing the gasoline consumption of

our new cars by up to one-third. Alan Cranston is consistent all right: First he votes to restrict the supply of gasoline and then he votes to increase the demand. The predictable result was a major blow to the economy that has sent unemployment soaring and forced Americans to spend millions of non-productive man hours in long, boring gasoline lines.

If it does not ask more questions than it answers, Alan Cranston's record as a Senator does raise one question that should be answered: Is Senator Cranston only another demagogue, trying desperately to hold onto the best job he has ever had, or is he a committed collectivist working knowledgeably and willfully to expand the power of Big Brother over all of us? Let us return to those thrilling days of yesteryear and see who Alan Cranston really is and why he does the strange things he does.

### The Shadowy Background

When one begins researching his curious and colorful background, Alan Cranston, the Senator, quickly becomes Lamont Cranston, the Shadow. He would rather reveal the number of his Swiss bank account than discuss his past. Indeed, the Shadow is very touchy about his past. Broach the subject and he will grab the nearest megaphone and begin to wail that he is the victim of a political smear. Had Jack the Ripper run for the Senate in California he would no doubt have employed exactly the same tactic.

To make certain no one would probe too deeply into his sometimes mysterious past, Alan Cranston gave Max Rafferty advance notice that he would call for help under the Fair Practices Code if the Republican candidate were to say so much as an unkind word about his past. The bluff worked. Rafferty turned control of his campaign over to Nixon staffers who apparently convinced Rafferty that all he had to do was to campaign on the theme of "Tippecanoe and Maxie too" and he could ride into the

\*Presumably Mr. Cranston would not recommend that the Cabinet post be filled by his son, Robin, a convicted narcotics smuggler. Senator Cranston's son was placed on probation, though others go to jail for decades for committing the same offense. He was later indicted for drugging a girl at a sex party.



Senate on Nixon's coattails. It turned out that Richard Nixon's coattails were shorter than Yul Brynner's hair, and Alan Cranston became a United States Senator while Max Rafferty, once one of the hottest political properties in the nation, was driven off to join the faculty at Troy State, a teachers' college in deepest Alabama. Cranston escaped exposure of his shady past.

Although sold to Californians by the electronic media as a calm and rational "moderate," Alan Cranston was raised in a radical family where he learned revolutionary politics at his daddy's knee. *Current Biography* tells us that the senior Cranston was a close friend of "the noted San Francisco newspaper editor" Fremont Older, and that it was Older who inspired young Alan Cranston to decide upon a career of journalism. What is not mentioned in the information supplied to *Current Biography* by the Senator is that Fremont Older was an important Red who had dedicated his life to revolutionary causes. In a letter to Felix Frankfurter, President Theodore Roosevelt described the man Senator Cranston cites as instrumental in guiding his career:

*... Fremont Older and the I.W.W. and the direct action anarchists and apologists for anarchy are never concerned for justice. ... The reactionaries have in the past been a great menace to this Republic, but at this moment it is the I.W.W., the Germanized Socialists, the anarchists, the foolish creatures who always protest against the suppression of crime, the pacifists and the like, under the lead of ... the Fremont Olders and Amos Pinchots and Rudolph Spreckels who are the really grave danger. These are the Bolsheviks of America . . . .*

They were indeed. And a nextdoor neighbor of the Cranstons during this

period reports that William Cranston, the close friend of Bolshevik newspaper editor Fremont Older, took his son Alan to visit the Soviet Union during summer vacations from high school. Cranston, naturally enough, now finds it convenient to deny these visits to the Workers' Paradise. Whatever the case, his father's commitment to Lenin is hardly grounds to send the son to the political guillotine.

Following graduation from Mt. View High School, Alan Cranston enrolled at Pomona College in 1932 and later transferred to Stanford. In the summer of 1935 he decided not to go to Russia but to the University of Mexico where he participated as a teenage Trotsky in the "wars" which led to the overthrow of Thomas Garrido Canabal. The *San Francisco Examiner* for July 19, 1935, tells the story of two Stanford seniors who were described as "boy revolutionaries" participating in the uprising. One of those "boy revolutionaries" was Alan Cranston, quoted in the same newspaper as saying "We stand with the University of Mexico even though we're only summer students. Down with the Dictator Garrido Canabal! What a lark!"

Yes, after Russia, what a lark. But it seems Cranston has had another of his convenient lapses of memory. He now answers constituents who enquire about his activities as a prototype Weatherman by claiming that the report is "false" and declaring: "I did not participate in the Mexican riots." Page one of the *San Francisco Examiner* of July 19, 1935, says otherwise.

When is a lark not a lark? When somebody brings up your revolutionary activities at a time when you are campaigning as a "moderate."

In the four years following his graduation from Stanford in 1936, Cranston's career again moved into the shadows. His official biography in *World Government News* states that from 1936 to 1938 he was with the International News Service as a foreign correspondent in London,



Italy, and Ethiopia. This is another fabrication to cover Cranston's radical activities. When interviewed, I.N.S. officials reported that Alan Cranston once worked as a "volunteer" in their London office, his association with I.N.S. being considered "more of an apprenticeship rather than an actual position" and "no employment record was ever kept on Cranston." In other words, the reported job with International News Service was a cover for other activity. Someone else bankrolled Alan Cranston's globe-girdling tours of the world's hot spots — someone whose identity Alan Cranston has found it politically convenient to forget.

Cranston returned to New York City in 1939, working as a free-lance writer and lecturing on the "perils of American isolationism." Among his contributions to the world of literature during this period was his own "unexpurgated" version of Hitler's *Mein Kampf*, which Cranston removed from the book stalls when the Communists and Nazis signed the Ribbentrop Pact and became allies. He now explains that it infringed on the Nazi Fuehrer's copyright.

Late in 1939, Cranston associated himself with a radical lobbying group known as Common Council and became the protégé of Louis Adamic, editor of the Council's publication, *Common Ground*. Adamic moved Cranston to Washington where the young man served on his staff. The two were inseparable friends, frequently weekendend together at Adamic's home.

Louis Adamic was as red as the Bolshevik leader Fremont Older, who Cranston says started his journalism career. According to the Hearings of the House Committee on Un-American Activities which were published as *Report On The American Slav Congress And Associated Organizations*, Louis Adamic was a member of the Communist Party who belonged to at least thirty-seven organizations that were officially cited by the federal government as Communist Fronts.

Adamic was actually and openly writing for the official Communist press during the entire period in which he was training Alan Cranston and was a Soviet spy.

It was while working under the tutelage of Communist Louis Adamic that Cranston hit the prints with a ringing defense of labor boss Harry Bridges, whom the government was trying to deport because he was an alien Communist. Bridges' Communist Party card was turned over by his estranged wife to the Immigration Service and was introduced as evidence in deportation Hearings. This made little difference to Alan Cranston. Alan was denounced on the floor of Congress by Representative Fred M. Busbey of Illinois, who noted Cranston's dedicated "support of Communist Harry Bridges" which "in many respects parallels the program of the Communist Party." Since Cranston's guru and editor was Soviet spy Louis Adamic, this is not overly surprising.

Records of Draft Board Number Sixteen in New York City show that after the Nazi invasion of the Soviet Union, while Alan Cranston was again beating the drums to march America into the bloody war in Europe, he submitted a formal request for occupational deferment, explaining that he was employed by the Common Council "in reference to education and assimilation of the foreign-born population in the United States." It was noble enough for others to march off to die, but the hide of Alan Cranston was precious and he would manage successfully to stay out of uniform until the shooting was almost over. So hypocritical is he that during that Senatorial campaign he had the incredible gall to suggest that his opponent, Dr. Max Rafferty, was a draft dodger.

A week before Pearl Harbor, another shadow crossed Cranston's life. Although a youth untutored in foreign languages, working for a top Communist, he was selected to head the Foreign Language Division of the Office of Facts and



Figures, later the Office of War Information. Adding to the mystery was the fact that Cranston, whose career had been inspired and guided by Comrades Fremont Older and Louis Adamic, chose as his chief assistant a young man named David Karr who (not incidentally) could neither read nor translate any foreign language. Karr admitted to the House Committee on Un-American Activities on April 6, 1943, that Cranston had personally sought him out for the job. A Civil Service Commission memorandum dated June 25, 1943, offers this additional information:

*The various FBI reports on David Karr are summarized as follows: While working for a brush company . . . Karr formed a close association with the Communist Party, joining it before he was hired by the Communist organ, the Daily Worker.*

*. . . Mr. Karr admitted to several FBI agents that he was doing re-write work for the Party Organizer. The Party Organizer is the most confidential of all publications of the Communist Party. It is printed for and issued to only those who are high in the ranks of the Party and it contains the latest instructions and decisions of the Communist Party.*

In other words, Alan Cranston sought as his chief assistant a man employed by the Communist Party to deal with its most confidential papers and directives. According to the *Sacramento Bee* of February 13, 1974, a mysterious David Karr recently contributed \$2,500 to the Senate campaign of Alan Cranston. The article is entitled "Cranston Wants Public Financing But He Must Rely On 'Fat Cats,'" and Senator Cranston's friend David Karr is now described as "an investment banker in Paris."

The Cranston and Karr policy at

O.W.I. was to bully editors of foreign-language newspapers into taking a pro-Communist line. On September 29, 1949, Paul Nadany, editor of *Amerikai Magyar-ság*, testified as follows before a Senate Judiciary Subcommittee:

*All through the war years, the policy of my paper was advocating all military aid to Russia against the Axis, but keeping the Communists three feet away, reminding them time and time again that they must first prove their sincerity after the shooting phase of the war was over. Naturally, they resented this attitude and with their influence growing daily in Washington, they felt free to attack my paper day after day. Alan Cranston, chief of the Foreign Language Section of the Office of War Information, and his first lieutenant, Dave Karr, formerly David Katz - I understand that he was with the Daily Worker - came to my office and practically held a club over my head to tone down all differences with the Communists. My publisher and I resented his attitude and told him so.*

Karr was not the only Comrade employed by Alan Cranston at the Office of War Information. Working directly under Cranston was Carlo Emanuel Prato, whose background was documented in the *Congressional Record* for July 11, 1950, Page A5016, as follows:

*Associated in the OWI division under control of Alan Cranston was an alleged Italian Communist, Carlo Emanuel Prato, who had been expelled from Switzerland as a Soviet agent, entered the United States on a Czech passport issued to Milan Janore.*

According to a House Committee Report entitled *Investigation Of Un-*



*American Propaganda Activities in the United States*, the Criminal Alien Division of the New York City Police Department described Prato as a "pay-off man of the OGPU." The O.G.P.U. was the Soviet secret police. Prato later worked with Cranston as a pioneer in the World Government movement, yet today the Senator claims: "I did not employ Carlos Prato (whoever he may be — I don't think I ever met him)." Prato, who also used the alias Perini, ran the Italian desk for Cranston at the Office of War Information. It was a key post and Cranston knew Soviet agent Prato all too well.

Alan Cranston was also called on the carpet by concerned Congressmen because he falsified facts about the Katyn Forest Massacre to hide the role of the Soviets from the American public. The Russians had murdered thirteen thousand Polish officers, intellectuals, and scientists, and dumped their bodies in mass graves. When a special Committee of Congress investigated the massacre and quizzed Cranston, he tried to explain away the suppression by claiming that Anthony Eden, President Roosevelt, and Sumner Welles believed the Nazis had committed the crime. He then admitted that he had gotten that idea from a book published years later, and that at the time he suppressed all reports of the massive Soviet atrocity he had no information whatever that any of the three held any such opinion. Today, the Senator still plays games with the facts, maintaining: "I did not set a false policy about the Katyn Massacre. President Roosevelt made the decision . . ."

The Senator no doubt thinks that libel of President Roosevelt will get him off the hook. After all, how many people are going to go back and read the Congressional Hearings which reveal that the man responsible for the Katyn cover-up was Alan Cranston? Evidence brought out by the 1952 Hearings on Katyn showed that Cranston went to such extremes to protect his Soviet friends as to have radio

programs which told the truth about the Communist atrocities put off the air.

In fact, Alan Cranston became so viciously pro-Soviet that he was attacked by name on the floor of Congress on November 4, 1943. The House Select Committee To Investigate The Federal Communications Commission uncovered evidence that the F.C.C. and Office of War Information were deliberately setting a pro-Communist slant to foreign-language broadcasts emanating from hundreds of radio stations throughout the United States. The Committee specifically charged that Cranston cooperated with the conspiracy. The House Appropriations Committee declared a month later that Alan Cranston's office worked "to further the interests of Soviet foreign diplomacy, oftentimes in contradiction to the declared policy of the United States Government . . ." This Committee further found that Cranston's office has "brought pressure to bear upon reputable democratic groups and individuals . . . in order to force them into unwilling cooperation with Communists and Communist-controlled organizations." The F.B.I. investigated Cranston, and reported that he "moves in Communist circles."

Alan Cranston resigned under pressure. His deferment from Draft Board Number Sixteen was no longer valid. As boss of the Office of War Information he had brought pressure to bear to insure deferment for others — including three editors of the openly Communist newspaper *Slobdna Rech*. But with Congressional investigators at his heels, and his deferment at an end, he had no choice but to join the Army or be drafted. According to Karl Barslag, longtime investigator for the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee, Cranston "applied for admission to Officers Candidate School but was denied [security] clearance by S-2 [Intelligence] of the Army in July of 1944 for reasons unknown." So serious a security risk that he could not even be cleared to serve as a second lieutenant in the U.S. Army, this



former high U.S. Government official and graduate of Stanford now entered the Service as a private.

Today, Senator Cranston claims: "I did not resign from the Office of War Information under fire; I did decline a government deferment and enlisted in the Army as a private." The denial doesn't square with the facts. In all of his biographical releases, again and again over the years, Cranston has described himself as entering the Service after declining deferment. He did not. The record of his Draft Board shows that he had in fact tendered a three-page request for deferment. But, with both Congress and the F.B.I. looking into his activities he was just too hot to be pulled out of the line of fire.

Once in the Army, Cranston managed to get himself assigned to the Information and Education Division. Just as before, the Communists were again looking after his career. A job was arranged for him editing *Army Talks* under the command of Major Julius Schreiber, a psychiatrist who later admitted that he was a member of the Communist Party. (See *Investigation Of Major Julius Schreiber*, Senate Internal Security Subcommittee, 1954.)

It was during this period that Cranston prepared *Army Orientation Fact Sheet No. 64*, which was so clearly Communist propaganda that it was reprinted in the Communist *Daily Worker*, in the Red weekly *In Fact*, and later reprinted as a pamphlet for mass distribution by a cited Communist Front. The Cranston "Fact Sheet" was described by Army Intelligence as a classic example of infiltration via the printed word. On June 7, 1946, the House Committee on Un-American Activities observed of this document by Alan Cranston:

*In the entire discussion occupying eight closely printed pages, there is not one word against Communism or Soviet military dictatorship. On the contrary,*

*the last two pages are filled with material designed to transmit propaganda favorable to Communism and military dictatorship . . . This document goes on to make many sly comparisons which, by inference, condemn our representative form of government and recommend to favorable consideration the Soviet form of government.*

How ironic that a man who has prepared Communist propaganda condemning our representative government would be elected to the United States Senate because no one dared to report the truth about his background.

### The New World Order

At the end of the war, Alan Cranston threw himself passionately into the movement for World Government. Of course, many sorts of people have beaten the drums for World Government. Their number includes myopic college professors, dreamy suburban housefraus, super-rich international operators . . . and the Communists. World Government is, in fact, an important tenet of revolutionary Communism.

In his book, *The Bolsheviks And World Peace*, published in 1918 when he was Commissar of War in Russia's first Communist Government, Leon Trotsky declared that "the task of the proletariat is to create a far more powerful fatherland, with a far greater power of resistance — the republican United States of Europe, as the foundation of the United States of the world." He argued that "the only way in which the proletariat can meet the imperialistic perplexity of capitalism is by opposing to it as a practical program of the day the Socialist organization of the world economy."

World Government has long been a formal objective of the International Communist Conspiracy. In 1936, for example, the Communist International at



Moscow presented the following important directive as part of its official program:

*...dictatorship can be established only by a victory of socialism in different countries or groups of countries, after which the proletarian republics would unite on federal lines with those already in existence, and this system of federal unions would expand...at length forming the World Union of Socialist Soviet Republics.*

Joseph Stalin divided his plan for achievement of this Communist world federalism into three stages:

*(1) Socialize the economies of all nations, particularly the Western capitalistic democracies; (2) bring about federal union of various groupings of these socialized nations; and, (3) amalgamate all of the federal unions into one world-wide union of socialist states.*

Thus the dissemination of World Government propaganda is essential to Communist strategy for capturing America. As Communist Party leader William Z. Foster put it in *Toward A Soviet America*: "A Communist world will be a unified, organized world. The economic system will be one great organization... The American-Soviet government will be an important section in this world organization..." But, says the official Communist publication *International Affairs*:

*The concept of a future in which capitalism and communism will "converge" on an "equal footing" is utopian through and through [merely bait for American "Liberals"]. The time will come, of course, when there will be a world government, but it will be the government of a world Socialist (Communist) community...*

Following the line set for dutiful Communist propagandists, Alan Cranston claims World Government will bring world "peace." If by peace one means the peace of the concentration camps described by Alexander Solzhenitsyn, then Trotsky and Stalin and Foster and Cranston are on the right track.

Mr. Cranston's first blow for World Government was a book he published in 1945 called *The Killing Of The Peace*. Cranston acknowledged in this book that the editing "of the entire manuscript" was done by Professor Frank Fleming, who as chance would have it had written a book on the same subject.\* Fleming has followed the Communist Line so slavishly that his efforts have been praised for their "great contribution to peace" by *Political Affairs*, the official theoretical journal of the Communist Party, U.S.A. Alan Cranston's "editor" has also been singled out for praise by the *Communist World Marxist Review* and has contributed articles to the *Communist New World Review*. Just how Mr. Cranston again found himself in such company is a matter of speculation which we leave to you.

Just as planned, *The Killing Of The Peace* vaulted Cranston into leadership of the World Government movement. He became a director of the executive committee of Americans United For World Government and served as chairman of the Ways and Means Committee at the Conference On World Government at Dublin, New Hampshire, in 1945. It was Alan Cranston who was selected to present the "Dublin Declaration" to the United Nations delegates meeting in London in February 1946. The Declaration

\*When Cranston had time to write such a book is a mystery. How much was edited Cranston, and how much was purest Fleming, is indicated by the fact that though this first volume was selected by the *New York Times* as one of the ten best books published in 1945, Alan Cranston has never since published another book! Perhaps Professor Fleming hasn't had time to "edit" another.



called for the transformation of the U.N. General Assembly into a world legislature with authority over an all-powerful United Nations Army.

In 1947, the discredited Americans United For World Government disbanded and merged along with five similar organizations to form the United World Federalists.\* Goals of the United World Federalists include world taxation and creation of an all-powerful U.N. Army. During 1949, Cranston lobbied for the World Government Resolution which was being introduced by the World Federalists in state legislatures around the nation. Before the public realized what was happening, Cranston and his United World Federalists had succeeded in getting their World Government Resolution through twenty-three state legislatures. Only after an intensive educational campaign, spearheaded by the Veterans of Foreign Wars, did the states begin to rescind these Resolutions to surrender U.S. sovereignty to a World Government. As one California Senator declared in urging that the Cranston measure be rescinded:

*This Resolution would apply to the California delegation in Washington to ratify United States entry into a world government that would take away United States sovereignty and permit a world army to exist stronger than the army of the United States. This resolution would take away... [our] sovereign right to maintain an army, navy or air force.... How do we know that the power we entrust to this world court will not be used against us?... There are worse things than war. Slavery is worse....*

On June 16, 1949, Alan Cranston became national president of the United World Federalists, a post which he has held four times. Senator Cranston still serves, even today, on the organization's

board. And, as you can imagine, he is very touchy about the links between his U.W.F. and Communism. According to his organization's house organ, *World Government News*, Cranston issued the following statement in the summer of

\*Some of the U.W.F. founders include such well known Communists and fellow travelers as: *Stringfellow Barr*, who in December 1952 signed an appeal for amnesty for leaders of the Communist Party convicted under the Smith Act (and who boasts more than twenty-eight other such affiliations with Communist Fronts and causes); *Van Wyck Brooks*, affiliated with the Communist Front American Committee for Protection of the Foreign Born (and thirty-two other Red campaigns); *Congressman Emanuel Celler*, a former Director of the Communist-staffed Garland Fund (who had already amassed some ten Communist affiliations before the U.W.F. Conference); *Clifton Fadiman*, an admitted Communist who in 1932 wrote an article in *New Masses* entitled, "How I Came To Communism"; *Thomas K. Finletter*, a director of the C.F.R. (who was named our permanent representative to N.A.T.O. during the Johnson Administration); *Waldo Frank*, a Communist and former special correspondent of the *Daily Worker*; *George S. Kaufman*, a sponsor of the Comintern's International Labor Defense (who had collected eight other such affiliations by 1943); *Serge Koussevitsky*, a sponsor of the Communist Front American Committee for Yugoslav Relief (he had ten other affiliations with Communist causes at that time); *Lewis Mumford*, who was named in 1948 by the California Committee on Un-American Activities as a "fellow traveler" who had been writing textbooks for public schools (he had by then publicly affiliated with seventeen Communist projects); *Scott Nearing*, an identified Communist; *Bishop G. Ashton Oldham*, a founding member and officer of the National Council of Churches (whose affiliations with Red operations number twenty-six); *Elmer Rice*, a sponsor of the Communist Front American Friends of the Soviet Union (officially cited in 1949 for twenty-seven such Red affiliations); *Frederick Schuman*, (listed in Appendix IX of the Dies Committee on Un-American Activities some twenty-four times; *Rosika Schwimmer*, the Ambassador in 1919 from Hungary to Switzerland under the Communist regime of Bela Kun; *Upton Sinclair*, officially cited in 1949 in California for thirty-five Red Front affiliations; and, *Carl and Mark Van Doren*, whose total affiliations with Communist Fronts and projects at that time numbered twenty.



1949, when the Communist Front records of some key United World Federalists were made public:

*I charge that those who shout "Communist" at every new [sic] solution proposed for today's political, social and economic problems are disloyal to democracy . . . . It is preposterous to suggest that UWF is a Communist conspiracy . . . . It is a known fact that we are looking for a libel suit to decide the issue once and for all . . . .*

Twenty years have now passed and Cranston and his U.W.F. cronies are still looking for that libel suit to "settle the issue once and for all." Your doctor will advise you against holding your breath. That is, he would so advise you if he had followed my researchers through our necessarily limited file of Senate and House Committee documents which indicate that the total number of affiliations with officially cited Communist Fronts and projects by the forty-two key founders of the United World Federalists amounts to at least 740. Going a step further, we find from a similar scanning of the public records of 180 U.W.F. officials and members that a total of 116 have managed to amass at least 1,250 affiliations with Communist Fronts and publications.

But the real issue of the Cranston Question is this: How can a man who as a Senator takes an oath to uphold the Constitution of the United States at the same time be an officer of an organization whose single most important purpose is to so destroy the Constitution of the United States as to subject American sovereignty to control by a World Government? The Senator cleverly evades this question by muttering that his United World Federalists are now headed by Joseph Clark, once a Senator, and that other government officials have also supported the anti-Americanism of the United World Federalists. In other words,

if others are breaking their oath to uphold the Constitution and to protect American sovereignty, it should be fine with us that Cranston is doing so also.

Alan Cranston defends his advocacy that the United States surrender our independence to a World Government with such doubletalk as this:

*(World Government) Resolution 64 does not propose that we give up a shred of sovereignty. Plainly it proposes a means by which we can gain the ability to exercise our presently impotent sovereignty in the vital area of war prevention. It proposes that we create a limited world government and deposit our sovereignty there . . . .*

Senator Cranston says we won't "give up a shred of sovereignty" if "we create a limited world government and deposit our sovereignty there." Lewis Carroll couldn't have said it any better. Neither could George Orwell.

But let us not leave it at that. Let us assume Cranston means what he says and seriously examine his view of World Government. First, he says he merely wishes to "deposit our sovereignty" in a world superstate. He claims we can both have our cake and eat it, but he does not explain how sovereignty can exist in two places at once: Either the United States is sovereign over our country or the World Government is sovereign. Clearly he means the World Government to be sovereign for he has proposed as a first step the turning over of one-tenth of the American defense budget — some eight billion dollars a year — to the United Nations for its own fully equipped "peacekeeping" force, presumably to be quartered on American soil. But remember, that is only the first step. In order to make it an all-powerful "peacekeeper," the U.N. military force would have to be stronger than the collective armies of all individual nations. Otherwise it would not have the



power to enforce peace. What Cranston is proposing is the sort of World Government advocated by Lenin, Stalin, and William Z. Foster.

But Cranston insists he is for a "limited" World Government. He notes that his global superstate would be "limited" to controlling all arms (including nuclear weapons) in order to keep the "peace" — just as Trotsky proposed. That's *some* limitation. The only power World Government would have is all the guns in the world. Once a World Government has that, how does one prevent it from usurping every other power? Senator Cranston has never answered that question. The answer should be obvious even to a Baby Snooks.

And, of course, the World Government which Alan Cranston wants to succeed the government he took an oath to defend would have the power to tax. That is a prime objective of Cranston's United World Federalists. In other words, your tax rate would be set by the mini-states of South America, Africa, and Asia. That's democracy. How do you think *they* would decide to tax you? Naturally, it will be on the basis of "ability to pay." And if we decide we don't like being bled white by the world's Reds, well that's tough. If Cranston had his way, *they* would have the guns.

Would we have the right to secede? Do you think the U.N. would let the golden goose secede before it had extracted the last golden egg from the American economy? If we are ever subjected to Alan Cranston's beloved World Government it will be more "forever" than any diamond.

This is what Alan Cranston is for. This is what he says will bring us peace. You don't have to be a genius to figure out that all it would really bring us is slavery. If the Republicans had any courage, they would make *this* the key issue of their campaign against Cranston. What more important issue could there be than the survival of the United States as an inde-

pendent nation? Today the United States Senator from California believes in *abolishing* the United States. If that isn't an issue then America has gone mad.

### The Great Come-On

In 1952, Alan Cranston began building his grass-roots political machine back in his native California. He started by organizing the California Democratic Council, known as the C.D.C., a federation of local Democratic Clubs. Cranston served as president of C.D.C. from 1953 until he became State Controller in 1958.

Once again, as he had throughout his entire adult life, Cranston operated in collusion with known Communists. During the winter of 1952, Louise Todd, then Secretary of the Political Commission of the Communist Party of California, announced at a Political Commission meeting of the Communist Party that Alan Cranston was preparing to form a new grass-roots political organization. The Communists and fellow travelers had been working in the Independent Progressive Party, but that "Front" had been so thoroughly exposed that it was of no further use to them. The Comrades needed a new organization for protective coloring, and control of a network of Democratic Clubs was obviously preferable to an independent operation. In the C.D.C. the Communists could mingle with, and attempt to manipulate, honest Democrats whose patriotism could not be impugned. And the association with the Democratic Party through the California Democratic Council would give the Reds a respectability they could not otherwise obtain. In view of this, Comrade Louise Todd ordered Party members out of the I.P.P. and into the New Cranston group.

A check of the rolls of registered voters will show that the Communists within the I.P.P. moved into Cranston's organization *en masse* as soon as it was founded in 1953. What is highly signifi-



cant here is that the Communists had advance knowledge of Alan Cranston's plan and moved to support him even before the formal creation of his California Democratic Council. This fact has been confirmed by Karl Prussion, who for many years served as an F.B.I. counterspy within the Communist Party. Here is Mr. Prussion's testimony:

*During the winter of 1952, at a section political commission meeting of the Communist Party, it was revealed to all comrades that Alan Cranston of Los Altos was preparing to form a new organization consisting of California Democratic Clubs (C.D.C.). All communists were instructed to start an exodus from the Independent Progressive Party... into the future C.D.C., and to organize such clubs at the appropriate time... All communists were also instructed to take with them into the C.D.C. all left-wing, sympathetic, liberal, socialistic elements from the Independent Progressive Party... The C.D.C. did organize, and now communists direct the policy through hidden identity... For example, at the 1960 convention of the C.D.C., held in Fresno, California, the entire platform of the Communist Party was adopted in toto.*

This is further corroborated by the report of longtime Communist leader Dorothy Ray Healey to the Southern California District Convention of the Communist Party, U.S.A., meeting at Los Angeles on April 13-14, 1957. Comrade Healey declared:

*The recent convention of California Democratic Clubs held in Long Beach had over 1,200 delegates — an amazing turnout for an off-election year. The speech of President Alan Cranston deserves*

*wide circulation and could well serve as an instrument to prod labor and other people's organizations further in political participation.*

It was Alan Cranston's control over the California Democratic Council that propelled him into electoral politics. In 1958 he was elected to the office of Controller of the State of California despite the fact that he is so notoriously ignorant of the value of money that his wealthy father had to place his inheritance in a "spendthrift trust." In 1962, despite a horrifying fiscal mess, he was re-elected for a second four-year term.

In 1964, however, the Cranston express was brought to a temporary halt when he lost to Pierre Salinger in a primary race for the U.S. Senate. Salinger's connection with the Kennedy family proved too much for even Alan Cranston. In 1966, he again tasted defeat at the hands of Ivy Baker Priest, who rode Ronald Reagan's coattails into the State Controller's office. Undaunted, Cranston made another bid for the Democratic nomination for the U.S. Senate in 1968, and this time he was successful.

### What To Do

It is doubtful that one California voter in one thousand has the slightest idea of the radical background of "their" Senator. The mass media in the state, and nationally, have cooperated in burying the information, all a matter of public record, which we have just presented. In fact, most of the major media in the state endorsed Cranston instead of exposing him. The machines of misinformation not only camouflaged Cranston's background, they created a public image of him as a moderate middle-of-the-road crusader battling extremism of the Left and Right. Cranston could not have bought this kind of phony image with ten million dollars. It was handed to him by an irresponsible press that has elected to chase the Watergate chicken thieves while it protects the



radical wolves gnawing at the vitals of the nation. Presenting Alan Cranston as a moderate is the biggest propaganda ripoff since the *New York Times* assured us that Mao Tse-tung and Fidel Castro were agrarian reformers.

And bear in mind that, although never given mass circulation, much of the information presented here has been published before. When it was, the Senator screamed like a stuck boar and issued general denials. Cranston declared:

*I have never found anything attractive about communism, philosophically or politically.*

The record, cited here as to chapter and verse, says otherwise. But it would be the height of naiveté to expect a man like Senator Cranston to confess and resign his office. He would prefer to wail that he is the victim of a monstrous scheme to smear him by calling him a Communist. *We are not calling Senator Cranston a Communist.* What we have done, from the public record, is to establish that throughout his entire adult life he has closely associated himself with Communists and Communist purposes. Whether Cranston is a perpetual dupe, or knows exactly what he is doing, is something about which we can only speculate. Even if he were to announce tomorrow on the steps of the Senate that he is a Communist, and has been a Communist since he was a teenager, his claim to the remainder of his Senate term is secure. Being a Communist is not, after all, against the law. Neither is it against the law for politicians to devote themselves to every deception. In politics, as in the marketplace, the motto of the people must be *caveat emptor* — let the buyer beware.

If Cranston runs true to form he will soon issue the usual snake-oil denial, pasted smartly on a quibble or two about some area of his background that he thinks the average American will not bother to check. So when you write to

Senator Cranston, as many of our readers will no doubt want to do, ask him to answer fully *all* of the following questions. We think that how he answers these questions will make it obvious who is telling the truth. It is, after all, important that you know.

#### Questions For Cranston

1. In view of your demand that the President release the Watergate tapes to clear up the record, will you waive Congressional courtesy and request the House Committee on Internal Security and the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee to release all data in their files on your extremist activities?

2. How has the fact that your son is a convicted narcotics smuggler, let off with a slap on the wrist, affected your position on tougher penalties for dope smugglers and peddlers of narcotics?

3. Is it true that you were influenced to enter journalism by Fremont Older, described by President Roosevelt as an American Bolshevik?

4. Is it true that the *San Francisco Examiner* of July 19, 1935, reports that you were engaged in revolutionary activities in Mexico?

5. Is it true that you were the protégé of Louis Adamic, an identified Soviet spy and member of the Communist Party, by whom you were employed and with whom you worked closely?

6. Were you denounced on the floor of Congress by Representative Fred M. Busbey of Illinois for your active support of Communist Harry Bridges?

7. While working for the Office of War Information did you hire David Karr, a writer for the Communist Party, as your top assistant?

8. Did David Karr recently donate \$2,500 to your political campaign as reported in the *Sacramento Bee* of February 13, 1974?

9. Is it true that you and the Communist Karr bullied anti-Communist foreign-language newspapers and broadcasters to



withhold all criticism of the Soviets as documented in Congressional Hearings?

10. Do you still deny your close connections with Carlo Prato of the Soviet secret police?

11. Did you come under Congressional criticism for your role in covering up Soviet responsibility for the Katyn Forest Massacre of thirteen thousand Polish officers and intellectuals?

12. Is it true that the House Select Committee To Investigate The F.C.C. concluded that your O.W.I. office worked "to further the interest of Soviet foreign diplomacy, oftentimes in contradiction to declared policy of the United States Government...?"

13. Is it further true that this Committee also concluded that you "brought pressure to bear upon reputable democratic groups and individuals... in order to force them into unwilling cooperation with Communists and Communist controlled organizations"?

14. Do you deny you were turned down for Officers Candidate School by Army Intelligence?

15. Do you deny that while in the Army you worked with confessed Communist Julius Schreiber and wrote *Fact Sheet No. 64* which was reprinted by Communist publications and distributed by Communist Fronts?

16. Is it true that your *Fact Sheet No. 64* was described by the House Committee on Un-American Activities as "favorable to Communism"?

17. Is it true that the "editor" you credited for your book, *The Killing Of The Peace*, has been repeatedly praised by the Communists and contributed articles to official Communist publications?

18. Is it true that you were director of Americans United for World Government,

were long president of the United World Federalists, and are to this day an officer of the nation's leading proponent of World Government?

19. How can you take an oath to uphold the Constitution of the United States and still champion the cause of World Government?

20. How could the power of a World Government be limited if it has the superior military power necessary to guarantee world peace?

21. If the U.N. had the military power you have advocated, how could we then prevent the General Assembly from fastening, for example, a fifty percent surtax on the incomes of all Americans for distribution to the "poor" of the world?

22. Is it true that the Independent Progressive Party was heavily infiltrated by Communists?

23. Is it true that the Communists were told to leave the Independent Progressive Party to join your new organization, the California Democratic Council, even before organization of the C.D.C. was formally announced?

24. Did you ever introduce a Resolution to have known Communists ejected from the California Democratic Council? If not, why not?

25. Do you believe that your background should be an open book to your California constituents? If so, will you agree to place this article in the *Congressional Record* and assist in its distribution?

Considering the fact that you are up for re-election in just five months, Senator Cranston, we hope you will find time to answer these questions as soon as possible. Your convenient muddy denials in the last hours of the campaign will be too little too late. ■ ■

Reprints of this copyrighted article are available at the following prices: One to 99 copies, four for one dollar; 100-499 copies, twenty cents each; 500-999 copies, eighteen cents each; 1,000 or more copies, fifteen cents each. Order from:

American Opinion, Belmont, Massachusetts 02178