

Mr. Kohlberg nor Mr. Levine—and in subsequent talks with Republicans I have encountered that same unpleasant antagonism toward me, namely, that I would not go whole hog, that I was concealing something.

Senator GREEN. Did Mr. Kohlberg indicate in any way how deeply he was interested in his point of view in putting it over?

Mr. LARSEN. Yes; he did. He said that he and his editor, Don Levine, had in their files a great mass of material that would substantiate their viewpoint and their contention that there was such a conspiracy and there was a far-reaching plot within the State Department to pervert the policy of the United States in favor of the Chinese Communists. I admitted that there was some evidence, but I did not admit that I was competent to judge that evidence finally. That was my opinion, and I still stick to that.

If I were asked, "All right, Mr. Larsen, what would you in the final analysis produce as evidence that the reporting was not quite correct from the field by the field officers in the State Department?" well, I have been through my files and I have come upon one document that I have thought of all the time and that I had in mind when I was in the State Department, and I searched the files for that document and I couldn't find it.

Mr. MORGAN. You searched your files?

Mr. LARSEN. I searched the State Department files in our department and I requested the clerk, or the file room, "Do you have a document submitting the minutes of the May 26 to July 1, 1943, Communist Congress in Yen-an?" At that Congress it was announced in Communist China by Mao Tse-tung that on the 23d of May the Comintern had been abolished, and at this conference Mao made it clear that the abolition of the Comintern meant that from now on we would not take orders directly from the Kremlin any longer, as we have done in the past, but the difference will not be so great, and I remember there was a hint that now the Comintern would go underground, and there was another admission by Mao and Chuh Teh, of the Communists, that Chinese communism is in fact Marxist Leninism, and that this theory applies to the whole world, and that they were not just agrarian reformers, as was generally reported, and that they had had relations with Russia.

Now, why should Emmanuel Larsen, a small, insignificant research analyst in there, have the effrontery to question the State Department dispatches? Well, because on the one hand I had evidence, what I considered genuine evidence, printed in English, by the Communists in Yen-an, saying that they were real Marxist Leninists in 1943, and that they were associated with and taking orders up to that time from the Kremlin.

At the same time I had showered upon me every day reports stating, by Mr. John Davis, that the Chinese Communists had a non-Russian orientation; by Mr. Service that the Communists were pursuing a policy of self-limitation and that they were not going to spread and take over China after the war.

Therefore, Emmanuel Larsen was entitled to suspect that there was something wrong somewhere. I did not make a fuss about it, because it was not my business. However, I always kept it in the back of my mind, and therefore I can at any time tell this story.