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The Red Scare: Spies Among Us

One of the first decisions facing newly elected President Eisenhower was whether to grant executive clemency to Julius and Ethel Rosenberg. Members of the communist party, the Rosenbergs were convicted of passing secret information about the atomic bomb to the Soviet Union in 1945 and sentenced to death. This case caused great controversy at home and abroad, because many claimed their guilt was not certain, that it was the result of Cold War hysteria.

However, the Rosenberg’s guilt was confirmed by a series of decoded Soviet cables, codenamed VENONA. To continue the VENONA project, this information had to remain classified and out of the public’s knowledge.

In this program, students will first be introduced to the reactions and advice of others outside of the Intelligence Community based on their knowledge of this espionage case. Next, students will be placed in President Eisenhower’s position to decide whether to grant executive clemency to Julius and Ethel Rosenberg based on the classified information to which he was privy. Finally, students are encouraged to use this lesson about the past to think more critically when taking in today’s news about Presidential decisions and the debate between national security and personal rights.

Objectives:
• To use a variety of primary and secondary sources to gain knowledge and analyze the past
• To identify and analyze the balance between national security and individual rights
• To explore the the impact of Cold War tensions
• To evaluate differing points of view from diverse sources on the same historical event
• To express a short written and oral argument
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Target Grades: High School, 11 - 12
Length: One Hour
Curriculum Standards:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Common Core State Standards</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RI - Reading Informative Text</td>
<td>1-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WIHST - Writing</td>
<td>1,7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SL - Speaking and Listening</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RH - History/Social Studies</td>
<td>1, 2, 6, 7, 9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Natl. Curriculum Standards for Social Studies

| High School |
|-----------------------------|---|
| Time, Continuity., and Change | Theme 2 |
| Individuals, Groups, and Institutions | Theme 5 |
| Power, Authority, and Governance | Theme 6 |

KS Stds for History, Govt, and Social Studies

| US Hist |
|-----------------------------|---|
| Cold War Conflicts | 1, 2, 3 |
| Human and Civil Rights in American Democracy | 1, 2, 3, 5 |
Lesson Plan

1. Show a segment of the PBS documentary, “Secrets, Lies, and Atomic Spies” in order to give background information of what happened prior to Eisenhower’s involvement. The first thirty minutes of this video can be found at: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=irh1WjUevYU, or it can be purchased in its entirety on VHS from Amazon. The most pertinent segment runs from 21:12 - 26:24.

   It starts when bookbreaker Meredith Gardner had cracked the Russian’s code (VENONA) and discovered the messages contained the top secret names of American scientists who had built the Atomic bomb. This started the domino effect that led to the Rosenbergs, whose case ultimately ended up on President Eisenhower’s desk as he took office in January 1953. It also points out that VENONA had to stay secret in the Rosenberg’s public trial.

2. Have copies of VENONA cable(s), drawings of Atomic Bomb, protestor photos, and McCarthy on the tables for students to see the primary sources of what is discussed in video segment and what was going on in America that influenced this case. These primary sources can be found on pages 62-71. Discuss the term “primary source.”

3. Provide copies of “Eisenhower’s Dilemma” to students. These pages will introduce students to the topic of the Rosenberg Trial in Eisenhower’s own words and set the stage for the decision making.

4. Each student should have one of the primary documents numbered 1-17 to examine. They should fill out a “Clemency Advice” worksheet for the document(s) examined. Students should also have copies of the “Who is that?” page to aid in their understanding of the people who are named in the documents.

   This exercise will provide students with the perspective of people from a variety of domestic, federal and international sources. Make sure students realize that even though some of the letters were written to others, all the information would would have made it to Eisenhower.

5. Students should present their findings to the rest of the class, focusing on their answers to 4-7 of the worksheet. The teacher may want to keep a visible tally of the recommendations made.
5. It is now time for students to step into President Eisenhower’s shoes and individually complete “Presidential Decision.” After completing this, students will read their presidential public announcement for the class. The teacher may want to keep a visible tally of the decisions made.

6. Provide students with “The Rest of the Story: Eisenhower’s Decision,” in which President Eisenhower reveals the decision he made. Students should read and individually answer the questions on “In Conclusion.” A final class discussion of student’s answers should be facilitated by the teacher.

7. Two optional extension hand outs are provided to the teacher. They can be used together or separately to encourage students to follow up on the story of the Rosenberg’s two sons, to compare the charges and consequences of others in this spy ring, and to synthesize their thoughts about the case into one cohesive argument.

Where Can I Find More?

To view online primary source documents in the holdings of the Eisenhower Presidential Library: http://www.eisenhower.archives.gov/research/online_documents/rosenbergs.html

To learn more or see the complete set of VENONA documents released: www.nsa.gov/docs/venona/venona_docs.html

To read the transcripts from the trial: http://law2.umkc.edu/faculty/projects/ftrials/rosenb/ROSENB.HTM

To learn more about all of the characters of this case, as well as links to primary sources: “The Trial of Julius and Ethel Rosenberg” http://spartacus-educational.com/USArosenbergT.htm

On my desk, when I took office, lay a document which was to lead to much controversy throughout the spring of 1953. Submitted to the Department of Justice but not acted upon in the final weeks of the Truman administration, it was an appeal for executive clemency in the case of Julius and Ethel Rosenberg who, convicted of espionage against the United States, were under sentence of death.

More than a decade earlier, Mr. and Mrs. Rosenberg had become members of the Communist party in New York City. At the height of World War II, in the summer of 1944, Mrs. Rosenberg’s brother, David Greenglass, began work as a machinist at the atomic weapons center in Los Alamos, New Mexico. In January 1945, six months before Potsdam, eight months before Hiroshima, he gave the Rosenbergs his first sketches — rough drawings of a high-explosive lens used to detonate the bomb. Later the Rosenbergs sent a courier, Harry Gold, who identified himself by showing Greenglass a torn piece of a paper box which matched the other half sent to Greenglass by the Rosenbergs; Gold carried away from the rendezvous more sketches of the lens. In September, Greenglass passed another crude drawing to the Rosenbergs, this time of the atomic bomb itself, with a set of explanatory notes.

No one will probably ever know exactly how much these grubby scraps of paper, passed in secrecy from hand to hand, changed the course of history and the safety of the United States.

Four years passed. Then a sequence of events occurred, each caused by an earlier one, like a row of dominoes going down. In England, Klaus Fuchs confessed to espionage for the Soviet Union. He implicated Gold, who in turn named Greenglass. In June 1950 Greenglass confessed, naming the Rosenbergs, and in January 1951 they were indicted.

For cooperating with the prosecution, Greenglass’ sentence was for fifteen years of imprisonment, Gold’s for thirty. In England, Fuchs drew only fourteen. But the Rosenbergs pleaded not guilty. The jury returned its verdict in March 1951; Mr. and Mrs. Rosenberg became the first Americans in peacetime to be sentenced to death on a charge of espionage.

The United States Court of Appeals upheld the conviction in February 1952. In October the Supreme Court granted a stay of execution during action on a petition for reconsideration of its earlier refusal to review the case. The next month the Supreme Court denied reconsideration. After denying...
judicial clemency, the original sentencing judge stayed the executions to allow the Rosenbergs to apply for executive clemency. There the question hung in January of 1953.

The Communist press screamed that the United States government had hypocritically convicted the Rosenbergs of espionage, framing them because they were Jewish. With them joined, at least in sympathy, other Americans who, not denying the Rosenbergs’ indisputable guilt, questioned the severity of their sentence. After all, they argued, Gold, Greenglass, and Fuchs got off with their lives and even without life imprisonment. Why, for the first time, give the death sentence in this case? Because the Rosenbergs, others answered, refused to confess. Execution would make them martyrs, the pleaders for clemency contended. But softening their sentence, the answer went, would keep other spies from confessing in the future. (Gold and Greenglass, who had confessed, escaped the death penalty.)

Despite these rebuttals, many people sincerely believed that life imprisonment might be a better judgment, particularly because the Rosenberg were the parents of two small sons and because one of the condemned was a woman.

On February 11, 1953, I made public my decision.

ANSWER THE FOLLOWING COMPREHENSION QUESTIONS

1. Of what were Julius and Ethel Rosenberg convicted?

2. Where did Ethel’s brother, David Greenglass, work?

3. What did David Greenglass give to the Rosenbergs in January 1945?

4. How did Harry Gold know he was meeting up with the right person (Greenglass) to pass along more sketches?

5. In September 1945, what drawings did Greenglass pass on to the Rosenbergs?

6. The Rosenbergs became the first Americans to get what?

7. What were some of the arguments others made in support of granting clemency for the Rosenbergs?
Executive Clemency = the power of a President in federal criminal cases, and the Governor in state convictions, to pardon a person convicted of a crime, commute the sentence (shorten it, often to time already served), or reduce it from death to another lesser sentence.

1. Julius and Ethel Rosenberg were convicted of espionage against the U.S. and sentenced to death.

2. David Greenglass worked as a machinist at the atomic weapons center in Los Alamos, New Mexico.

3. In January 1945, David Greenglass gave the Rosenbergs rough sketches of a high-explosive lens used to detonate the atomic bomb.

4. Gold and Greenglass had to match up the torn pieces of a paper box that they were each given.

5. The September 1945 drawings were of the atomic bomb itself, along with a set of explanatory notes.

6. The Rosenbergs were the first Americans in peacetime to be sentenced to death on a charge of espionage.

7. Some arguments for granting clemency:
   - the Rosenbergs were framed because they were Jewish
   - the sentencing was too severe in comparison with the other confessed spies
   - the Rosenbergs are parents of two small sons and Ethel is a woman
Clemency Advice
For the President

Examine the primary documents that offered advice to President Eisenhower as he faced making the decision of Executive Clemency for the Rosenbergs. Fill out the following questions.

Document # ______

1. Determine some physical qualities of the document.
   A. Does it have an official letterhead? _____ If yes, from what agency or office?
   B. Is it handwritten? _____ or typed?_____
   C. Are there any official seals? _____ If yes, what are they for?
   D. Are there any notations on the page? _____ If yes, what are they?

2. What type of document does this appear to be?
   letter memorandum telegram report newspaper clipping
   photo press release other _____________________

3. What date does it appear the document was created? _____________________________________

4. Who appears to be the author or creator of this document? ________________________________

5. What is the author’s title or what authority does s/he have (if any)? ______________________

6. What is the author’s recommendation or message concerning the Rosenbergs? _______________
   ___________________________________________________________________________________
   ___________________________________________________________________________________
   ___________________________________________________________________________________

7. Rate this letter 1-10 on the importance that President Eisenhower should give this document’s recommendation or message. least 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 most
If it is not included on the document, the following information should help identify the people named in the primary documents.

**Adams, Sherman** = Republican governor of New Hampshire, 1949-53; Chief of Staff of Dwight D. Eisenhower’s Presidential campaign, 1952; The Assistant to the President, 1953-58.

**Bennett, James** = Director of the U.S. Dept. of Justice, Bureau of Prisons, 1937-64.

**Brownell, Herbert Jr.** = Attorney General, 1953-1957

**Dillon, Clarence Douglass** = U.S. Ambassador to France, 1953-57; Deputy Under Secretary of State for Economic Affairs, 1957-58; Under Secretary of State, 1959-61; Secretary of Treasury, 1961-65.

**Dulles, John Foster** = Secretary of State, 1953-1959.

**Hagerty, James C.** = Press Secretary to President

**Hopkins, William J.** = Member of the White House Civil Service Staff, 1931-71.

**Jackson, C.D.** = Executive, Time Inc., 1931-64; President, Council for Democracy, 1940; Deputy Chief, Psychological Warfare Branch, Allied Forces Headquarters, 1943; Deputy Chief, Psychological Warfare Division, Supreme Headquarters, Allied Expeditionary Force, 1944-45; President, Free Europe Committee, 1951-52; Speech writer for Dwight D. Eisenhower, 1952; Special Assistant to the President for International Affairs, 1953-54; Speech writer and consultant to the President, 1958.

**Johnson, Charles E.** = Executive Officer of Psychological Strategy Board, 1951 - 1953


**Miller, Clyde** = Professor at Columbia University and former colleague of Eisenhower.

**Pinkley, Virgil** = The editor and publisher of the *Los Angeles Mirror*, a part of the *Los Angeles Times* that ran from 1948 - 1962. At the time of this letter, the *Times* had the largest circulation of any U.S. Newspaper.

**Rosenberg, Michael and Robert** = The young sons of Ethel and Julius Rosenberg

**Rosenberg, Sophie** = Julius Rosenberg’s mother.

**Shanley, Bernard M.** = Member of the Advisory Committee for the Eisenhower campaign of 1952; Special Counsel to President Eisenhower, 1953-55; Appointment Secretary to President Eisenhower, 1955-57.

**Stephens, Thomas E.** = Appointments Secretary to General Eisenhower, 1950-53; Special Counsel to the President and Appointments Secretary, 1953-61.

**Tauey, Charles H.** = Official of the Psychological Strategy Board, Washington, D.C.

**Urey, Harold C.** = A Nobel Prize-winning atomic scientist.
Primary Documents

1. Letter to Dwight D. Eisenhower from Clyde R. Miller, June 8, 1953, AND Eisenhower’s reply to Clyde Miller on June 10, 1953.

2. “We Are Innocent” Flyer advertising a clemency rally for the Rosenbergs on June 11, 1953. Flip side has letter from Michael Rosenberg to Dwight D. Eisenhower on May 20, 1953. Flyer created by the National Committee to Secure Justice in the Rosenberg Case.


5. Telegram from Paris (Clarence Douglas Dillon) to Secretary of State (John Foster Dulles), May 15, 1953.


7. Telegram to Mrs. Mamie Eisenhower from Sophie Rosenberg, June 16, 1953.

8. Memo to Mr. Stephens from William J. Hopkins, February 12, 1953.

9. Memo for presidential file regarding Michael Rosenberg’s note to President Eisenhower, February 27, 1953 AND Telegram from Michael Rosenberg to President Eisenhower, June 17, 1953.


11. Memo to Governor Adams from Bernard M. Shanley, April 21, 1953.


17. Memorandum to Herbert Brownell, the report of interview with the Rosenbergs by James Bennett, June 5, 1953.
Mr. Dwight D. Eisenhower  
The White House  
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. President:

If the enclosed publicity broadside about the Rosenbergs has any truth in it— and I suspect it may have—great harm would result, it seems to me, if their death sentence were carried out. The name of America instead of being associated with justice and mercy would stand for just the opposite among tens of millions the world over. We could expect the Communist propaganda machine to make the most of that situation. As a student of public opinion I have studied their propaganda through many years. I am confident they would exploit any appearance of injustice.

I suspect, I say, there may be truth in this broadside. I say this because for some years I have had occasion to know one of the attorneys associated with the case and I have grave doubts about the man's mental fitness if not his integrity.

It would seem to me the part of wisdom, Mr. President, to grant a measure of clemency to the Rosenbergs. While Mr. Truman was President, moved by an editorial in The Churchman, I expressed substantially the same views to him. The letter was not acknowledged—nor would I expect it to be, for I am aware of the physical impossibility involved— but this matter seems to have such an important bearing upon our nation's reputation everywhere that I write to you in the hope that you will see fit to give it reconsideration.

Clemency, I feel, can do no harm; it might do vast good. I recall your saying to me some years ago in a conversation in your office at Columbia University, that it was inconceivable to you, as one who had to pass on many sentences handed down in courts martial, that a person should be condemned without a full hearing and review of the case. Your humanity and fairness made a deep impression on me. I hope with all my heart that as President of our country you are able to realize in growing accomplishment the inspiring ideal you have expressed.

Respectfully yours,

[Signature]

Clyde N. Miller
Personal and Confidential

Dear Clyde:

Thank you very much for your thoughts on the Rosenberg conviction. It is extremely difficult to reach a sound decision in such instances. Not all the arguments are on either side.

I started studying the record of the case immediately after Inauguration, and have had innumerable conferences on it with my associates.

Several of the obvious facts which must not be forgotten are these. The record has been reviewed and re-reviewed by every appropriate court in the land, extending over a period of more than two years. In no single instance has there been any suggestion that it was improperly tried, that the rights of the accused were violated, that the evidence was insufficient, or that there was any factor in the case which justified intervention on the part of the Executive with the function of juridical agencies.

As to any intervention based on considerations of America's reputation or standing in the world, you have given the case for one side. What you did not suggest was the need for considering this kind of argument over and against the known convictions of Communist leaders that free governments -- and especially the American government -- are notoriously weak and fearful and that consequently subversive and other kind of activity can be conducted against them with no real fear of dire punishment on the part of the perpetrator. It is, of course, important to the Communists to have this contention sustained and justified. In the present case they have even

Personal and Confidential
stooped to dragging in young and innocent children in order to serve their own purpose.

The action of these people has exposed to greater danger of death literally millions of our citizens. The very real question becomes how far can this be permitted by a government that, regardless of every consideration of mercy and compassion, is also required to be a just government in serving the interests of all its citizens. That their crime is a very real one and that its potential results are as definite as I have just stated, are facts that seem to me to be above contention.

Another factor that appeals, quite naturally, to Americans is that one of these criminals -- indeed the more strong-minded and the apparent leader of the two -- is a woman. But the question presents itself -- if the Executive should interfere because of this fact, would we be justified in encouraging the Communists to use only women in their spying process?

I assure you that I appreciate receiving your thoughts on the matter. You not only have the right of any citizen to submit your suggestion, but, of course, our old friendship at Columbia assures that I would give special attention to your convictions. But when it comes to the decision to commute such a sentence -- which would mean that these arch criminals would be subject to parole at the end of fifteen years -- I must say I have not yet been able to justify such an action.

I have answered your letter at some length, because I know that you wrote it out of a deep sense of duty and friendship. I realize that your desire to protect America is as great as mine, but I doubt that you have had to consider some of the results that could spring from the action you recommend.
Personal and Confidential

We shall, of course, have another clemency petition presented this week, from which we will see whether there are additional considerations to take into account.

With personal regard,

Sincerely,

Professor Clyde Miller
Butler Hall
Columbia University
New York 27, New York
"We Are Innocent"

SAY ETHEL AND JULIUS ROSENBERG

They are told, "Talk and you can live." But only days from death, they swear they are innocent. Against their word is the word of proven perjurers!

PERJURY! Newly-discovered documents — in the handwriting of chief prosecution witness David Greenglass — prove Greenglass lied when he swore in court that Julius Rosenberg sent spy Harry Gold to him. "I didn't know who sent Gold to me," Greenglass admits.

My husband is "an hysteric" who would "say things were so even if they were not," says Mrs. Ruth Greenglass of her husband, David, in an interview with her lawyer.

PERJURY! AN AFFIDAVIT from a staff member of R. H. Macy's department store proves Greenglass lied when he claimed the Rosenbergs got an expensive console table from the Russians. The affidavit proves the table was an inexpensive one bought at Macy's, as the Rosenbergs had testified.

AN AFFIDAVIT from FBI agent John Harrington reveals a major witness lied on the stand in identifying the Rosenbergs.

PERJURY! Witness Max Ehrlich faced a perjury indictment for swearing falsely to the government and admitted he hoped to make things easier for himself by his testimony against the Rosenbergs.

Even as you read this, new evidence of perjury is being uncovered.

Don't let them die on perjured testimony. See that the FULL facts come to light NOW . . . NOT AFTER THEY ARE ELECTROCUCED!

WRITE—WIRE PRESIDENT EISENHOWER:

Clemency for the Rosenbergs

Clemency Rally

Thursday, June 11th, Union Square, 5 P. M.

Issued as a public service by: National Committee to Secure Justice in the Rosenberg Case, 1050 6th Ave., New York 18, L 4-1585
Dear President Eisenhower,

I saw on television on Monday Mr. Oatis is not in prison anymore because the President of the country let him go. She said he will write a letter to the President over there and she told why Mr. Oatis should be let go. I think it is a good thing to let him go home because I think prison is a very bad place for anybody to be.

My mommy and daddy are in prison in New York. My brother is six years old. His name is Rolley. He misses them very much and I miss them too. I got the idea to write you from Mr. Oatis on television. Please let my mommy and daddy go and not let anything happen to them. If they come home Rolley and I will be very happy. We will thank you very much.

Very truly yours,
Michael Rosenberg

Letter Sent to
President Eisenhower
May 20, 1953

Write and Wire President Eisenhower:
Clemency for the Rosenbergs

Issued by: NATIONAL COMMITTEE TO SECURE JUSTICE IN THE ROSENBERG CASE
1050 Sixth Avenue, New York 18, N. Y. • LOngeore 4-9585
Dear Herb:

I hate to make a nuisance of myself, but I can't help thinking that it is worth one more try to crack at least one of the Rosenbergs, now that we have the added psychological leverage of Soviet anti-Semitism.

Cracking the Rosenbergs is not a "third degree" problem, but a psychiatric problem. Therefore, would it not be possible to get some really skillful Jewish psychiatrist, say Dr. Karl Binger, to attempt to insinuate himself into their confidence during these next thirty days, and if they did show signs of coming along, a stay of execution for another thirty or sixty days could be arranged while the work progressed.

I am sure you understand that my interest is not in saving the Rosenbergs. They deserve to fry a hundred times for what they have done to this country. But — if they can be cracked, what they can tell us may save the lives of hundreds of thousands of Americans later!

Again, please forgive my importuning you.

Kind regards.

Sincerely,

The Hon. Herbert Brownell
The Attorney General
Department of Justice
Washington, D.C.

C. D. Jackson
Thank you for your letter. Of course I understand perfectly that our conversation at lunch was entirely personal and not official.

I think that the fact that Greenglass did not receive as severe a punishment as the Rosenbergs was not due to a "deal" having been made beforehand. When Greenglass came up for sentencing the judge asked for the recommendation of the government. I understand that this is a time-honored practice in all American jurisprudence. The prosecuting attorney thereupon recommended clemency for Greenglass. I gather that he did it for the very best of all possible reasons -- which is the protection of the security of the United States and of the free world. He wanted to make it attractive for other spies to give information.

There is, apparently, reason for believing that a large number of other individuals are involved in the spying and that it is still operating. This matter is thus a most serious threat to the security both of your country and mine. It makes it utterly vital to bring all possible pressure to reveal the identity of the other individuals in order to protect the millions of innocent people in the whole free world whose lives are actually at stake.

As far as the treatment of Fuchs and May is concerned, I can only express my own belief, which is based on conversations with persons who are well informed, that the information which they transmitted was nothing like as important as that which was transmitted by the Rosenbergs, and that there is not the over-all knowledge of these matters in England that there is here. This is, of course, not due to any inherent superiority in this country but to the obvious fact that it is in this country that the practical development of atomic matters is being carried on on the largest scale.

It is certainly ironic that the United States, which in this whole matter is actuated solely by the desire to protect the security of the free world, should be criticized and attacked by those whom it is seeking to serve.

Instead of criticizing us for doing an extremely disagreeable duty, in the course of which every requirement of justice has been scrupulously observed, our friends in Europe would be well advised to think of the nameless millions behind the Iron Curtain who have gone to the gas and torture chambers and concentration camps without even the slightest pretense of a fair trial.

I deeply appreciate the friendly spirit which has prompted you to write to me.

(From C.D. Jackson)
January 30, 1953

CONFIDENTIAL

Dear Herb:

Bobby Cutler gave me the attached statement which was prepared by the Psychological Strategy Board, and he now suggests that I forward it to you.

As I understand it, this was a statement which had been prepared for President Truman.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Honorable Herbert Brownell, Jr.
The Attorney General
Washington 25, D. C.

[Declassified]
E.O. 11652, Sec. 1

[Signature]
December 30, 1952

FBI DRAFT OF PRESIDENTIAL STATEMENT
ON ROSENBERG CASE

I have given earnest consideration to the records in the case of Julius and Ethel Rosenberg and to the appeals for clemency made on their behalf. These two individuals have been tried and convicted of a most serious crime against the people of the United States. They have been found guilty of conspiring with intent and reason to believe that it would be to the advantage of a foreign power, to deliver to the agents of that foreign power certain highly secret atomic information relating to the national defense of the United States.

The nature of the crime for which they have been found guilty and sentenced far exceeds that of the taking of the life of another citizen; it involves the deliberate betrayal of the entire nation and could very well result in the death of many, many thousands of innocent citizens. By their act these two individuals have in fact betrayed the cause of freedom for which free men are fighting and dying at this very hour.

We are a nation under law and our affairs are governed by the just exercise of these laws. The courts have provided every opportunity for the submission of evidence bearing on this case. In the time-honored tradition of American justice, a freely selected jury of their fellow-citizens considered the evidence in this case and rendered its judgment.
All rights of appeal were exercised and the conviction of the trial
court was upheld after full judicial review, including that of the
highest court in the land.

I have made a careful examination into this case and am satisfied
that the two individuals have been accorded their full measure of
justice.

There has been neither new evidence nor have there been mitigating
circumstances which would justify altering this decision, and I have
determined that it is my duty, in the interest of the people of the
United States, not to set aside the verdict of their representatives.

In order that the people of the United States may be reminded of
the character of the crime for which these two individuals are being
punished, I am making available a summary of the facts in the case
which has been prepared for me by the Department of Justice.
FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE

JAMES C. HAGERTY, PRESS SECRETARY TO THE PRESIDENT

THE WHITE HOUSE

STATEMENT BY THE PRESIDENT

I have given earnest consideration to the records in the case of Julius and Ethel Rosenberg and to the appeals for clemency made on their behalf. These two individuals have been tried and convicted of a most serious crime against the people of the United States. They have been found guilty of conspiring with intent and reason to believe that it would be to the advantage of a foreign power, to deliver to the agents of that foreign power certain highly secret atomic information relating to the national defense of the United States.

The nature of the crime for which they have been found guilty and sentenced far exceeds that of the taking of the life of another citizen; it involves the deliberate betrayal of the entire nation and could very well result in the death of many, many thousands of innocent citizens. By their act these two individuals have in fact betrayed the cause of freedom for which free men are fighting and dying at this very hour.

We are a nation under law and our affairs are governed by the just exercise of these laws. The courts have provided every opportunity for the submission of evidence bearing on this case. In the time-honored tradition of American justice, a freely selected jury of their fellow-citizens considered the evidence in this case and rendered its judgment. All rights of appeal were exercised and the conviction of the trial court was upheld after full judicial review, including that of the highest court in the land.

I have made a careful examination into this case and am satisfied that the two individuals have been accorded their full measure of justice.

There has been neither new evidence nor have there been mitigating circumstances which would justify altering this decision, and I have determined that it is my duty, in the interest of the people of the United States, not to set aside the verdict of their representatives.

###
FROM: Paris
TO: Secretary of State
NO: 5972, May 16, 1 p.m.

EYES ONLY FOR SECRETARY OF STATE FROM AMBASSADOR

I am deeply concerned with long term effect of possible execution of Rosenbergs on French opinion.

This mission has concerned itself particularly with Rosenberg case and has undertaken all possible measures designed to inform and persuade French opinion of scrupulous fairness of trial and validity of verdict of guilty as charged. We have also specifically exposed and refuted Communist distortions and claims that Rosenbergs victims racial persecution and political witch-hunting. I believe that our efforts, and especially documentation on case now available, have contributed to acceptance by majority French interested opinion, other than that willfully following party line, that Rosenbergs had fair trial and are guilty of charges brought against them.

At the same time, fact of matter is that even those who accept guilt of Rosenbergs are overwhelmingly of opinion that death sentence unjustifiable punishment for offenses as revealed by trial, particularly when compared with prison terms meted to British scientists Allan Nunn May and Klaus Fuchs.

In addition to this, following important factors have combined to reinforce sentiment that even though guilty Rosenbergs should not (repeat not) get death: (1) marital and parental status Rosenbergs; (2) family connection Greenglass without whose testimony charges could not (repeat not) have been brought home; (3) protracted delays; and (4) latest doubts aroused as to reliability Greenglass testimony by publication statement—allegedly in Greenglass handwriting—whose authenticity not (repeat not) yet denied. (Press here has run photostats of statement in which Greenglass writes that what she told FBI may not have been true. See EMTEF 5582, April 20. Department has informed Embassy such a statement "may well exist").

Substantial segment of French opinion also makes a distinction between degree of guilt of Rosenberg as the principal, and his wife as an accessory.

We should not (repeat not) deceive ourselves by thinking that this sentiment is due principally to Communist propaganda or...
that people who take this position are unconscious dupes of Communists. Fact is that the great majority of French people of all political leanings feel that death sentence is completely unjustified from moral standpoint and is due only to political climate peculiar to United States now (repeat now) and at time when trial took place, even though trial itself conducted with fullest protection rights individual.

While over here, Mr. Cohn of Senator McCarthy's staff publicly sought to convince European opinion of his maturity experience in spite of his youth by claiming that he prosecuted Rosenbergs. In the light of highly unfavorable reaction of European opinion to mission and views of Messrs. Cohn and Schine, nothing could be better calculated than this claim to convince waverers that Rosenbergs, if executed, will be victims of what European press freely terms "McCarthyism".

In view of the foregoing considerations, I feel bound to bring to your attention our strong conviction that if death sentence is carried out, this will have a most harmful long term effect on the opinion and attitude of the French people towards the United States.

We therefore urge that an appraisal of the Rosenberg sentence be made in terms of the higher national interest.

I realize that the Communist Party will exploit any commutation as evidence that trial was unfair, but I am convinced that any propaganda capital Communist Party would and could make in short run out of this obvious line would mean little compared with long term damage that execution of Rosenbergs would do to foreign opinion of US and of our whole democratic processes.

Dillon
THE WHITE HOUSE
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THE PRESIDENT,

THE WHITE HOUSE,

I respectfully request that you grant a brief appointment to clergymen who will be in Washington tomorrow June 16 as spokesmen for 2,300 of their fellow clergymen who have asked for commutation of the death sentence of Julius and Ethel Rosenberg.

This large, independent, and unaffiliated group who have declared their trust in the humane American way are residents of all the 48 states and members of 29 separate denominations. The signers include spiritual and executive leaders of their respective denominations, president deans and professors of numerous theological schools and colleges and important members of interdenomination organizations.

They are united in the belief that the death sentence is too severe, and is most unwise in view of the international situation. This position is shared
BY MANY RELIGIOUS LEADERS IN FOREIGN COUNTRIES INCLUDING POPE PIUS XII, MAURICE CARDINAL FELTON, ARCHBISHOP OF PARIS AND PRESIDENT OF THE INTERNATIONAL CATHOLIC MOVEMENT "PEACE OF CHRIST" PIERRE MARIE CARDINAL GERLIER PRIMATE OF FRANCE. AND OTHER PROMINENT DIVINES BOTH PROTESTANT AND JEWISH THROUGHOUT WESTERN EUROPE.

WE HAVE MADE THE REQUEST FOR AN APPOINTMENT ON PREVIOUS OCCASIONS ON BELIEF THAT YOU WILL WISH TO HONOR THE LONG ESTABLISHED GROUPS OF THE AMERICAN CLERGY ON MORAL ISSUES.

KINDLY REFER TO OUR COMMUNICATIONS OF JANUARY 11 1953 FEBRUARY 13 1953 MARCH 6 AND 23 1953, APRIL 23 1953 WITH FULL LIST OF SIGNERS ATTACHED. I MAY BE REACHED AT THE HOTEL WASHINGTON, WASHINGTON DC ANYTIME AFTER 2 AM TUESDAY JUNE 16. VERY RESPECTFULLY YOURS

BERNARD D LOOMER DEAN SCHOOL OF RELIGION UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO.
February 13, 1953.

My dear Mr. Adams:

May I call to your attention the following statement which I have released to the press today?

"At the request of the Holy See the Apostolic Delegation last December communicated to the Department of Justice the fact that the Holy Father had received numerous and urgent appeals for intervention with intercession in behalf of Julius and Ethel Rosenberg which, out of motives of charity proper to his apostolic mission without being able to enter into the merits of the cases, His Holiness felt appropriate to bring to the attention of the United States civil authorities."

In view of the many reports that have appeared in the press I felt that I should inform you of this statement directly.

Furthermore, I am directed by the Holy See to inform the competent United States authorities that many new demands are being received at the Vatican urging the Holy Father to intervene for clemency in behalf of the Rosenbergs and that leftist newspapers insist that His Holiness has done nothing. I will be most grateful if you will kindly notify this to the President.

With sentiments of esteem and every best wish,

I remain

Sincerely yours,

Julius Rosenberg

Mr. Sherman Adams

The White House

Archbishop of Laodicea
Apostolic Delegate
February 13, 1953

TELEPHONE CONVERSATION WITH JAMES HAGERTY
THE WHITE HOUSE

Mr. Hagerty telephoned the Secretary at 9:30 this morning with reference to a story carried by both AP and UP that the Pope had intervened in the Rosenberg case. The Secretary checked with the staff in his office, who had just convened for the regular meeting, and told him that we had not received any communication from the Vatican on the matter.

Mr. Hagerty asked the Secretary’s advice as to why he could say at his 10:30 Press Conference and the Secretary suggested that he say that neither the White House nor the State Department had any knowledge of the matter except for the press report and nothing could be said about it.

Both stories stressed that the Pope had made the appeal “some time before the President announced his decision”.

DO:D
The White House
Washington
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MRS. DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER

THE WHITE HOUSE

I TURN TO YOU IN MY DEEP GRIEF AND IMPLORE YOU TO
INTERCEDE WITH PRESIDENT EISENHOWER TO GRANT MERCY TO
MY BELOVED CHILDREN. I BEG OF YOU TO ACT THROUGH
THE CHARITY OF YOUR HEART FOR AN OLD WOMAN WHOSE DAYS
ARE SPENT IN WEEPING. I BEG OF YOU TO THINK OF TWO
CHILDREN FOR WHOM HIS HOLINESS POPE PIUS HAS EXPRESSED

COMPASSION IN HIS APPEAL FOR MERCY. I WILL PRAY
TO THE GOD OF ALL OF US FOR YOU IN THANKFULNESS FOR
YOUR COMPASSIONATE HELP

MRS. SOPHIE ROSENBERG 36 LAUREL HILL TERRACE
NEW YORK CITY.
MEMORANDUM FOR MR. STEPHENS:

Re: Telegraphic reaction to the President's action in the Rosenberg case

So far, 1,364 telegrams have been received in opposition to the President's action and 57 in support of his action. The vast majority of those in opposition come from population centers on the East and West Coasts, principally New York and California. Less than 1% go into the question of guilt or innocence. The majority of them express shock at the President's action and urge reconsideration. Some of the other thoughts expressed are as follows:

1. The American conscience cannot accept this decision.
2. Execution would be a miscarriage of justice.
3. In the name of humanity and American decency, there should be reconsideration.
4. Such death sentence is unprecedented.
5. Execution would be a blot on the good name of America.
6. The punishment here is more severe than that given Axis Sally, Tokyo Rose, and others of that kind.
7. Some few oppose capital punishment and others simply ask the President to be merciful.

Those in support of the President's action are of three types:
1. Those who congratulate the President.
2. Those who commend his action.
3. Those who think his action took courage.

WILLIAM J. HOPKINS
The White House
Washington

WB 239 PD
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LAKWOOD N.J.ER JUN 17 911AM

THE PRESIDENT
THE WHITE HOUSE

TODAY 4 O'CLOCK ROBBY, MY GRANDMOTHER, AND I ARE
GOING TO WASHINGTON. SINCE YOU HAVE NOT
ANSWERED MY LETTERS YET I WOULD LIKE TO SPEAK TO YOU AND
TELL YOU HOW GOOD MY MOMMY AND DADDY ARE. IF YOU ARE BUSY
PLEASE GIVE A LETTER TO THE POLICEMAN WHOM I GAVE A LETTER
TO ON SUNDAY SO HE CAN GIVE IT TO ME.

VERY TRULY YOURS
MICHAEL ROSENBERG TOMS RIVER N.J.
MEMORANDUM FOR THE FILES:

Note of 2/16/53 to the President from Michael and Robert Rosenberg, 36 Laurel Hill Terrace, NYC; state they don't want to be left without a mommy and daddy.

Sent to Mr. Shanley 2/27/53,

elb

Nothing further in file 7/2/53.
Honorable Dwight D. Eisenhower
The President
The White House
Washington, D.C.

May 22, 1953

My dear Mr. President:

I am being bombarded by various Committees claiming as a mission in life, the securing of justice in the Rosenberg case.

I quote a paragraph in the last letter I have received from one of these groups:

"We trust that you will be moved to intercede with the President in behalf of a commutation of sentence. Please let us know what your views are in this crucial matter."

Because of this request to appeal to you in behalf of the Rosenbergs, I should like to say to you that the action you have already taken in this case is to be commended and that any other action would not be understood by more than 60% of the people of this country.

With kind regards, I am,

Sincerely,

Brady Gentry.
MEMORANDUM TO: Governor Adams

FROM: Bernard M. Shanley

April 21, 1953

Relative to the Rosenberg situation, at the moment the Supreme Court is in the process of determining whether or not it will hear the petition for certiorari. A decision is expected in about two weeks, and therefore the execution of the sentence is being delayed pending this decision.

A survey of the McFadden Publications indicates that 52.5% of 200 housewives approve of the death sentence; 24% recommend life; 16.9% favor deportation; and 14.7% suggest some punishment other than death because of the children.
June 17, 1953

The President

The White House

Dear Mr. President:

I have here with a petition for executive clemency, dated June 16, 1953, prepared by Emanuel H. Block, Esquire, as Attorney, and signed by Ethel Rosenberg and Julius Rosenberg. This petition was filed with the Pardon Attorney in the Department of Justice yesterday. We have carefully reviewed it and find that it does not contain any facts warranting a reversal of your previous action in this matter.

Since your denial of the previous petitions, the United States District Court for the Southern District of New York, the United States Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and the United States Supreme Court have rejected various applications on behalf of the petitioners covering a number of aspects of the case. Nothing has transpired during this period which casts any doubt on the fairness of the trial or the protection of the rights of the petitioners to full judicial review of their case. Indeed, as you know, the Chief Justice of the United States Supreme Court has recalled the Court into special session to consider the one remaining aspect of the case before the Courts.

The Department of Justice has in recent weeks investigated every allegation brought to its attention reflecting adversely upon the conduct of the trial or of the witnesses, and has found that none of these allegations is substantial. As I stated to you at the time you were considering the prior application for executive clemency, the evidence of the guilt of these petitioners for a crime of heinous proportions, affecting the safety of our country and its people, is credible and convincing. The verdict is justified, and the completeness
The fairness of the trial cannot be questioned. There is
plenty of proof that the people constituting the dead
center of a conspiratorial espionage group bent on betraying
this country's interest into the hands of another nation.

The petition submitted by a representative of the Government offered the petitioners the guarantee
of life for the price of a confession of guilt. The state-
mant is valid. The petition also indicates that certain
pleas for clemency in support of petitioners' claims for
executive clemency have been postdated from you by the
Department of Justice. This will confirm to me that you
have personally been kept advised of all information in
connection with the case of the petitioners.

I am in favor that the petition be denied.

Respectfully,

Petition denied:

Dwight D. Eisenhower
Attorney General
June 19, 1953

petition + only add to jail on 6/22/53
IN THE MATTER OF THE CONSTITUTION OF SENTENCE OF

JULIUS ROSENBERG AND ETHEL ROSENBERG

The President
Sir:

These petitioners were convicted in the United States District Court for the Southern District of New York on an indictment charging them with conspiring with David Greenglass, Anatoli Yakovlev, and Morton Sobell to communicate to the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics documents, writings, sketches, notes and information relating to the national defense of the United States with intent and reason to believe that it would be used to the advantage of the Soviet Union. Ruth Greenglass, wife of David, and one Harry Gold were named in the indictment as conspirators but not as defendants. *

The petitioners on April 5, 1951, were sentenced to death. The execution of sentence has been deferred from time to time pending appellate proceedings, and the order of the District Court now

*Gold pleaded guilty on July 20, 1950, to an indictment in substantially the same terms and was sentenced by the United States District Court for the Western District of Pennsylvania, at Philadelphia, to a term of thirty years, the maximum term of imprisonment imposable under the statute. Yakovlev, an official employee of the Soviet Consulate General in New York, left the United States and was not placed on trial. David Greenglass testified for the Government and was sentenced for fifteen years. Ruth Greenglass has not been prosecuted. Sober was sentenced to thirty years.
is that the date for execution will not be fixed prior to five days following the action of the President on the petitions for clemency.

The conviction was appealed to the United States Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, where the judgment was affirmed on February 25, 1952. A petition for certiorari was denied by the Supreme Court of the United States on October 12, 1952. Thereafter the petitioners brought a proceeding in the District Court to have the conviction set aside, based on the general ground that the trial was null and void because of gross violation of the petitioners' rights. Honorable Irving R. Kaufman, the District judge who presided at the trial, disassociated himself with the subsequent proceeding, which was heard by the Honorable Sylvester J. Ryan, who after hearing denied the relief prayed for. Judge Ryan’s judgment was affirmed by the Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit on December 31, 1952. The time for applying for a writ of certiorari on the second judgment of the Court of Appeals has not yet expired. If application for such a writ is made, the Department will oppose it.

Following the conclusion of the several appellate proceedings, the petitioners presented to Judge Kaufman a motion for reduction of sentence in accordance with the applicable judicial rule. After hearing, Judge Kaufman denied the motion on January 2, 1953, rendering an extended opinion, a copy of which is attached to the accompanying file.
The applicants have presented petitions for Executive clemency in which they protest their innocence, attack the government’s evidence and attempt to rebut it by their own story. At the conclusion of the recitation of evidence, each petitioner makes the following significant statement:

Under the circumstances of our case, the jury’s verdict of guilty could not, as a matter of law, have been upset by any court. A question of fact was presented to the jury for its determination. That determination, under the Federal law, is final and binding upon the appellate courts, even though these courts might upon the same evidence have arrived at a contrary conclusion.

Following the foregoing recital, the petitioners proceed with an argument which could be interpreted as a representation that had the appellate courts been able to make a different finding upon the facts, the might have done so. Their representations in that respect are not convincing. The evidence presented at the trial is fairly set forth in the opinion of the United States court of Appeals, which is in the attached files*, and set forth in more detail in the brief of the United States, which is also submitted herewith. In view of the petitioners’ admission that the evidence justified the conviction, I deem it unnecessary to encumber this communication with a repetition or condensation of the record. Suffice it to say that it was amply and credibly shown that Julius Rosenberg had, at

* The statement of facts is appended hereto.
the instance of Yakovlev and other agents of the Soviet Union, induced David Greenglass, a machinist employed by the United States at the Los Alamos Project of the Atomic Energy commission, in New Mexico, to procure and give to him evidence about the location and construction of the Project, the names of the scientists employed, and descriptions of devices made there, all of which was accepted by Julius Rosenberg and by him transmitted to his Russian employers. Harry Gold, the man who was sentenced to thirty years in Philadelphia for his part in the espionage, was associated with Rosenberg and acted in an effective capacity as an agent for the transmission of the information. Greenglass and Gold both testified at the trial, exposing the entire scheme. They were, it is true, co-conspirators with the Rosenbergs, but a reading of the record indicates that their testimony was credible and was sufficiently supported by circumstantial evidence. At any rate, the jury believed them, and there is no reason why you should not.

Judge Kaufman, when he imposed sentence upon these petitioners, said:

The evidence indicated quite clearly that Julius Rosenberg was the prime mover in this conspiracy. However, let no mistake be made about the role which his wife, Ethel Rosenberg, played in this conspiracy. Instead of deterring him from pursuing his ignoble cause, she encouraged and assisted the cause. She was a mature woman, — almost three years older than
her husband and almost seven years older than her younger brother. She was a full-fledged partner in the crime.

In his opinion filed in connection with the motion for reduction of sentence, Judge Kaufman says:

Julius and Ethel Rosenberg were the prime movers in this conspiracy, into it they sucked David and Ruth Greenglass.

Both these statements of Judge Kaufman are amply justified by the evidence. Ethel Rosenberg was the sister of Greenglass and cooperated fully with her husband in influencing him to do what he did. That the information procured from Greenglass and transmitted by Rosenberg was of importance, and tended to help the Soviet Union, is manifest upon a reading of the evidence. Typical examples of the testimony on that point are following —

A government witness, Dr. Walter S. Koski, an expert employed by the United States on the Atomic Project, was shown, while on the stand, sketches and descriptions of things worked on at the Los Alamos Station, which Greenglass made at the trial in representation of sketches given by him to Rosenberg. Dr. Koski testified in part:

Q. And would I be exaggerating if I were to say colloquially that one expert interested in finding out what was going on at Los Alamos, cold get enough from where exhibits in evidence which you have before you to reveal what was going on at Los Alamos?
A. One could.
Equally significant in the following testimony from another government expert as to one of the sketches are these questions and answers:

Q. Does the knowledge as disclosed in the material read (by the stenographer) in conjunction with the sketch before you (drawn by Greenglass) demonstrate substantially and with substantial accuracy the principle involved in the operation of the 194 atomic bomb?
A. It does.

* * *

Q. Can a scientist, and can you, perceive what the actual construction of the bomb was?
A. You can.

Q. Was this information classified at the time?
A. It was classified top secret.

Q. Is it still classified?
A. Yes, Sir.

Q. Does this information relate to the national defense of the United States of America?
A. It certainly does.

* * *

Q. Does the information that has been read to you, together with the sketch concern a type of atomic bomb which was actually used by the United States of America?
A. It does. It is the bomb we dropped at Nagasaki, similar to it.
February 17, 1953

THE WHITE HOUSE
Feb 20 8 27 AE '53
RECEIVED

Dear Mr. President:

Your decision in connection with the Rosenbergs is the only possible one!

We are dealing with traitors and spies in this instance.

You can see how we feel out here, based on the enclosures.

Warmest personal regards.

Cordially,

President Dwight D. Eisenhower
The White House
Washington, D. C.

VP:pr
Enclosures

*Los Angeles Mirror*
THE PRESIDENT

THE WHITE HOUSE

THE CASE AGAINST THE ROSENBERGS OUTRAGES LOGIC AND JUSTICE. IT DEPENDS ON THE TESTIMONY OF GREEGLASS AND HIS WIFE, BOTH CONFESSIONED SPIES AND ALLEGED ACCOMPlices OF THE ROSENBERGS. GREEGLASS, IS SUPPOSED TO HAVE REVEALED TO RUSSIA THE "SECRET" OF THE ATOMIC BOMB. THOUGH THE INFORMATION SUPPOSED TO HAVE BEEN TRANSMITTED COULD HAVE BEEN IMPORTANT, A MAN OF GREEGLASS CAPACITY IS WHOLLY INCAPABLE OF TRANSMITTING THE PHYSICS, CHEMISTRY AND MATHEMATICS OF THE ATOMIC BOMB TO ANYONE. HE AND HIS WIFE WERE THE ONLY ONES WHO PRETENDED TO CONNECT THE ROSENBERGS WITH ATOMIC ESPIONAGE. NEW EVIDENCE MAKES EVEN MORE PLAIN, WHAT WAS PLAIN ENOUGH BEFORE, THAT THE PROSECUTION'S CASE WAS NO LOGIC IN IT AND THAT IT DEPENDS UPON THE BLOWING UP OF PATENTLY PERJURED TESTIMONY. I TRIED TO SEE THE ATTORNEY GENERAL THIS PAST WEEK BUT WAS UNABLE TO SECURE AN APPOINTMENT. ON BEHALF OF ALL INTERESTED IN THE DEFENSE I ASK TO BE ABLE TO PRESENT MY UNDERSTANDING OF THE CASE TO YOU, MR. PRESIDENT.

HAROLD E. UREY.
MEMORANDUM

To: Mr. C. E. Johnson
Through: Dr. H. S. Craig
From: Charles H. Tauey

Subject: Certain Actions Aimed at Influencing Unfavorable Foreign States of Mind - Suggestions and Comments.

Reference: Your request of May 27 and Mr. Morgan's draft memorandum.

1. Suggestions.

a) Rosenberg case: That the President reconsider the Rosenberg case, not only on the basis of its legal merits and security implications, but also on the basis of its psychological impact abroad. I understand that the Supreme Court decision to reject the third Rosenberg appeal opens a new recourse to the White House. On the other hand, I think that the build-up of the case by the Communists since the last Presidential decision reveals a clear intent on the part of the Kremlin to make some kind of martyrs out of the Rosenbergs and, in any case, to shut their mouths forever. The Rosenbergs are more useful to the Communist cause dead than alive. As a consequence, we should examine whether the very serious reasons which militate in favor of capital punishment for their crime are still strong enough to withstand the psychological advantages which would result abroad from the outcome of a clemency measure. I submit that the powers of the President in matters of clemency being discretionary, the national interest requires that such powers be exercised on the basis of a careful evaluation of all the effects of a decision on national security in its broad rather than in its narrow sense. It may well be argued that clemency would be evidence of weakness, or that capital punishment is necessary as a deterrent, or that the public revulsion at the magnitude of the crime requires the heaviest penalty. These are very valid arguments, and they might prevail. However, there is no justification for failing to explore the entire scope of the Rosenbergs' execution, particularly the impact of such a decision on foreign psychology, and its effect on U.S. prestige and U.S. leadership. The risk that a measure of clemency will be taken as a show of weakness is very farfetched at the present time. A powerfully-worded statement can present the obvious truth: namely that we do
not yield to Communist pressure but smoke out Communist strategy. Moreover, no circumstances are more opportune for a commutation measure than those created by the execution of the alleged American spies in the Ukraine. True, the Rosenbergs are traitors, whereas these people were only supposed to be spies, but this aspect of the problem would only enhance the psychological impact of clemency in the Rosenberg case. This is an opportunity for demonstrating vividly the contrast between a free society sure of itself, cool and discreet in wielding its power of punishment, and a slave society which can stand only on the corpses of its victims. Of course such a decision will have to be taken promptly to forestall a new clemency campaign: it would be self-defeating indeed to appear to yield to the pressure of such a renewed campaign, whereas now we can take advantage of the lull between the campaigns. The announcement of a clemency measure should be carefully worded and given the necessary balanced play by all U.S. media. Some of the arguments displayed in the attached WASHINGTON POST editorial might be useful.

b) The way forward. An approach which might go a long way to restore goodwill among free nations would be to emphasize officially an idea expressed at a meeting of the House Un-American Activities Committee some three or four weeks ago. I do not recall the exact statement, but one of the members of the Committee said that the great problem for the United States was not only that of detecting and punishing subversion, but also that of providing the spiritual way out to misguided individuals who, sometimes under the influence of high ideals, have joined the Communist cause. By helping such individuals to find the way forward (I do not say the way back, for this phraseology might imply an idea that they are leaving something "advanced" and progressive) we would do ourselves a great service, not only in the short term, by fostering a flow of intelligence, because of the fear of community reaction, still remains hidden, but also, from a long-term point of view, for such individuals, when the opportunity is open to them to honorably recant, can in many cases be made useful members of our society. This may require explanation. What is meant is not - or not only - the possibility of access to government employment after a kind of "probation period", and other administrative measures of this kind, but an emphasis and a generalization of the attitude of a Christian society which accepts forgiveness as one of the bases of human relations. I think that this approach would have a tremendous appeal abroad since foes of America - and some of its friends - blame it for a "legalistic" attitude, for a tendency to sacrifice the "individual" to the abstract. The best way to show them that they are wrong is to reaffirm our belief in the value of pardon. I attach some quotations on this subject from the book by Morris L. Ernst and David Loth, "Report on the American Communist".
EDITORIAL IN WASHINGTON POST, MAY 28, 1953:

JUSTICE AND PROPAGANDA

Once again the Supreme Court has declined to hear arguments that Julius and Ethel Rosenberg should be given a new trial. The decision seems to us eminently sound and correct. The direct and circumstantial evidence that the Rosenbergs were guilty of helping to transmit vital military secrets relating to the production of the atomic bomb to Soviet Russia was powerful and convincing. Nor is there, as far as we can see, the least indication that the trial at which the Rosenbergs were convicted was anything but fair and complete.

The only valid question is one that is entirely outside the purview of the Supreme Court. The question is whether it is the part of political wisdom to permit the death sentences imposed upon the Rosenbergs to be executed. The answer can be given only by President Eisenhower, who must determine whether or not to exercise his powers of clemency by commuting the sentences.

It should be recognized that death is one of the alternative penalties prescribed by the statute; the other would have been imprisonment up to a maximum of 30 years. It is no criticism of Judge Irving R. Kaufman, who imposed the death sentences, to suggest that the value of this case to the international Communist propaganda would have been far less if the milder penalty had been imposed. There was no reason for him to have taken such an extraneous factor into account; to have done so would have been a departure from the position of objective impartiality that a judge must preserve.

Yet President Eisenhower can hardly ignore the fact that the Rosenberg case has become a powerful instrument of anti-American agitation abroad, especially in those countries where the Communist minority is powerful and vociferous. Pope Pius XII found it discreet to notify both the Truman and Eisenhower Administrations through the Apostolic Delegate that he had received many appeals to intervene in behalf of mercy. The unhappy truth is that whether the Rosenbergs live or die, Communist propaganda stands to benefit. If they are electrocuted, they can be represented, after the analogy of Sacco and Vanzetti, as victims and martyrs to American capitalist tyranny and class hatred. But if the sentence is commuted, it will be taken in many quarters as another sign of the powerful pressures that international communism is able to exert even upon its enemies.

These, it seems to us, are some of the considerations President Eisenhower must take in mind when a fresh campaign for executive clemency is launched, as it will be when Judge Kaufman has set a new date for execution of the sentence. He should recognize that the efficacy of the Communist propaganda in the Rosenberg case has not been diminished by its palpable fraudulence and irrationality. But
he can take it for granted that the Communist leaders care nothing about the personal fate of the Rosenbergs. In all probability the Communists would prefer to have them die, since death would seal their mouths forever.
President Dwight D. Eisenhower
White House, Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. President,

At various intervals during the two long and bitter years I have spent in the Death House at Sing Sing, I have had the impulse to address myself to the President of the United States. Always, in the end, a certain innate shyness, an embarrassment almost, comparable to that which the ordinary person feels in the presence of the great and the famous, prevailed upon me not to do so.

Since then, however, the moving plea of Mrs. William Cabis on behalf of her husband has lent me inspiration. She had not been ashamed to bare her heart to the head of a foreign state; would it really be such a presumption for a citizen to ask for redress of grievance and to expect as much consideration as Mrs. Cabis received at the hands of strangers?

Of Czechoslovakia I know very little, of her President less than that. But my own land is a part of me, I should be homesick for her anywhere else in the world. And Dwight D. Eisenhower was "Liberator" to millions before he was ever "President." It does not seem reasonable to me, then, that a letter concerning itself with condemned wife as well as condemned husband, should not merit this particular President's sober attention.

True, to date, you have not seen fit to spare our lives. Be that as it may, it is my humble belief that the burdens of your office and the exigencies of the times have allowed of no genuine opportunity, as yet, for your more personal consideration.

It is chiefly the death sentence I would entreat you to ponder. I would entreat you to ask yourself whether that sentence does not serve the ends of "force and violence" rather than an enlightened justice. Even granting the assumption that the convictions had been properly procured (and there now exists incontrovertible evidence to the contrary), the steadfast denial of guilt, extending over a protracted period of solitary confinement and enforced separation from our loved ones, makes of the death penalty an act of vengeance.

As Commander-in-Chief of the European theatre, you had ample opportunity to witness the wanton and hideous tortures that such a policy of vengeance had wreaked upon vast multitudes of guiltless victims. Today, while these ghastly mass butchers, these obscene
racists, are graciously receiving the benefits of mercy and in many instances being reinstated in public office, the great democratic United States is proposing the savage destruction of a small unoffending Jewish family, whose guilt is seriously doubted throughout the length and breadth of the civilized world! As you have recently so wisely declared, no nation can chance "going it alone." That, Mr. President, is truly the voice of the sanity and of the leadership so sorely needed in these perilous times. Surely you must recognize then, that the ensuing damage to the good name of our country, in its struggle to lead the world toward a more equitable and righteous way of life, should not be underestimated.

Surely, too, what single action could more effectively demonstrate this nation's fealty to religious and democratic ideals, than the granting of clemency to my husband and myself.

Such an act would also be a fitting reply to a small boy's desperate appeal. His bright young mind and homesick heart prompted him (even as his mother was prompted), to see in Mr. Oatis' release, a hope for the release of his own dear parents. I approach you then as he did, solely on the basis of mercy, and earnestly beseech you to let this qualify away you rather than any narrow judicial concern, which is after all the province of the courts. It is rather the province of the affectionate grandfather, the sensitive artist, the devoutly religious man, that I would entreat. I ask this man, himself no stranger to the humanities, what man there is that History has acclaimed great, whose greatness has not been measured in terms of his goodness? Truly, the stories of Christ, of Moses, of Ghandi hold more sheer wonderment and spiritual treasure than all the conquests of Napoleon!

I ask this man, whose name is one with glory, what glory there is that is greater, than the offering to God of a simple act of compassion!

Take counsel with your good wife; of statesmen there are enough and to spare. Take counsel with the mother of your only son; her heart which understands my grief so well and my longing to see my sons grown to manhood like her own, with loving husband at my side even as you are at hers -- her heart must plead my cause with grace and with felicity!

And the world must humbly honor greatness!

Respectfully yours,

(signed) (Mrs.) Ethel Rosenberg #110-510

Women's Wing - C C
racists, are graciously receiving the benefits of mercy and in many instances being reinstated in public office, the great democratic United States is proposing the savage destruction of a small unoffending Jewish family, whose guilt is seriously doubted throughout the length and breadth of the civilized world! As you have recently so wisely declared, no nation can chance "going it alone." That, Mr. President, is truly the voice of the sanity and of the leadership so sorely needed in these peculiar times. Surely you must recognize then, that the ensuing damage to the good name of our country, in its struggle to lead the world toward a more equitable and righteous way of life, should not be underestimated.

Surely, too, what single action could more effectively demonstrate this nation's fealty to religious and democratic ideals, than the granting of clemency to my husband and myself.

Such an act would also be a fitting reply to a small boy's desperate appeal. His bright young mind and homesick heart prompted him (even as his mother was prompted), to see in Mr. Oatis' release, a hope for the release of his own dear parents. I approach you then as he did, solely on the basis of mercy, and earnestly beseech you to let this quality sway you rather than any narrow judicial concern, which is after all the province of the courts. It is rather the province of the affectionate grandfather, the sensitive artist, the devoutly religious man, that I would entreat. I ask this man, himself no stranger to the humanities, what man there is that History has acclaimed great, whose greatness has not been measured in terms of his goodness? Truly, the stories of Christ, of Moses, of Ghandi hold more sheer wonderment and spiritual treasure than all the conquests of Napoleon!

I ask this man, whose name is one with glory, what glory there is that is greater, than the offering to God of a simple act of compassion!

Take counsel with your good wife; of statesmen there are enough and to spare. Take counsel with the mother of your only son; her heart which understands my grief so well and my longing to see my sons grown to manhood like her own, with loving husband at my side even as you are at hers -- her heart must plead my cause with grace and with felicity!

And the world must humbly honor greatness!

Respectfully yours,

(signed) (Mrs.) Ethel Rosenberg #110-510

Women's Wing - C C
The third part of his conversation consisted of a denunciation of Judge Kaufman and the sentence he gave. Now, he asked, could it be possible under any circumstances that a death sentence be meted out to him and his wife in the face of the sentence of thirty years given to Harry Gold and fifteen years to David Greenglass, who were admittedly arch-conspirators in an espionage plot. He contended that he was in no sense guilty of espionage and that the sentence was savage in the extreme.

Julius lacked the detached calmness and self-assurance that characterized my former conversations with him. He no longer seems to have the attitude of the martyr, which I felt marked his conversation the last time I saw him. Notwithstanding the fact that he told me several times that he understood I was not there to make any deal with him or put him on the rack, as he phrased it, he nevertheless was quite belligerent, excitable and made some statements that on questioning he was willing to modify. He talked much of Fascist tactics used in his case and inferred the sentence was not what one could expect of a great democracy, that he and his wife were of such small importance peoples abroad would never be able to understand our action in condemning them to death.

I next went to the women's cellblock where I saw Mrs. Rosenberg. I followed about the same approach in telling her that the purpose of my visit was to see how she was getting along and also to ascertain whether she by any chance desired me to put her in touch with the proper Government agents so that she could have an opportunity to make any statement or give any information about her case that would be helpful to the Government in solving some unanswered questions relating to the whole matter. Evidently she and Julius had anticipated some such inquiry because her attitude and her statements were substantially the same as those of her husband, although she wasn't quite as verbose or excited as he was. She said that obviously the Government could not prove whatever suspicions they had about certain aspects of the case or we would not be turning to her for cooperation and that she had no intention of putting her finger on somebody else or giving false or misleading information even though it might have the effect of staying her own execution. She said that if the Government wanted her testimony on any matter she would have to be brought into open court.

Realizing that I wasn't getting anywhere, I asked the Warden to bring in Julius and to be present while I again repeated the purpose of my presence in the institution and told him that I would appreciate it if he would transmit promptly any message that either Julius or Ethel wished to have brought to the attention of the Department. Both Julius and Ethel again protested that they would have no messages and no information and that the only thing I could do for them would be to present to the Attorney General a recommendation that their sentence be commuted. My final word
to Julius was that I would be around the institution for an hour or so and that if he wished to see me again before I left to notify the guard. He said that he only wished to see me in the event I had some good news for him.

In the course of the interview Julius asked me if I had consulted his attorney or advised him of my visit. When I told him I had not he requested me to do so which I did later. I informed Mr. Bloch by telephone as soon as he could be reached, which was about 6 P.M., June 2, of my visit and my offer to expedite any request the Rosenbergs had bearing on a further explanation of the facts involved in their activities. Mr. Bloch expressed surprise that he had not been informed of the visit and invited to be present. I told him I was merely acting as intermediary and in my official capacity as the one to whom responsibility for their safekeeping had been delegated. He made no further protest and merely said something to the effect that he would see the Rosenbergs the next day about some new legal moves he had in mind.

Director

JVBlmt
After completing “Clemency Advice” with several primary documents, it is time to decide. You are in Eisenhower’s Presidential shoes. You know the truth exposed via the VENONA project. You realize only a handful of American intelligence officers share this knowledge, so many others are protesting on behalf of the Rosenbergs. Leaving the court’s decision as it is will not be a popular decision.

As President Eisenhower, will you grant clemency to Julius Rosenberg?

_____YES  _____NO

As President Eisenhower, will you grant clemency to Ethel Rosenberg?

_____YES  _____NO

Write a presidential public announcement stating your decision and explaining your decision to the world. Be prepared to stand and make your announcement for the class.
The Rest of the Story: Eisenhower’s Decision

excerpt from Mandate for Change by Dwight D. Eisenhower
Chapter IX: “Some Early Decisions”
pages 224 – 225

On February 11, 1953, I made public my decision.

The nature of the crime for which they [the Rosenbergs] have been found guilty and sentenced [I wrote] far exceeds that of the taking of the life of another citizen; it involves the deliberate betrayal of the entire nation and could very well result in the death of many, many thousands of innocent citizens. . . .

The courts have provided every opportunity for the submission of evidence bearing on this case. . . . All rights of appeal were exercised and the conviction of the trial court was upheld after full judicial review. . . .

I have made a careful examination into this case and am satisfied that the two individuals have been accorded their full measure of justice. . . .

During the spring the Communist press and its cohorts, and others, including those opposed to capital punishment, protested the sentence. Through mass meetings and picketings, the Communists went all out to twist public sympathy in their direction. On May 25, however, the Supreme Court delivered its decision: it again refused to hear the appeal. On June 15 it denied a plea to stay the execution.

The next day, because this problem was very much on my mind, I wrote to my son, John, then serving in Korea, about one aspect of the case:

To address myself more specifically to the Rosenberg case for a minute, I must say that it goes against the grain to avoid interfering in the case where a woman is to receive capital punishment. Over against this, however, must be placed one or two facts that have great significance. The first of these is that in this instance it is the woman who is the strong and recalcitrant character, the man is the weak one. She has obviously been the leader in everything they did in the spy ring. The second thing is that if there would be any
commuting of the woman’s sentence without the man’s then from here on the Soviets would simply recruit their spies from among women.¹

In the letter to John, I had explained that the incidence of threatening letters was such that, as a precautionary measure, I had to double the security guard around his children.

On June 19 the Supreme Court vacated a stay of execution which had been granted two days earlier on a point of law by Mr. Justice Douglas (whether the federal district judge had the right to impose the death penalty when the jury had not recommended it). And that night, with Communist and anti-Communist demonstrations up and down Pennsylvania Avenue in front of the White House, the sentence of the courts was duly executed.

¹ In a letter addressed to a friend who was opposed to the execution of the Rosenberg sentence, I included the following:

“As to any intervention based on consideration of America’s reputation or standing in the world, you have given the case for one side. What you did not suggest was the need for considering this kind of argument over and against the known convictions of Communist leaders that free governments -- and especially the American government -- are notoriously weak and fearful and that consequently subversive and other kinds of activity can be conducted against them with no real fear of dire punishment on the part of the perpetrator. It is, of course, important to the Communists to have this contention sustained and justified. In the present case they have even stooped to dragging in young and innocent children in order to serve their own purpose.

“The action of these people has exposed to greater danger of death literally millions of our citizens. The very real question becomes ‘how far can this be permitted by a government that, regardless of every consideration of mercy and compassion, is also required to be a just government in serving the interests of all its citizens?’ That their crime is a very real one and that its potential results are as definite as I have just stated, are facts that seem to me to be above contention.”
In Conclusion

After reading the rest of the excerpt from Eisenhower’s Mandate for Change, students should answer and discuss the following questions:

Did President Eisenhower grant clemency?  

☐ YES  ☐ NO

1. Do you agree with Eisenhower’s decision?  Why or why not?

2. What surprises or interests you most about this case?

3. How, according to President Eisenhower, does the Rosenbergs’ crime “far exceed that of the taking of the life of another citizen”?

4. What reasons did President Eisenhower present for not giving special consideration to the fact that a woman and mother was receiving capital punishment?

5. Why did President Eisenhower double the security guard around his grandchildren?
6. Why would this information not be released to the public during the trial and request for clemency?

7. What were some of the consequences of this decision for Eisenhower?

8. How does knowing this bit of the past help you evaluate today’s news about Presidential decisions?

9. Do you think the US Intelligence Community should be able to intercept Americans’ messages (texts, phone calls, email, etc.) today in order to try to capture those who are a threat to our country? Or is that invasion of our personal rights to privacy?
1. opinion

2. opinion

3. This crime “involves the deliberate betrayal of the entire nation and could very well result in the death of many, many thousands of innocent citizens. . . .” They were passing the secrets to building the atomic bomb, which kills way more than just one person at a time. It could bring down our whole country.

4. No special consideration of gender was made because, in this case, it is the woman who is “the strong and recalcitrant character,” and not punishing her the same would simply cause the Soviets to recruit females spies from here on.

5. He had received many threatening letters.

6. opinion

7. At the time of the trial, the U.S. government needed to protect its sources because VENONA was still an on-going project.

8. Some answers may include the fact that he had to make a very controversial and unpopular decision without being able to publicly disclose the facts that supported him.

9. Some answers may include the fact that we the people don’t always know all the facts of a case for good reason, and we have to find a balance between trusting and questioning our leaders.

10. Some answers may include the fact that decisions are difficult and often unpopular at the time, it is impossible to please everyone and that puts the leader in dangerous situations no matter what, enforcing the law or the majority vote sometimes means a leader must put aside his own opinion.
The Final Letter From the Rosenbergs to Their Children

(Written on the day of their execution)

Dearest Sweethearts, my most precious children,

Only this morning it looked like we might be together again after all. Now that this cannot be, I want so much for you to know all that I have come to know. Unfortunately, I may write only a few simple words; the rest your own lives must teach you, even as mine taught me. At first, of course, you will grieve bitterly for us, but you will not grieve alone. That is our consolation and it must eventually be yours. Eventually, too you must come to believe that life is worth the living. Be comforted that even now, with the end of ours slowly approaching, that we know this with a conviction that defeats the executioner! Your lives must teach you, too, that good cannot flourish in the midst of evil; that freedom and all the things that go to make up a truly satisfying and worthwhile life, must sometime be purchased very dearly. Be comforted then that we were serene and understood with the deepest kind of understanding, that civilization had not as yet progressed to the point where life did not have to be lost for the sake of life; and that we were comforted in the sure knowledge that others would carry on after us. We wish we might have had the tremendous joy and gratification of living our lives out with you. Your Daddy who is with me in the last momentous hours, sends his heart and all the love that is in it for his dearest boys. Always remember that we were innocent and could not wrong our conscience. We press you close and kiss you with all our strength.

Lovingly,

Daddy and Mommy

Julie Ethel

P.S. to Manny: The Ten Commandments religious medal and chain and my wedding ring--I wish you to present to our children as a token of our undying love.

P.S.---to Manny: Please be certain to give my best wishes to __________. Tell him I love and honor him with all my heart-- Tell him I want him to know that I feel he shares my triumph-- For I have no fear and no regrets-- Only that the release from the trap was not completely effectuated and the qualities I possessed could not expand to their fullest capacities-- I want him to have the pleasure of knowing how much he meant to me, how much he did to help me grow up-- All our love to all our dear ones.

Love you so much--

Ethel

Reprinted from We Are Your Sons by Robert and Michael Meeropol (1975).
Consider & Compare

Record the **charges** of these other individuals involved in this spy ring and the **consequences** they each received.

Example: David Greenglass received a 15-year sentence after a guilty plea of being an atomic spy for the Soviet Union. After serving only 10 years, he was released from Federal prison on November 16, 1960.

How do these **compare** to the Rosenbergs’ charges and consequences?

You’ve been exposed to many facets of this controversial event in United States’ history. Write a persuasive editorial based on your evaluation of the facts. Was justice done?
**David Greenglass:** David Greenglass received a 15-year sentence after a guilty plea of being an atomic spy for the Soviet Union. After serving only 10 years, he was released from Federal prison on November 16, 1960.

**Ruth Greenglass:** After testifying that it was her sister-in-law, Ethel Rosenberg, who typed up the atomic bomb information and not herself, Ruth Greenglass was not indicted for any crime.

**Harry Gold:** Harry Gold confessed to being an atomic spy courier and served fifteen years in a Federal prison.

**Klaus Fuchs:** Klaus Fuchs confessed to supplying information from British and American nuclear weapon research to the USSR and was sentenced to fourteen years in Her Majesty’s Prison Wakefield in England. He was released after serving nine years and four months.

**Theodore Hall:** Theodore Hall was never prosecuted, but just before his death he vaguely admitted to delivering technical information that helped the Soviet Union build a bomb years earlier than it could have otherwise because he did not feel it would be safe for America to have a monopoly on nuclear capabilities.

**Morton Sobell:** Morton Sobell was sentenced to 30 years for wartime espionage but only served seventeen years and nine months at Alcatraz.

The major **comparison** between the above spies and the Rosenbergs is that -- for no larger charges -- the death penalty was enforced on the Rosenbergs.

The **persuasive editorial** should be based on students’ own opinions supported by facts learned about the case.
The two young sons of condemned atom spies Julius and Ethel Rosenberg and Julius' mother, Sophie, join marchers in front of the White House during a demonstration by people seeking clemency for the Rosenbergs in 1953. (AP photo)

The Rosenberg’s children, Robert and Michael, were often used by protestors and the media to help gain sympathy and clemency for their parents.
Many felt that the Rosenberg’s conviction was part of the Red Scare (Communist) hysteria, equating it to the Salem witch hunts of early American history.

Also influencing the U.S. public was Senator Joe McCarthy. Americans were afraid when the Soviet Union successfully tested their first atom bomb in 1949. A few months later, McCarthy took advantage of the nation’s wave of terror, and claimed he had a list of 205 people working within the US State Department who were known members of the Communist Party. Many Americans latched on to this fear and McCarthy pushed on with his “investigations” for several years, ruining the lives and careers of many innocent citizens in his path. These reckless and unsubstantiated accusations are known as “McCarthysim.” McCarthy’s downfall finally began in October of 1953, when he started to investigate communist infiltration into the military. This was the final straw for President Dwight D. Eisenhower, who realized that McCarthy’s movement needed to be stopped. In 1954, the Senate voted to censure McCarthy, ending his power.

Not all protestors were trying to save the Rosenbergs (above), just as not all protestors were from the U.S. This was a controversial topic in Europe as well. This photo (left) shows thousands demonstrating in Paris on 18 June 1953. They are calling for the pardon of US communists Julius and Ethel Rosenberg. (Photograph: Keystone/Getty Images)
These photos show protestors on both sides of the issue in front of the Massachusetts State House in Boston, June, 1953. (Verner Reed, photographer) Obtained from:
http://www.historicnewengland.org/collections-archives-exhibitions/online-exhibitions/verner-reed/the-photographer-as-storyteller
These are sketches of the high explosive lens mold and cross-section of the atomic bomb as drawn by David Greenglass at the espionage trial of Julius and Ethel Rosenberg. Greenglass claimed that these were part of the secret information he passed on to Julius Rosenberg. Greenglass obtained this information because he worked on the Manhattan Project based at Los Alamos.

Obtained from: National Archives, Records of U.S. Attorneys, 1/1945
National Archives Identifiers: 2878747 and 278753
research.archives.gov
The prosecution presented this JELL-O box during the trial of Julius and Ethel Rosenberg for espionage. The prosecution contended it was used to verify identities at secret meetings. The prosecution stated that Julius Rosenberg cut apart the side panel, giving his brother-in-law and sister-in-law, David and Ruth Greenglass, on half and Harry Gold the other. Each would present their two sections upon meeting to exchange top secret information.

Obtained from:
National Archives, Records of U.S. Attorneys
3/6/1951 - 3/29/1951
Identifier: 278774
http://docsteach.org/documents/278774
Page one of intercepted, decoded, and translated VENONA cables numbered 1749, 1750 from New York to Moscow on December 13, 1944. Obtained from:


---

VENONA

TOP-SECRET

USA

Ref. No.: 3/0/37/2050 (of 13/7/50)

Issued: 22/9/76

Copy No.: 3

DESMURG

ORGANIZATION OF WORK ON ENORMOUS AND PHOTOGRAPHY OF MATERIAL: AXMO, PERS, OSA, KALIB, LIBERAL, "GLAD", "THU", "SUP", "KLEIST", "HEIN" (1944)

From: NEW YORK

To: MOSCOW

Nos.: 1749, 1750

13 December 1944

[8-part message complete]

PART 1

To VIKTOR[ill].

Your Nos. 3740[ill] and 3797[ill].

We consider it risky to concentrate all the contacts relating to ENORMOUS[ENORM]ix and AXMO[ay] alone. This is good in that it limits the circles of [2 groups uncovered] persons but it is dangerous to disrupt [1 group uncovered] work on ENORMOUS.

[49 groups uncovered]

PERS[vi]: [2 groups uncovered] Comp-[ivii]. Our proposal

[24 groups uncovered]

not to give [2% any more] on ENORMOUS.

2. To leave OSA[viii] and KALIB[ix] in contact with LIBERAL[x] until [3 groups uncovered] work.

Cont'd overleaf
3. "MLAD"[xi]

[51 groups unrecoverable]

[PART II] Further

[14 groups unrecoverable],

Both are [FELLOWCOUNCILMAN] [MIKOLAJ][xi1]. Both are helping us and both meet LIBERAL and ARNO [7 groups unrecoverable]. KHALTRI[xii] handed over 17 authentic drawings relating to the AP-7[xiv] (postal deepstop No.9)[xv].

He can be trusted. The transfer of KHALTRI alone to SWET[xvii] is no way out of the situation. It will be necessary to put SWET in touch with KALIREC[xvi] in order to bring material for photography into the PLANT [SAVOD][xviii]. I cannot carry material into and out of the PLANT late in the evening. I insist on bringing KHALTRI and MYRI[xviii] together, putting the latter in touch with KALIREC or SWET and separating both from LIBERAL.

In TIRN[TIR][xix]

[14 groups unrecoverable]

round the clock. There are no major contradictions between letters 5 and 7 about LIBERAL. They complement each other. LIBERAL's shortcomings do not mean that he will be completely useless for photography. He is gradually getting used to photography.

No. 957[1] [Signature unrecoverable]

Footnotes:

[1] Part II only of this message was also published earlier, on 3/VSH/T9, Item 4.

[xi] VIKTOR: Lt General Pavel Mikhaevich FIFIN.


[xv] ARNO: Harry SODO.

[xvi] PEER: "PEER"; formerly "PERZL"; "PERZL" is "PERZL".

[viii] OSA:  ie "WASP"; Ruth GREENGLASS.
[ix] KALIBER:  ie "CALIBER"; David GREENGLASS.
[xi] LIBERAL:  Julius ROSENBERG.
[xii] MAD:  ie "YOUNG"; Theodore Alvin HALL.
[xiv] Kn’YmS:  ie "THAMES"; Alfred Epanimondas SARANT, who was employed at the BELL Telephone Laboratories (cf. Footnote [xiv]), NEW YORK CITY, from October 1942 to September 1946.
[xv] APQ-7:  Or AN/APQ-7: a high-resolution airborne radar developed by the MASSACHUSETTS Institute of Technology and built by BELL Telephones (cf. Footnote [xiii]) in the 1940s.
[xvi] SVET:  ie "LIGHT"; possibly Aleksandr Andreevich RABY.
[xvii] KALIGRAT:  ie "CALLIGRAT"; Aleksandr Semenovich FOKIN.
[xix] MTR:  ie "METRE"; Joel BARR.
[xv] TYRE:  NEW YORK CITY.
This is an intercepted, decoded, and translated VENONA cable numbered 1773 from New York to Moscow on December 16, 1944. Obtained from:


---

From: NEW YORK
To: MOSCOW
No: 1773

16 December 1944

To VIKTOR[i].

OSA[iii] has returned from a trip to see KALIBR[iii]. KALIBR expressed his readiness to help in throwing light on the work being carried on at Camp-2[iv] and stated that he had already given thought to this question earlier. KALIBR said that the authorities of the Camp were openly taking all precautionary measures to prevent information about ENORMUS[ENORMOS][v] falling into Russian hands. This is causing serious discontent among the progressive [8% workers] [17 groups unrecovetable]

the middle of January KALIBR will be in TYRE[TIR][vi]. LIBERAL[vii], referring to his ignorance of the problem, expresses the wish that our man should meet KALIBR and interrogate him personally. He asserts that KALIBR would be very glad of such a meeting. Do you consider such a meeting advisable? If not, I shall be obliged to draw up a questionnaire and pass it to LIBERAL. Report whether you have any questions of priority interest to us.

KALIBR also reports: OPPENHEIM[viii] from California and KISTIATOWSKII[ix] [MLAD's[x] report mentioned the latter] are at present working at the Camp. The latter is doing research on the thermodynamic process. Advise whether you have information on these two professors.

No. 967
15 December

ANTON[xi]

---

Comments:

[i] VIKTOR: Lt. Gen. P. M. FITIN.
[ii] OSA: i.e. WASP, Ruth GREenglASS.
[iii] KALIBR: i.e. CALIBR, David GREenglASS.
[iv] Camp-2: Probably LOS ALAMOS.
[vi] TIR: NEW YORK CITY.
[vii] LIBERAL: Julius ROSENBERG.
[viii] OPPENHEIM: Presumably Dr. J. Robert OPPENHEIMER, Director of the LOS ALAMOS Laboratory.
[ix] KISTIATOWSKII: Dr. George Bogdan KISTIATOWSKII, Chief of the Explosives Division at the LOS ALAMOS Laboratory.
[x] MEAD: i.e. YOUNG, [Theodore A. Hall]
[xi] ANTON: Doucha ROMANOVICH KVASHINOV.

TOP SECRET

20 May 1973

VENONA