only is such unreasonable but it is impossible.

Now the FCC is tightening up. I quote the entire paragraph in which reference is made to me:

"Several complaints have also stated that programs such as those featuring Dr. Carl McIntire and/or Dean Manion were cancelled because the scripts of the programs were not submitted to the stations in advance of the broadcast. The information set forth above indicates that the Commission has imposed no such across-the-board general requirement. However, this is not to say that these stations have acted unreasonably or contrary to law. The Commission has long held that with the exception of broadcast appearances by political candidates, the licensee is responsible for everything carried over its station. And, it follows that, with the exception of broadcast appearances by political candidates, the licensee may impose regulations or requirements in order to assure himself that the material proposed to be broadcast is in the public interest. If a licensee feels that with respect to Dr. McIntire's or anyone else's broadcast, it is necessary for him to see a script prior to broadcast, the licensee would be acting within his rights, and properly exercising his discretion pursuant to the Communications Act. The converse of this would seem to be either that licensees must broadcast whatever anyone offers to them or that licensees have no right to review in advance proposed broadcast material. The Communications Act is clearly to the contrary."

Notice, here it is clear that the politicians can speak freely without this censorship imposed over them by the Federal Communications Commission through the local radio station. As a clergyman, I demand as much freedom of speech in this country as the politicians have. According to this statement of the Federal Communications Commission, it is the local radio station licensee who must do the censoring; while the position which the Federal Communications Commission ought to take, so far as the First Amendment of the Constitution is concerned, is to forbid the local station operators to censor. If they cannot censor the speeches of politicians, as is clearly indicated here, they ought not to be able to censor the speeches of clergymen like myself. Moreover, it is clear that the Federal Communications Commission holds the local radio station owner responsible for every word that is said on his station, except that of the politicians. If this is not control, we have never had it, and is a direct infringement upon the Constitutional guarantees of freedom of speech and the free exercise of religion. What the FCC is doing here, through making the local station responsible for every word that is said on the air, is trying to shift its responsibility in the matter wholly and entirely to the local station operator.

But this Memorandum by the Federal Communications Commission reveals the most amazing ignorance on the part of the Commission of what is going on so far as religion is concerned in this country, or it is a deliberate effort on the part of the Federal Communications Commission to close its eyes and to be blind to all the controversy that has developed in the field of religion in the matter of doctrine as it relates to modernists and fundamentalists to the ecumenical movement and the Twentieth Century Reformation movement, and to the National Council of Churches. The Memorandum says, "The Commission knows of no substantial public controversy in this country concerning the merits of religion . . ." The remainder of this paragraph reads, "and certainly the Commission did not hold that the broadcast of church services, devotionals, prayers, etc. invoked the 'fairness doctrine.' However, some of the

programs described above as dealing with 'anti-Communism', 'pro-Americanism' or religion often do express vigorous viewpoints on the United Nations Organization, the wisdom of foreign aid, how best to combat Communism and a host of other genuinely controversial issues. The language of the Commission's Public Notice is intended to make clear that to the extent any program, regardless of label, deals with controversial issues of public importance, the 'fairness doctrine' applies." So either way you take the 20th Century Reformation Hour program and our ministry--sermons, they may be censored. Radio Station WCAM demanded this right and was sustained by the Federal Communications Commission, and, rather than submit to a secular censorship under the provisions of the Federal Communications Commission, the radio broadcast on WCAM was removed from the air by the station itself. This is censorship a la FCC. And in regard to the 20th Century Reformation Hour and our battle against Communism, the FCC is taking the view that Communism is now a controversial question, and Gus Hall may step up now and demand equal time. All of this sort of confusion has one effect, a tendency on the part of radio stations to avoid the whole sphere of question and doubt and uncertainty by simply not airing such programs at all.

I have discussed the FCC on my program and invited the chairman or someone representing the FCC to come and make a reply. This they have declined to do. Instead, we now get a Memorandum which further tightens the noose around Carl McIntire and those of us who are seeking to use our free speech without censorship to preserve the faith of our fathers and our heritage of religious freedom in this country. We do and we don't; we are and we aren't; we do control, we don't control; the "fairness doctrine" applies, the "fairness doctrine" doesn't apply. And all of the final decisions in this area are made by the Federal Communications Commission itself. Where has our freedom gone?

There must be one answer to this. We must carry the story to the public, and that is the reason I am giving it to you at the present moment. I still am free to talk about these matters on the radio and I will use that freedom and continue to use that freedom until our vouce is silenced. But I am afraid that the time is short. My appeal, therefore, is that everyone who receives this letter keep it in hand; read it, study it. It appears to me that they are seeking to make an example out of my ministry as a servant of the Lord and the great outreach of the 20th Century Reformation Hour. If they are successful, it will be tragic indeed.

I am writing you this from Portland, Oregon. The General Assembly of the United Presbyterian Church today approved the Confession of 1967. The United Presbyterian Church now is going to provide the leadership of all the churches in the matter of social revolution. The new moderator of the Assembly, Dr. Eugene Smathers, in his very first press conference, was asked why his ideas in regard to social action had not made more progress. He replied that too many people were listening to Carl McIntire. This is the trouble. Our answer is that more people must listen to us than ever before.

My friend, I want you to help me fight in this struggle for freedom and fight the Federal Communications Commission. I am just as much entitled to speak on the air freely as is any politician in the country. I am a clergyman and the pastor of one of the great churches of this land.

We have had two magnificent rallies while I have been out here, one in Portland and one in Eugene. On Saturday afternoon, at two o'clock, on my way