

New Evidence in the Rosenberg Case

Introduction

Since the Spring of 1951, when Ethel and Julius Rosenberg were sentenced to death and Morton Sobell to 30 years at Alcatraz at the conclusion of a hurried ten-day trial, an ever growing debate has developed throughout the country as to the facts in the case.

In March, 1952, the National Committee to Secure Justice in the Rosenberg Case published the entire trial transcript. On the basis of these transcripts, thousands of which were sold throughout the country, the national debate on the facts in the Rosenberg case assumed tremendous proportions.

Dr. Harold Urey, Prof. Albert Einstein, Prof. Stephen Love, and many attorneys, educators and religious leaders called for clemency. More and more people became convinced that grave doubt exists as to the guilt of the Rosenbergs and Morton Sobell and that the short ten-day trial did not contain the necessary guarantees of a fair trial under the American Constitution. Eighty thousand Americans signed an amicus brief, requesting a new trial for the Rosenbergs and Morton Sobell. Many more thousands appealed to the President of the United States to grant clemency to the Rosenbergs.

Now, in the Spring of 1953, new documents have come to light, throwing serious doubt on the testimony of David and Ruth Greenglass, chief witnesses against the Rosenbergs. These documents, first published in France, were presented to the American people at a public rally of 10,000 people at Randall's Island Stadium in New York on May 3, 1953.

In the interest of seeking the truth in the Rosenberg Case, guaranteeing American justice, and preventing the tragic execution of two people who to this day maintain their complete innocence, we present these documents to the American people.

Issued as a public service by:
National Committee to Secure
Justice in the Rosenberg Case
1050 Sixth Ave., N. Y. 18, N. Y.

The Documents

The documents received by the National Committee to Secure Justice in the Rosenberg Case arrived from the French Rosenberg Committee in the form of photostats.

The first document consists of three pages written in David Greenglass' own handwriting. These three pages were later authenticated by a foremost handwriting expert, Mrs. Elizabeth McCarthy, of Boston, Mass. The document is dated "Saturday, June 1950". It purports to be a statement or recapitulation of what David Greenglass told the F.B.I.

The importance of this document lies in the contradiction it gives to Greenglass' courtroom testimony; it is written in the language of a man inventing a story rather than telling a truthful narrative; it contains serious and inexplicable omissions, and finally, confesses that he permitted the F.B.I. to "remember" for him events he could not himself recall.

The second document, dated June 18, 1950, is a typewritten one, also of three pages, which appears to be a memorandum from an attorney for his files. It concerns a discussion between members of the law firm and relatives of David Greenglass. This second document is likewise of extreme importance because in it Mrs. Ruth Greenglass, David's wife, contradicts vital aspects of her husband's written statement and courtroom testimony and portrays her husband as an hysteric and liar. This document provides evidence that Greenglass committed perjury.

These two documents do not deal with peripheral or secondary matters in the case. They go to the heart of the case, and therefore raise fundamental doubts, which, when taken in the context of other doubts — particularly the absence of a single document linking the Rosenbergs to a "conspiracy to commit espionage" — cause the trial to be viewed in an altogether new light.

The following pages present a comparison of the newly discovered documents with the Greenglass testimony.

"TENDENCY TO HYSTERIA"

In a decision of the U.S. Court of Appeals, Judge Jerome N. Frank said: "Doubtless if that (Greenglass) testimony were disregarded the conviction (against the Rosenbergs) could not stand."

In effect Judge Frank posed the question — which man will you believe, David Greenglass or Julius Rosenberg? If Greenglass lied there is no case against the Rosenbergs.

One of the new documents, the typewritten lawyer's memorandum describing an interview with Ruth Greenglass, David's wife, gives an intimate account of what kind of a person Greenglass is. Here, is a report of what Greenglass' wife has to say about him:

"As to her husband, she stated that he had a 'tendency to hysteria.' At other times he would become delirious and once when he had the grippe he ran nude through the hallway, shrieking of 'elephants', and 'lead pants.'

"She had known him since he was ten years old. She said that he would say things were so even if they were not. He talked of suicide as if he were a character in the movies but she didn't think he would do it."

GREENGLASS ADMITS LIE

In the document in Greenglass' handwriting, he frankly admits making statements he did not remember to be true, and directly lying to the F.B.I. He writes, describing a statement to the F.B.I.:

"I stated that I met Gold in N. M. at 209 Hick St., my place. They told me that I had told him to come back later because I didn't have it ready. I didn't remember this but I allowed it in the statement."

Thus he admits letting the F.B.I. put words into his mouth. Then he adds:

"But this I'll tell you, I can honestly say the information I gave Gold may be not at all what I said in the statement."

The language Greenglass uses throughout his written document is that of a man fabricating a story. "I made sure to tell the F.B.I.", "I established the approximate meeting place", "I definitely placed"—these are the kind of phrases he uses.

SUMMARY — Dr. Harold C. Urey, nuclear scientist, said after reading the transcript of the trial: "I found the Rosenberg testimony more believable than the Greenglass."

David Greenglass, a hysteric and a self-confessed liar, is the man on whose word two persons have been sentenced to die.

HISTORY REFUTES TESTIMONY

The most damaging testimony against Ethel and Julius Rosenberg was the sworn testimony of Ruth and David Greenglass, who claimed that the Rosenbergs recruited them as spies. On the basis of this testimony, above all else, the Rosenbergs were condemned to death.

In his handwritten statement, Greenglass relates how he told the F.B.I. that his wife had been sent to recruit him for espionage by Julius Rosenberg. He says:

"I told them that on a visit to me in November, 1944, my wife asked me if I would give information. I made sure to tell the F.B.I. that she was transmitting this info from my brother-in-law Julius and was not her own idea."

In court Ruth Greenglass went into great detail about the description of the A-bomb she purports to have received from Julius Rosenberg in November, 1944.

A. (Continued) And he said—I wanted to know how he knew what David was doing. He said that his friends had told him that David was working on the atomic bomb, and he went on to tell me that the atomic bomb was the most destructive weapon used so far, that it had dangerous radiation effects, that the United States and Britain were work-

Trial Transcript, p. 679

Mrs. Greenglass claimed to have learned about the atomic bomb in Nov. 1944. However, in the typewritten document, Mrs. Greenglass admits not know-

ing about the bomb until it was dropped on Hiroshima in August, 1945. The document states:

"She would not have allowed her husband to bring anything home after Hiroshima had disclosed what the project was. She intended to raise a family and did not want that kind of material around."

SUMMARY — Thus on the witness stand Ruth Greenglass claimed to have known all about the A-bomb in November, 1944. But in the memorandum she says that she did not know about the A-bomb until Hiroshima in August, 1945 — the time when the American people learned of the bomb. If Julius Rosenberg had told her, as she claimed, of the "dangerous radiation effects" of the atomic bomb in 1944, she would not have had to wait until 1945 to learn what the project was.

WAS GREENGLASS GUILTY OF URANIUM THEFT?

The prosecution posed an important question — why did Ethel and Julius Rosenberg try to get a vaccination certificate for David Greenglass to leave the country? The defense stated the Rosenbergs believed that Greenglass may have been involved in theft — possibly uranium theft.

The document quoting the interview with Mrs. Greenglass admits she and her husband were questioned about uranium when an F.B.I. agent visited their home in February, 1950. But in the trial, Greenglass refused to say why the F.B.I. visited them. The document says:

"She (Ruth Greenglass) pointed out Dave did not ask for the job; that he was going overseas; that they have been watched constantly and feels as if they are the object of persecution. Shortly before their accident the F.B.I. asked if they had a specimen of uranium in the house, in the course of what they call a routine investigation. One of their friends had a similar experience."

The uranium question was brought out by the trial testimony of Julius

Rosenberg, who stated that he believed David Greenglass was "in trouble" because of a possible theft of uranium.

And I recall at that time in my mind the incident—the instant he told me what happened to him in February when the FBI had come around to visit him and question him about some uranium. I thought maybe it had something to do with that or had something to do with a conversation Ruthie had with me many years back.

1251

"I said, 'Dave, are you in trouble or something?'
"He said, 'Don't ask me anything about it. You got to do this for me. If you can't give me the money I need, at least do this for me.'"

And the Court asked you at the time some questions about the fact that you were unfriendly or you were hostile to each other, and in the face of that you said he came to you and he put this twofold request to you, the \$2000, and if you can't do that for him, the certificate showing that he had been vaccinated for smallpox, and also the additional matter of asking the doctor while you were at it what was required to go into Mexico.

Q. Did anybody ever ask you for \$2000. for a smallpox certificate or what kind of injections were required to get into Mexico?

A. Yes, David Greenglass.

Q. I say, did anybody else ever ask you for anything like that?

A. No, sir.

Q. Did you proceed to find out why?

A. He was very agitated, and I asked him in the best way I knew how to ask him.

Q. Did you suspect why he wanted it?

A. I suspected he was in some trouble.

Q. Did you suspect perhaps that it had to do with the theft of gasoline from the Army?

A. Possibly, part.

Q. Did you suspect perhaps that it had something to do with the theft of uranium from Los Alamos?

A. Possibly.

Q. Did you suspect that it had something to do with the type of information relating to the atomic bomb?

[fol. 1861] A. No, I didn't suspect that.

Trial Transcript, pp. 1121, 1251

But the Greenglass testimony in the trial deliberately evaded the uranium issue. Greenglass—you will note—purports not to remember why the F.B.I. agent visited him

Q. Where did these FBI representatives see or speak to you in February, 1950?

A. One man called me up on the phone and he said he would like to see me. He came to my house; he sat down at my table; I offered him a cup of coffee and we spoke—he did not say to me that he suspected me of espionage or anything else—he just spoke to me about whether I had [fol. 802] known anybody at Los Alamos, and that was the gist of the whole conversation. He walked out of the house maybe an hour later, and that is all there was to it.

Q. All right now, let's see. Did he introduce himself as a member of the FBI?

A. He did.

Q. Did he ask you any questions, either directly or indirectly, with respect to your knowledge of any illegal activity that occurred at Los Alamos while you were there?

A. I don't recall exactly what the whole conversation was about. It made very little effect on me, because it didn't—I mean, it didn't seem like anything—I mean—

A. (Continuing:) He discussed with me—when he came into the house it was very difficult to find out what he wanted. He didn't come out and say that he wanted some information. He just talked around the point. I didn't get what he really wanted to find out.

Trial Transcript, pp. 564, 565

SUMMARY — Ruth Greenglass admitted to her attorney that an F.B.I. agent visited them in February, 1950, to question them about uranium.

(Continued on page 10)

Saturday
June 1950

I

I have many approximate statements
to the F.B.I. that I met Gold on
June 1950. They told me that I had
told him to come back later because I
didn't have it ready. I didn't remember
this but I allowed it in the statement.
When he came back again I told them
that I gave him the envelope with the
stuff not expecting payment and then he
gave me an envelope. Later I found
that it contained \$500.

TEXT OF GREENGLASS' DOCUMENT

Saturday

June 1950

These are my approximate statements to the F.B.I.

1. I stated that I met Gold in N. M. at 209 Hick St., my place. They told me that I had told him to come back later because I didn't have it ready. I didn't remember this but I allowed it in the statement. When he came back again I told them that I gave him the envelope with the stuff not expecting payment and then he gave me an envelope. Later I found that it contained \$500.

2. I told them that on a visit to me in Nov. 1944 my wife asked me if I would give information. I made sure to tell the F.B.I. that she was transmitting this info from my brother-in-law Julius and was not her own idea. She was doing this because she felt I would be angry if she didn't ask me.

I then mentioned a meeting with a man who I didn't know, arranged by Julius. I established the approximate meeting place but no exact date. The place was a car, an Olds owned by my father-in-law, at somewhere above 42nd St. on 1st Ave. in Manhattan. I talked to the man but I could recall very little about which we spoke. I thought it might be that he wanted me to think about finding out about H.E. lenses used in experiment tests to determine data on the A bomb.

I made a general statement on my age, etc.; you know, the usual thing.

I mentioned no other meeting with anyone.

One more thing. I identified Gold by a torn or cut piece of card, but I didn't tell them where or how I got it. Also, I definitely placed my wife out of the room at the time of Gold's visit.

Also, I didn't know who sent Gold to me.

I also made a pencil sketch of the H.E. mold set up for an experiment. But this I'll tell you, I can honestly say the information I gave Gold may be not at all what I said in the statement.

MEMORANDUM

TO: FILE
FROM: RHG

June 19, 1950

Re: David Greenglass

OJR and I visited Mrs. Greenglass at her home, 285 Rivington Street, Brooklyn, New York, at 4:00 P.M. Sunday, June 18, 1950. She was in bed as she had just returned from the hospital.

We first discussed the question of arranging a meeting of various relatives at our office to discuss financial problems. The relatives proposed are as follows:

1. Abe. Feit
1039 Union St., Brooklyn, N. Y.
Tel. STerling 3-6473
Business Address:
810 Washington St. — Tel. ST 3-6073
2. Mr. Feit is father-in-law of Louis Cohen,
80 Lefferts Ave.
Tel.: Jacob Cohen & Son
BUckminster 2-7103
3. Norman Brown (Friend of the family)
7981 Louis St.
Tel. OR 4-3609
4. Barney Zerkel (A cousin)
2124 East 26th St.
Tel. DE 2-0312
5. Sam Greenglass
1384 Carroll St. Telephone:
6. Rose Stein (Friend)
7. Stella Silverman (Friend)

There was subsequently present during the conference: Issy Feit, Sam Greenglass, Bernard Greenglass, and Louis Abel.

Mrs. Greenglass discussed her visit to New Mexico. She was there between March 1945 and March 1946. They had been married in 1942. She feels that New Mexico is a very bad place to try the case since the citizens did not like GI's, because of the big boom and then the big slack, because of anti-semitism and because the local citizens all felt bitter about the wives of the GI's taking jobs there. She was employed in Albuquerque by the OPA and temporarily by the Soil Conservation Office.

As to her husband, she stated that he had a "tendency to hysteria". At other times he would become delirious and once when he had the gripe he ran nude through the hallway, shrieking of "elephants", "Lead Pants".

She had known him since she was ten years old. She said that he would say things were so even if they were not. He talked of suicide as if he were a character in the movies but she didn't think he would do it. They had been under surveillance by the FBI for several weeks. In particular, they had noticed a car of the Acme Construction Company, 1400 First Avenue in Manhattan. She ascertained there was no such Company. (There is an Acme Construction Company at 1402 Fulton Street in Brooklyn). She was interviewed at the hospital by two FBI men, Mr. Tully and Mr. Wood. One was tall, ruddy and dark. The other she described as toothy and short. They assured her that they had nothing against her. She described her stay in Albuquerque and stated that she could not remember all of her addresses. Since it was difficult for GI's to get rooms for a long period, they had lived in five or six places. She had only been to Los Alamos to a party for a few hours one time. She had remembered no visitors at her house. She had notice of the project and signed an affidavit for it. She knew her mail was censored. She would not have allowed her husband to bring anything home after Hiroshima had disclosed what the project was. She intended to raise a family and did not want that kind of material around. In the future she will refer everyone to her lawyer.

She pointed out Dave did not ask for the job; that he was going overseas; that they have been watched constantly and feels as if they are the object of persecution. Shortly before their accident the FBI asked if they had a specimen of uranium in the house, in the course of what they call a routine investigation. One of their friends had a similar experience.

People in the neighborhood want to raise a petition.

All newspapers are to be referred to her lawyer.

People keep flocking in the house to offer support and advice including that perhaps a right-wing lawyer should be selected. The Jewish Daily Forward, which is certainly not a leftist newspaper, is very excited about the anti-semitic issue and has offered a lawyer. Mrs. Greenglass urged OJR to try to get a court appointment for himself and he agreed to try. OJR pointed out that if Dave was innocent he should talk; that if not it would be advisable not to talk but to let the Government prove its case. The third course was that of cooperation. That was also discussed at length.

There was a long discussion about JR.

Questions to be looked up:

1. Was the arrest valid — was he held in detention before the complaint issued?
2. What is the effect of the complaint?
3. What do the cases hold on the intent to harm the Government?
4. Statements of Co-conspirators.
5. Venue
6. Joinder

At the trial the Greenglasses evaded this issue. Is it possible that this might account for some of the money which Greenglass received from Gold? Is it possible that uranium — precious to the production of the atomic bomb — is something which machinist David Greenglass could obtain a little more easily perhaps than the secret of the atomic bomb?

A THREAT CARRIED OUT

A basic defense theory was that Greenglass implicated Julius Rosenberg to lessen his own punishment and protect his wife, Ruth Greenglass.

Julius Rosenberg, in direct testimony, stated that Greenglass had threatened him in late May or early June, 1950 (before Greenglass' arrest). The testimony follows:

Q. Would you say this was still in May, or would you say this was already in June?

A. It might have been the first week in June or the end of May.

Q. You are not sure?

A. I can't fix it exactly, if it was a day or two in June or a day or two in May.

1130

toward the East River Drive. I said to Dave at this point "You look very agitated. Calm yourself, take it [fol. 1679] easy. What's troubling you"? And he said "Julie, I am in a terrible jam." I says "No— I says "I realize you have been asking me for money, you have been telling me to go to my doctor for a certificate, you have been talking about Mexico. What is the trouble, Dave?"

He said "I can't tell you everything about it. All I want you to do for me, Julie, is I must have a couple of thousand dollars in cash." I says "David, I don't have the money on me, I can't raise that kind of money."

He says, "Julie, can you borrow it from your relatives?"

I says, "No, Dave, I can't do that."

He says, "Can you take it from the business for me?"

I says, "Dave, I cannot do that."

"Well, Julie, I just got to have that money and if you don't get me that money you are going to be sorry."

I said, "Look here, Dave, what are you trying to do, threaten me or blackmail me?"

Trial Transcript, pp. 1128, 1130

David Greenglass' handwritten document now confirms the defense theory.

Greenglass writes:

"I made sure to tell the F.B.I. that she (Ruth) was transmitting this info from my brother-in-law Julius and was not her idea. She was doing this because she felt I would be angry if she didn't ask me."

SUMMARY — From the wording of the written document, "I made sure to tell the F.B.I.", it can be seen that Greenglass deliberately implicated Julius Rosenberg, at the same time shielding his wife. Thus the document confirms the defense theory and shows how Greenglass made good his threat against Julius Rosenberg.

WHOLESALE LYING

David Greenglass and Harry Gold were indicted in New Mexico on charges of espionage. It was on the basis of this indictment that David Greenglass was arrested. His early statements deal with Gold almost exclusively. The trial testimony places greater and greater emphasis upon Julius Rosenberg, who Greenglass alleged sent Gold as a spy courier. In light of this direct implication of Julius Rosenberg with Greenglass and Gold it is necessary to take note of the following serious discrepancies between the documents and the Greenglass testimony.

Greenglass, in his own handwriting, admits regarding his statement to the F.B.I.:

"Also, I definitely placed my wife out of the room at the time of Gold's visit."

In direct contradiction, Ruth Greenglass not only testified that she was in the room at the time of Gold's visit, but identified Gold from a photograph. Her testimony follows:

A. It was about 1:30.
 Q. Did there come a time when somebody did come to see you in Albuquerque?
 A. Yes.
 Q. When was that?
 A. On the first Sunday in June, 1945.
 Q. Where were you at that time?
 A. I was in our apartment on North High Street.
 [fol. 1003] Q. At the time that this person came to see you, had you ever seen the person before?
 A. Never.
 Q. Was it a man or a lady?
 A. It was a man.
 Q. Do you now know who that man is?
 A. Yes, I do.
 Q. And who is he?
 A. Harry Gold.
 Q. I show you Government's Exhibit 5 and ask you if you recognize this picture (showing to witness)?
 A. Yes.
 Q. Who is it, please?
 A. Harry Gold.
 Mr. Kilsheimer: (Showing the witness Government's Exhibit 5).
 Q. Who was present at your apartment at the time Harry Gold came?
 A. My husband and myself.

Trial Transcript, p. 699

Now note a second contradiction. In the handwritten statement Greenglass confesses:

"Also I didn't know who sent Gold to me."

But on the witness stand he told a different story. He said Gold had been sent by Julius Rosenberg:

A. There was a knock on the door and I opened it. We had just completed eating breakfast, and there was a man standing in the hallway who asked if I were Mr. Greenglass, and I said yes. He stepped through the door and he said, "Julius sent me," and I said "oh," and walked to my wife's purse, took out the wallet and took out the matched part of the Jello box.

Trial Transcript, p. 457

SUMMARY — Here are two direct contradictions on crucial points in the testimony. Greenglass admits he didn't know who sent Gold to him, while in the trial he testified that it was Julius Rosenberg. In the document Greenglass places his wife outside the room on Gold's alleged visit, while in the trial his wife claimed she was in the room.

THE MYSTERIOUS \$4,000

A vital contradiction in dates revealed by the new documents shatters the Greenglass testimony about the \$4,000 the Rosenbergs allegedly gave him to leave the country.

A major premise of the prosecution was that Julius and Ethel Rosenberg, as alleged heads of a spy conspiracy, had large sums of money available. While the Rosenbergs denied ever giving \$4,000 to Greenglass, David Greenglass testified that he received \$4,000 from Julius Rosenberg and gave the money to one Louis Abel to hold. On Greenglass' request, Abel allegedly used the money to pay attorney O. John Rogge. Ruth Greenglass testified the money was paid on June 16, 1950.

But the newly-discovered memorandum based on discussions that took place two days later — on June 18, 1950 — describes "financial problems" and notes a request by Mrs. Greenglass that Rogge try to get himself court-appointed in the cases. The memorandum says:

"We first discussed the question of arranging a meeting of various relatives at our office to discuss financial problems. The relatives proposed are as follows . . .

"There was subsequently present during the conference: Issy Feit, Sam Greenglass, Bernard Greenglass, and Louis Abel . . . Mrs. Greenglass urged OJR to try to get a court appointment for himself and he agreed to try."

Mrs. Greenglass, who in the above asked Rogge to become court-appointed, testified in the trial that she was aware of the payment of \$4,000 before she left the hospital on June 16, 1950.

Ethel Rosenberg, who denied ever giving the \$4,000, testified as follows with respect to the Greenglass' need for money:

"Have you enough money?"

She said, "Well, I have been asking my relatives and I am trying to raise money. It is pretty hard," and she sort of looked at me; so I said, "Look, Ruthie, I don't know what I would give to be able to say that I have some money that I can give you. I wish I could do that, but I really can't at the moment. You know how it is. However, if I can think of anyone that might possibly lend me some money for you, you can be sure I will do whatever I can," and with that we reached East Houston Street and I put my arms around her and kissed her. She remained rigid in my arms, didn't return the kiss, said, "Goodby" coldly, turned on her heel and left.

SUMMARY — If in fact O. J. Rogge received \$4,000 on June 16, 1950, would there be a conference on finances two days later? Would Mrs. Greenglass, with full knowledge that the attorney had just received \$4,000, ask him to become court-appointed, a request which implies a serious inability to pay for legal help?

If in fact Mrs. Greenglass did not pay the \$4,000 through her brother-in-law, Louis Abel, is there any proof whatsoever that the \$4,000 actually existed?

OTHER DISCREPANCIES

The foregoing have been a series of comparisons between the court record and the newly discovered documents in the Rosenberg case. The consistent pattern of discrepancies between the Greenglass testimony and the documents on some of the most vital points of this case have been demonstrated. Also, it has been seen that the Rosenberg testimony in many cases is consistent with the documents.

A number of other discrepancies are present in the discovered documents. For example, in the documents Ruth Greenglass admits that "people keep flocking in the house to offer support and advice..." while in her testimony she insisted that no one had come to her house. In the document she admits "The Jewish Daily Forward... has offered a lawyer", while in the testimony she denied speaking to any newspaper men during her first days at home. In the document she suggests "people in the neighborhood want to raise a petition..." (an act which implies a belief in innocence) while in her testimony she stoutly denied telling anyone she and her husband were innocent.

Finally, the reader must understand that David and Ruth Greenglass swore on the witness stand that from the first hour of Greenglass' arrest, they told the entire truth in the case. In cross-examination, defense attorney Emanuel Bloch drew from David Greenglass an admission that in his early statements he made

no mention of the transfer of atomic secrets and did not implicate Ethel Rosenberg. This point must be remembered when one sees that nowhere in the new documents is there any mention of Ethel Rosenberg.

CONCLUSIONS

There is literally not one single statement in the newly-discovered documents which is not at variance with the trial testimony. Some of the points of difference are so obvious that even the most cursory knowledge of the court record one is aware of the importance of these differences. Other points are more subtle and require a study of the entire record as well as an understanding of the theory advanced by both the prosecution and the defense.

There is one part of the document, however, that almost defies description or analysis. David Greenglass' final statement in his written document reads as follows: "But this I can honestly say the information I gave Gold may be not at all what I said in the statement."

What is the meaning of the above quote? Can one begin to speculate? What did Greenglass actually give Harry Gold? What is the actual crime that took place? Was the atom bomb stolen by David Greenglass?

Can there be any more basic question in a case in which two people are being sent to their death for the theft of the atom bomb? Can we, after reading the above, lightly accept the fact that Julius and Ethel Rosenberg will be executed for a crime which we are not even sure took place?

If in two accidentally discovered documents so many inconsistencies, so many open lies, and so many doubts become apparent, must we not wonder what future documents will unfold and what other obvious lies they will reveal?

American justice is the responsibility of all American citizens. Execution of the Rosenbergs despite the mountains of doubt would be a tragic event that would reflect adversely on the good name of our country, and remain upon the consciences of all American citizens. We urge you to write and wire President Eisenhower to grant clemency to the Rosenbergs so that the full facts in the case may come to light.

THE VERBATIM RECORD OF THE ROSENBERG TRIAL

One year ago the Rosenberg Committee took the unprecedented step of publishing the entire word-for-word record of the Rosenberg trial.

An entire first printing was sold out, and a new printing has just come off the press.

Thousands of lawyers, judges, ministers, educators and sociologists have read this record and have become convinced that there are grave doubts in the Rosenberg Case.

For ALL the facts in the case, for all the testimony of the Rosenbergs, Greenglasses, Elizabeth Bentley, Harry Gold—the Record is indispensable.

The Record is in eight small volumes, boxed, and sells for \$6.00.

Please send me a copy of the verbatim Record of the Rosenberg Trial, for which I enclose my ☐ check
☐ money order ☐ cash for \$6.00.

Name

Address

CityZone.....State.....

☐ I want more information on the Rosenberg Case.

Write, Wire President Dwight D. Eisenhower:
CLEMENCY for the ROSENBERGS

