



April 24, 1952
**Office of Policy Coordination Dissents from State
Department Views on Radio Free Europe**

Citation:

“Office of Policy Coordination Dissents from State Department Views on Radio Free Europe,” April 24, 1952, History and Public Policy Program Digital Archive, Obtained and contributed to CWIHP by A. Ross Johnson. Cited in his book *Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty*. CIA mandatory declassification review document number C05458950.
<http://digitalarchive.wilsoncenter.org/document/114383>

Summary:

Frank Wisner in a memorandum to Robert Joyce dissents from State Department criticism that exile participation on Radio Free Europe is minimal and rejects State’s proposal that East European National Councils should themselves organize broadcasts.

Credits:

This document was made possible with support from the Blavatnik Family Foundation and the Leon Levy Foundation.

Original Language:

English

Contents:

- Scan of Original Document

24 Apr '52

(4)

APPROVED FOR RELEASE
DATE: 16-Feb-2011

OFF 42 FOR 79-2912
DOE 10 FOLDER 17

MEMORANDUM FOR: MR. ROBERT F. JOYCE
Policy Planning Staff
Department of State

SUBJECT: State Department Paper on "The Functions of NCFE
and RFE"

1. Thank you for forwarding to us the State Department memorandum on the functions of NCFE and RFE. I am sorry that there has been a delay in replying to it. The chief reason has been our effort to obtain a written statement of position from the NCFE Executive Board, and particularly from Robert Lang, the Director of NCFE. After long considering the matter, Lang has expressed a desire to talk personally with you about the subject, and I understand that since the elapsed time he has had no opportunity for a conference with you on the problem. I agree with the view you expressed to him -- that there ought to be further conferences -- but nevertheless want you to know our own views without further delay.

2. I think that there is a basic element of misunderstanding in the State Department paper. That is the idea which seems to me to be implicit in it that the exiles do not broadcast. In fact, the exiles do all the broadcasting. By and large, these men are not political figures but technicians, writers and newsmen having somewhat the same training and point of view as those who do similar work for American companies. Frequently, also, exile leaders from within the National Councils are asked to make personal broadcasts. This practice will continue. All in all, so great is the exile domination of RFE broadcasts that in many instances these broadcasts have taken on the tone and coloration of indigenous radio in the countries to which they are aimed. Wherever possible, that is the aim of RFE -- to compete within each country as an indigenous national station.

3. In addition, even allowing, however, for this misunderstanding, as I believe it to be, the State Department paper presents a point of view with which I cannot agree. This is that the National Councils could in practice be placed in charge of RFE. I am almost

Copy from NCFE folder #2
Mar-June 1952
Job 60-748 Sub 1

~~SECRET~~

(24)

certain they could not be. No statement made by NPS, no line of policy that NPS could pursue, no suggestion or propaganda line that NPS could follow could be done in the name of the National Councils so long as the members of each Council are incapable of reaching a group decision or of reaching a majority decision which the minority would not attempt to subvert. It seems to me that there is only historical value in talking about what the original concept of the National Councils was. The concept has changed, and the change was necessary to correspond to the fact. The fact is the inability of each National Council to speak as a single voice.

b. Without further discussion, therefore, I am unprepared to ask NPS to make a major change in its policy such as the State Department paper suggests. I understand that you and Mr. Braden have agreed with Admiral Miller and Mr. Long to discuss this problem thoroughly with the people who are concerned in the State Department and I hope that after these discussions we may reach an agreement on the matters which the paper raises.

FRANK G. WINNER

CIO:KRB/eh
(24 Apr 52)

Orig & 1 - Addressee
2 cc - S.R. (1 for DD/P)
1 cc - ADPC
1 cc - CIO
1 cc - IO/TNMC
1 cc - EE/OPC
1 cc - SE/OPC
2 cc - RI

~~SECRET~~