

I. F. Stone's Weekly

VOL. I NUMBER 1

JANUARY 17, 1953

WASHINGTON, D. C.

15 CENTS

Mr. Truman's Farewell Evasions

The warning to Stalin made the headlines. The warning to ourselves was played down. "War today between the Soviet empire and the free nations," Mr. Truman said in his last State of the Union message, "might dig the grave not only of our Stalinist opponents, but of our own society, our world as well as theirs." The outgoing President was apocalyptic in his picture of the war of the future. "Man could extinguish millions of lives at one blow, demolish the great cities of the world, wipe out the cultural achievements of the past . . ." Mr. Truman said "Such a war is not a possible policy for rational men."

But if a new war between the giants of East and West threatens their mutual destruction, if such a war is not a possible policy for rational men, then the alternative is co-existence. If the disputes of U.S. and U.S.S.R. cannot be settled on the battle-field without endangering the survival of civilization, then they must be settled somehow at the conference table. The conclusion is inescapable, but Mr. Truman managed again to escape it, as he has all through his years in the Presidency.

Mr. Truman fears war, but remains evasive about peace. The meaning of the H-bomb and the new weapons of destruction is that men must learn to live together on the same planet in mutual forbearance. What Mr. Truman should have said is that in the awful perspective of a new war no pains must be spared to negotiate differences between Washington and Moscow. But Mr. Truman's emphasis was on his old hope that if cold war and containment were continued long enough the Soviet regime would somehow crack up from within. Negotiation requires compromise, but there was in Mr. Truman's message the same self-righteous insistence that any settlement must be on our terms. Some years ago at press conference he made it clear that what he sought was unconditional surrender by Moscow as the price of ending the cold war. Mr. Truman set the mood and Mr. Acheson coined the phrase for it—"total diplomacy." It was to shut the door on negotiation and keep the heat on until the Soviets crumpled.

What happens to us in the meantime? Mr. Truman says we are being "hurried forward" in atomic research "from one discovery to another, toward yet unforeseeable peaks of destructive power." Will this safeguard our own security? "We must realize," Mr. Truman himself warns, "that no advance we make is unattainable by others, that no advantage in this race can be more than temporary."

The more terrible the weapons of destruction grow, the greater must become our fear that the enemy also possesses them, the greater our frenzied effort to remain ahead. The atmosphere and momentum of an atomic arms race spell ever

greater insecurity at ever greater cost. Like a new war, this too is no policy for rational men.

We can impose tension on the Soviet system only by imposing tension on ourselves. The tension which we hope will disintegrate the Soviet system from within may do the same to our own. Mr. Truman warns against "fear that breeds more fear, sapping our faith, corroding our liberties, turning citizen against citizen . . . Fear could snatch away the very values we are striving to defend." But how avoid that fear in a world of mounting tension, hate and war preparations?

To pursue such a policy with stubborn blindness while warning against its inevitable consequences is to give a drunken party and salve one's conscience with a lecture on alcoholism. "Already the danger signals have gone up," Mr. Truman says piously. "Already the corrosive process has begun . . . every diminution of our tolerance, each new act of enforced conformity, each idle accusation, each demonstration of hysteria—each new restrictive law—is one more sign that we can lose the battle against fear." It is also a sign that we cannot wage cold war on Soviet society without waging cold war on our own.

Mr. Truman thinks of himself as a liberal. It is at once something subtler and more human than hypocrisy which leads him to say, "We must take our stand on the Bill of Rights. The inquisition, the star chamber, have no place in a free society." The same capacity for inviting war in the name of peace made it possible for him to launch star chamber loyalty purges and peacetime sedition prosecutions while preaching civil liberties. The man who devoted most of his years in the White House to propagating alarm ends by warning us "The Communists cannot deprive us of our liberties—fear can."

But how make people accept the heavy burdens of cold war without injecting ever greater doses of fear and suspicion? If the purpose is to preserve liberty and safeguard peace, the cold war is no more rational than another world war would be. In any case the one, if continued, must lead inevitably to the other. At the Pentagon indeed these last words of Mr. Truman's must seem little more than smoke-screen to hide the full import of current military preparations from civilians.

Washington's Farewell Address had better advice than Truman's. Washington warned the new Republic—and the warning now seems prophetic—not to cherish "permanent inveterate antipathies against particular nations." Washington saw that hatred could be one of the most entangling of all entangling alliances. He said "the nation which indulges toward another an habitual hatred . . . is in some degree a slave. It is a slave to its animosity." Only negotiation, co-existence and peace can emancipate us from the campaign of hate and its hateful consequences.

New Light on the Korean Mystery

Was The War No Surprise to Chiang Kai-shek?

The Senate report on McCarthy makes it possible to throw new light on one of the most tantalizing episodes in the Korean War. This concerns the burst of speculation in soybeans on the eve of the war. In touching on McCarthy's own successful flier in soybeans later that same year, the report asks whether he had confidential information "with respect to the trend of the soybean futures market" and adds an intriguing parenthesis. It says "Just prior to the transaction in question, the Commodity Exchange Authority of the Department of Agriculture conducted an investigation of alleged soybean market manipulation involving, among others, a number of Chinese traders."

The report on McCarthy is not too intrepid a document. It was not surprising, on inquiry at the Department of Agriculture, to discover that the Senate Subcommittee on Privileges and Elections had omitted from the report its own biggest news "scoop" in the soybean story. Inquiry at the Department turned up (1) the full text of a report on its investigation into soybean speculation and (2) a list of the Chinese who took part in this trading. The original report, issued on August 10, 1950, passed almost unnoticed at the time outside grain publications. It withheld the names of the Chinese speculators. But in the file of the Agriculture Department's later press releases on the subject there turned up a statement of last November 26 saying that the Senate Subcommittee on Privileges and Elections had asked for the names and addresses of the Chinese traders "referred to, but not identified" in the original report. Attached was a list of names, with their holdings in soybean futures when the Korean war began.

The Department declined to identify the names further, but one of the largest speculators on the list turned out to be T. V. Soong's younger brother, T. L. Soong. "T. V." is, of course, Chiang Kai-shek's brother-in-law. One of the smaller speculators was Nationalist China's executive director on the board of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development. These directors are appointees of the governments they represent. Though such names confirm what had hitherto only been suspected—that "insiders" close to Chiang and his government played a prominent part in the speculation—the Senate committee did not even mention its discovery.

If the Korean War was a surprise attack, how is it that Chinese close to Chiang began to speculate in soybeans in the weeks before the fighting broke out? The question was first raised by the *Monthly Review* in its issue of October 1951. A "Footnote to Korea" by the editors, Leo Huberman and Paul Sweezy, called attention to the unsuccessful effort of the late Senator McMahon during the MacArthur hearings to elicit information from Secretary of State Acheson on reports that certain Chinese had cornered the American soybean market at the time the Korean War began. The "Foot-

note" put that obscure colloquy into new and startling light by coupling it with an item published two months later, on August 16, 1951, on the financial page of the *New York Herald Tribune*. This item said that some 50 Chinese living in the United States and abroad had cleaned up \$30,000,000 in speculative operations in soybeans "just before" the war.

Just how extensive these operations were was not clear until now. The original Department of Agriculture study to which the McCarthy report calls attention shows that Secretary Acheson was perhaps less than candid in his answers to Senator McMahon. The Senator wanted to know whether Acheson had ever discussed with Secretary of Agriculture Brannan "a corner that's supposed to have existed in the soybean market a year ago last June in the hands of certain Chinese in this country." A "year ago last June" was when the Korean War began. The casual listener would assume from the Acheson replies that the matter was of little importance and that little was known about it (p. 2187, vol. 3, MacArthur hearings):

SECRETARY ACHESON: Yes, I have discussed it with him.

SENATOR MCMAHON: Is there anything that you can say at this time concerning the personalities who were engaged in that operation . . . ?

SECRETARY ACHESON: I don't know that I ever knew who the personalities involved were.

In the light of the information now turned up, this "I don't know that I ever knew" seems superbly evasive. If the Secretary of State discussed the matter with Secretary of Agriculture Brannan, they must have considered it of more than routine importance. Brannan could hardly have failed to tell Acheson that a full investigation had been made by the Agriculture Department's Commodity Exchange Authority and that the names of all the participants were known, as the report of August 10, 1950, shows.

This neglected report begins to indicate the full dimensions of the skeleton the Secretary of State wished to keep securely closeted. The story the Department of Agriculture report unfolds begins several months before the Korean War. The war broke out on June 25, 1950. Four months earlier, the Commodity Exchange Authority of the U. S. Department of Agriculture began to receive "a large number of complaints" from processors of soybeans in this country that the soybean futures market had fallen "so completely under the control of speculators" that it could no longer serve for legitimate hedging operations. One complainant pointed out that more soybeans were being traded on the Chicago market than all the other principal grain futures combined; another, that the sudden sharp rise in soybean prices "is helping only the speculators as a large majority of the farmers have already disposed of their farm holdings." The Commodity Exchange

Authority began to investigate and found "very sizable trading by persons with Chinese names, and in some instances with Hong Kong addresses." Speculation in futures by Chinese is not unusual but "no previous instance had been found," it said, "in which Chinese held as large a proportion of the total open contracts in any commodity."

The Commodity Exchange Authority wondered why the Chicago Board of Trade reduced speculative margins on soybeans on March 13 "from the already low level of 8.3 percent to 6.1 percent . . . in the face of an active market." In the four weeks which followed, the daily average volume of trading rose to 15 million bushels a day, as compared with 10 million daily in the preceding four weeks. Since few suspected that war was coming in the Far East, it was thought that Chinese Nationalist interests were trying to corner the market. On August 7, 1950, the Chicago Journal of Commerce carried a front page item stating that the President of the Chicago Board of Trade had refuted previously published reports that a virtual corner of soybeans by "Chinese Nationalist" interests had been instrumental in causing prices to soar from \$2.20 to \$3.45 a bushel. The refutation was made to look somewhat sickly when three days later the Commodity Exchange Authority issued its report on "Speculation in Soybeans," the report from which the quotations here were taken. This showed that by June 30, 1950, 56 Chinese accounts held almost half of all open contracts for July futures on the long side of the market, *i.e.*, of those playing for a rise in price.

The inference is irresistible though not necessarily correct that inner Chinese Nationalist circles knew war was coming and cashed in on their knowledge. If this ugly inference is false, the Nationalists should be anxious for a Congressional investigation which would clear them of suspicion that a group of them made themselves a nice little profit of \$30,000,000 on a war which has cost the American people and its allies heavily in lives and money. It may be, of course, that they had informers in Red China who tipped them off to a coming attack from North Korea. It may also be, as I indicated in my book, *The Hidden History of the Korean War*, that Chiang and Syngman Rhee provoked the attack from the North. It should not be forgotten that in this, as in any other unsolved crime, it is useful to begin by determining who benefitted. The biggest beneficiary of the Korean War was Chiang Kai-shek. The war diverted the Chinese Reds from their plans to attack Formosa. It gave him a virtual American protectorate over Formosa, and an increased flow of American aid. The \$30,000,000 in that perspective is small change, but an investigation into that small change might throw a flood of new light on the origin of a conflict which threatens to engulf the globe in World War III.

I. F. Stone's Weekly

• Editor and Publisher, I. F. STONE

Published Weekly at Room 225, 1416 F St., N.W., Washington 4, D. C., 50 times a year. Subscription rates: Domestic, \$5 a year; Canada, Mexico and elsewhere in the Western Hemisphere, \$6; England and Continental Europe, \$10 by 1st class mail, \$15 by air; for Israel, Asia, Australia and Africa, \$10 by first class mail, \$20 by air mail. Single copy, 15 cents. Telephone, STerling 3-0938.

Vol. 1, No. 1

January 17, 1953

COMMENT

Fate of the Compass

This weekly represents an attempt to keep alive through a difficult period the kind of independent radical journalism represented in various ways by PM, the New York Star and the Daily Compass. This new enterprise embodies the hope that by beginning on a rock-bottom basis it will prove possible to survive and expand. In launching the new weekly, I want to salute Ted O. Thackrey for the endless ingenuity and sheer grit with which he managed for three and a half years to keep the Compass alive. The bald economics of daily newspaper publishing is enough to make the stoutest heart quail. T. O. T. performed a miracle in keeping the Compass going as long as he did. I am afraid it will be a long time before anyone else manages to duplicate his feat.

Many subscribers have written to ask what happened to the Compass and why it closed without an announcement. I cannot speak for T. O. T. but I know that on earlier occasions he had managed to pull a new rabbit out of the hat at the last moment just when all seemed over. He hoped that dismal day before election in November that he could do it again. The Compass closed down like the New York Star and PM before it for the simple reason that it ran out of money. It ran out of money for the simple reason that there were not enough people in New York City who wanted an independent paper of its kind deeply enough to

go on buying it regularly. Those readers who stuck to it through some very thin days to the end made up in one sense for the inadequacy of their numbers by the quality of their devotion. But that was not enough to balance the books.

It is not true that the Compass was shut down by Corliss Lamont or that its closing was a result of the fact that T. O. T. and I both supported Stevenson rather than the Progressive Party in this past election. Had it not been for Lamont the paper would have closed much sooner. He stuck to the end and made heavy sacrifices for the paper. He never tried in any way to dictate its policies. Those of us who worked on it owe him a vote of thanks.

What He Held In His Hand

Speaking of Stevenson: Readers will be interested in the November 22 and December 13 issues of the Jesuit weekly America. The editor-in-chief, the Rev. Robert C. Hartnett, took McCarthy apart for the job he did on Stevenson in McCarthy's TV address of October 27. "I hold in my hand a photostat of the Daily Worker," said the Senator, but ducked out before reporters could look at it. The photostat was supposed to prove that the Communists supported Stevenson. Father Hartnett reported that he could find no such article in the Daily and McCarthy replied by sending him the photostat. But the photostat turned out to be the last of three articles by Alan Max called "I. F. Stone and the Fight Against McCarthyism," in which as Father Hartnett said the Daily Worker "beat the Compass over the head and read it a long lesson for being indulgent toward the Stevenson candidacy." The Jesuit editor labelled McCarthy's tactics "vicious falsehood." Next time McCarthy does an "I hold in my hand"—his favorite stance—it would be more discreet of him to keep holding it where no newspaperman can see it. Father Hartnett deserves applause for his scoop and for taking out of Holy Writ and into the hot arena of politics the injunction which fits McCarthyism, "Thou Shalt Not Bear False Witness."

Best People in The U. S. A.

A personal word is in order. I feel as if I am going to work for the best people in the

U. S. A. The morning mail since I announced the Weekly has been an inspiration. More than 5,000 subscriptions came in before publication, and with them the kindest notes of good wishes any newspaperman could want. There were letters and subs from all over the United States and Canada. Small towns in Nevada, the Ozarks and Arkansas; out-of-the-way communities in Saskatchewan and the Deep South, are represented on the subscription list along with New York and the big cities of the East and Pacific Coast. I start with no obligations except those of gratitude and conscience, independent as Sandburg's hog on ice. I believe there remains a solid substratum of good sense and good will in this country, that there are still people willing to listen to an opposition point of view if fairly, accurately and soberly presented. I intend to fight for peace and for civil liberties—and I believe that both are indivisible. If readers will be charitable at the start, and give me a little time to get the hang of this format, I will try and do a good job.

Clemency for The Rosenbergs

As we go to press for the first time, the final fate of the Rosenbergs is in the hands of President Truman. Those who have known Mr. Truman in the capital during his years in the Senate and the White House know that he is a man of warm heart and instinctive humanity. I hope that he will commute that barbaric and savage death sentence. The Rosenberg trial, bad as it was, was considerably more fair than the kind of drum-head procedure in which people like Slansky were convicted of weird charges and whisked off without appeal to execution. The commutation of sentence would really put a proud note in the Voice of America, a magnanimous note worthy of a great nation. There is lynch fever and blood lust in the Rosenberg case, a primitive urge to kill linked with superstitious awe for the atom bomb, which has become a kind of American tribal god and totem. The execution of the Rosenbergs would be a victory for all that is dark and dubious in our unconscious as a nation and a people.

Please Excuse

The rush of subscriptions has been so heavy that it has been impossible to check the names of subscribers against the mailing lists I have been using. So if you find yourself with two copies—one a free sample, please pass it on to a friend. If you have not yet subscribed, please do so now, using the subscription blank on the reverse side. Save this first issue, a complete file will some day be valuable and I will soon offer a permanent binder at nominal cost specially made for the weekly. New subscribers can still get the first issue. To the many who took the trouble to drop a note with their subscription, my heartiest thanks and apologies for not being able to answer all well-wishers personally. I hope General Eisenhower feels as encouraged about his inaugural as I do about mine.

I. F. Stone

Who Will Watch This Watchman?

The Romans had a saying, "quis custodiet custodiem?"—who will watch the watchman? The wry question applies patly to the case of Joe McCarthy. The Senator who is now the chairman of the Senate's key watchdog committee is the Senator who most needs watching. The report made on McCarthy by the Senate subcommittee on privileges and elections is a monument to the ineptitude of gentlemen in dealing with a brawler who pays no attention to the rules, Queensbury or otherwise. The report, spottily covered in the nation's newspapers despite a very full account sent out (to its credit) by the Associated Press, is the first official full length portrait of the most brazen operator to appear in the U. S. Senate since the days of Huey Long.

The new document is the third Senate report which has found McCarthy mixed up in funny business on which action by law enforcement agencies has been asked. A subcommittee of the Senate armed services committee reporting in October, 1949, called for investigation by the Justice and Defense Departments into the campaign to save the Malmedy slayers. McCarthy figured in this as an advocate of strict Anglo-Saxon due process for the SS men who killed 350 unarmed American prisoners and 150 Belgian civilians in the Battle of the Bulge. Nothing happened. The Rules committee in August, 1951, suggested State and Federal inquiry into the financial irregularities and defamatory tactics of the campaign in which McCarthy helped defeat Millard Tydings for reelection to the Senate the year before. Again nothing happened. It is now the honor of the Senate, not McCarthy, which is going down for the third time.

McCarthy cannot complain that he got less than the due process due him. Six times the subcommittee invited him to appear and rebut the charges bravely made by former Senator Benton, six times McCarthy failed to show up. The subcommittee lacked the nerve to subpoena him.

The picture drawn by the new report is of a man who cannot resist speculation on margin. His activities in and out of the market since 1942 are those of a born gambler. A series of financial difficulties were eased by some odd transactions of

which the \$10,000 he received from Lustron for a housing pamphlet is the best known. Newly brought to light in this report is the \$20,000 note signed for McCarthy by the Washington representative of Pepsi-Cola at a time when the Senator's bank account in Wisconsin was over-extended. Pepsi-Cola was then lobbying for decontrol of sugar and McCarthy was chairman of a Senate subcommittee—on sugar!

McCarthy's financial accounts are hectic. From January 1, 1948, to November 12, 1952, he deposited \$172,000 in one Washington bank; his administrative assistant and alter ego, Ray Kiermas, deposited \$96,000. Of these amounts almost \$60,000 deposited by McCarthy and almost \$45,000 deposited by Kiermas "has not been identified as to source." The Senator's most successful speculation was his flier in anti-Communism. Contributions flowed in after his famous attack on the State Department, February 9, 1950. In the months which followed more than \$20,000 was deposited by him in a special account used for donations to help him fight Communism. "However," the report says dryly, "no connection could be established between many of the disbursements from this account and any possible anti-Communist campaign." In one case traced by the committee, McCarthy deposited a \$10,000 loan to fight Communism in a special account, and then withdrew it three weeks later to pass on to a friend for a speculation in soybeans. (See page two for the international side of this soybean story.)

Outgoing Democrats and incoming Republicans will live equally to regret that they did not cut McCarthy down to size when they had the chance. With his congenial cheek and the enormous powers conferred upon him by his key Senate chairmanship, McCarthy promises to become Eisenhower's chief headache. McCarthy is in a position to smear any government official who fails to do his bidding. With much daring and few scruples, McCarthy can make himself the most powerful single figure in Congress and terrorize the new Administration. All those mumblings and rumblings about how Communists are "already infiltrating" the Republicans are indicative.

I. F. Stone's Weekly 1-17-53
 Room 225 Kellogg Bldg.
 1416 F Street, Washington 4, D. C.

Please enter the following subscription. \$5 for 1 year is enclosed. (See page 3 for foreign rates)

Name

Street

City Zone

State

I. F. Stone's Weekly
 225 Kellogg Bldg.
 1416 F St., Washington 4, D. C.

Sec. 34.66, P.L. and R.
 U. S. Postage
PAID
 Washington, D. C.
 Permit No. 40221

I. F. Stone's Weekly

VOL. I NUMBER 2

JANUARY 24, 1953



WASHINGTON, D. C.

15 CENTS

From Mink to General Motors

Amid the glittering wives of Eisenhower's many-million-*aired* Cabinet even the wife of "the plumber" was opulent. Mrs. Martin Durkin, the new First Lady of the Labor Department, was to appear at the Inaugural Ball in a bouffant gown by Countess Alexander, of toast brown Chantilly lace, with a ten yard sweep of skirt. The wife of the new Secretary of the Treasury barely managed to outpace this proletarian splendor by wearing "huge clips . . . of rubies and diamonds." The political tone of the festivities matched. Thanks to the vigilance of Representative Busbey, of Illinois, Aaron Copland's "A Lincoln Portrait" was dropped from the Inaugural Concert as "un-American." At the Inaugural reception, Adolph Menjou struck a suave blow for the free world when he turned his back on Soviet Ambassador Georgi Zarubin, who had asked to be presented, no doubt for purposes of infiltration.

There was a surprise in the Inaugural Address. In his farewell to the faculty of Columbia, Eisenhower had said he was breaking a release date to give the assembled professors a passage of special interest from his forthcoming Inaugural. "As long as we preach with conviction and teach with integrity," Eisenhower read, "that is the true defense against communism." The implications were reassuring, but the sentence was dropped from the Inaugural, as Eisenhower dropped a similar passage on a famous occasion during the campaign. The Inaugural as revised carried not the faintest suggestion of a plea for academic freedom, or civil liberty of any kind. The word freedom was often used but only in the general sense in which it always appears when a new war is being whooped up. Eisenhower said "freedom is pitted against slavery; light against dark" but this is immemorial metaphor. As far back as the earliest tribal wars over stolen axe handles, the issue has been freedom against slavery. The Inaugural was a gaudy composition, febrile and synthetic. Its prose style was not quite as purple as MacArthur's but it was sometimes almost as banal as Ridgway's. Those who listened for concrete ideas listened in vain. All the cliches which make one despair of negotiation were there. "Appeasement" was "futile." We shall never "try to placate an aggressor by the false and wicked bargain of trading honor for security." Eisenhower was bathetic when he said "in our quest of honorable peace, we shall neither compromise, nor tire . . ." The quest will be very tiring if he thinks peace can be achieved without compromise. Eisenhower seems to be tired already. "In the final choice," he said at one point, "a soldier's pack is not so heavy a burden as a prisoner's chains." Eisenhower is all set to march.

Just where is not clear. Eisenhower is no fire-eater, but seems to be a rather simple man who enjoys his bridge and his golf and doesn't like to be too much bothered. He promises, from what was observed of him by the press on his campaign train, to be a kind of president in absentia, a sort of political

vacuum in the White House which other men will struggle among themselves to fill. In the meantime Congress, impatient as ever, wants something done about Korea. It would like to widen the war but without enlarging the risk, and at the same time to reduce the military budget; all it wants is a miracle. There are indications that something is up. One does not send one's Secretary of State and Mutual Security Director abroad immediately after inauguration for a junket, nor just to "gather information." Not much information can be gathered when one plans as Dulles and Stassen do to visit seven countries in nine days. A rapid fire round of visits at this pace is made for predigested take-it-or-leave-it propositions. If the Korean war is to be widened in search of trick solutions some quick high level negotiation is necessary.

Eisenhower's path to the White House door is already strewn with time-bombs: Truman's mischievous farewell praise for the Presidential press conference, which Eisenhower so much fears; the order handing tidelands oil to the Navy; Senator Morse's bill challenging Eisenhower on his promise to erase "every vestige of racism" from the capital. The most explosive of all was that laid in the Wilson case by the obtuseness of his own followers, giddy with victory. Who could have dreamt that big business would prove so crass as to drive a Byrd and a Duff into opposition? The appointments to the Defense Department could hardly have been more brazen. General Motors, largest defense contractor, got the top job and the deputyship. The Army secretary is head of a firm which does a \$125,000,000 business with the Army. The Air secretary is a heavy holder of motor stock. The Navy secretary is a Texas oil man. A law which goes back to 1863 makes it a crime for an official to act for the government in transactions in which he is "directly or indirectly" interested. Charles E. Wilson has \$2,500,000 in GM stock and \$600,000 more due him in the next four years providing he does nothing "inimical" to GM's interests. Pending for action by the new Secretary of Defense is an application from GM for an increase in profits on its contracts. Wilson and his associates expect the law to be waived in their favor and Wilson sought to dismiss the ethical problems by telling the Senators, "What is good for General Motors is good for the country and what is good for the country is good for General Motors." The remark recalls that outburst by George F. Baer in the coal strike of 1902 when Morgan's man rejected pleas for arbitration by saying that the rights of labor in this country would be protected "not by labor agitators, but by the Christian men to whom God in his infinite wisdom has given the control of the property interests of this country." That brash assertion of property's Divine Right to rule brought a Bronx cheer from the country even in 1902. No Administration ever started with a bigger, more revealing or more resounding pratfall. Eisenhower will be haunted by General Motors as Truman was by Mink.

John Foster Dulles: Portrait of A Liberator

No dodger could have been more artful than the new Secretary of State at his confirmation hearing before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. John Foster Dulles managed to convey the impression when questioned by indignant Democrats that the foreign policy planks of the Republican platform were just rhetoric and at the same time to assure Republicans like Taft that he stood by every word in them. At one point Senator Humphrey came close to hitting pay dirt. He wanted to know what was meant by the charge that the Democrats had abandoned friendly nations like the Baltic States, Poland and Czechoslovakia to Communism. Dulles explained that this was a reference to the policy of containment. Humphrey asked whether it wasn't true that the plight of the Baltic States was due to the Stalin-Hitler pact. "Do you recall having made any suggestions at the time," Humphrey queried, "as to how we might relieve the Baltic States?" Dulles, in his best church warden manner, replied that he had made no recommendation because he was "in private life" at the time.

It is a pity Senator Humphrey did not press the point further. The Hitler-Stalin pact sealed the fate of Poland as well as the Baltic States. Dulles, though a private citizen, did make recommendations on the subject at the time. After the fall of Poland, on October 28, 1939, Dulles made a speech in Detroit at the National Council of the Y.M.C.A. declaring that he "saw neither in the origin of the present war, nor in its objectives 'any affirmative reason for the United States to become a participant.'" (NY Times 10/29/39.) In other words, he recommended the abandonment of Poland. The origin of the war lay in Japanese aggression against China and German aggression against Poland. The objectives were to clear the way for German exploitation and enslavement in Eastern Europe, and for Japanese in Asia. Neither origin nor objectives troubled Dulles.

Humphrey went all the way back to a speech Dulles made in 1928 to test the Secretary of State's views on foreign trade. But neither he nor any other Senator touched on the contrast between the equanimity with which Dulles regarded Axis aggression before the war, and the moralistic fervor with which he preaches "liberation" today. The architect of the so-called "peace of reconciliation" with Japan was reconciled from the very first to Japanese and German aggression. A few months after Hitler marched out of Geneva and into the Rhineland, tearing up the arms provisions of the Versailles Pact, Dulles was moved to set forth his views on international politics. His little noticed and long forgotten article for the October, 1935, issue of the *Atlantic Monthly*, called "The Road to Peace" is recommended reading for Inaugural Week. Dulles met the growing international crisis with a defense of the need for force in history which somehow made the aggressed rather than the aggressor seem to blame for what was happening in the world. The road to peace, as Dulles saw it, was to

give Germany, Italy and Japan what they wanted.

Dulles likes to imply that he is an old Wilsonian but he regarded the League as merely a means of imposing French hegemony on Europe. He opposed the non-recognition doctrine applied by the League and by Stimson "with reference to the situation brought about by Japan in Manchuria"—note the phrasing, which avoided any implication of Japanese aggression. Dulles was against non-recognition because it was "merely designed to perpetuate the status quo." Dulles in those days harped so much on the wickedness of trying to maintain the status quo as to make himself sound almost like a revolutionary. Dulles thought it "at least conceivable" that what the Japanese were doing in Manchuria reflected "a logical and inevitable tendency" which "could not be held in suspense until that hypothetical day when China was prepared freely to acquiesce therein." The circumlocutions were lush but the meaning was plain. The legal footwork was downright brilliant. The defendant, far from being guilty of rape, was the helpless victim of the plaintiff's obstinate reluctance to give consent!

Smooth is an inadequate word for Dulles. His prevarications are so highly polished as to be aesthetically pleasurable. Let us look more closely at how he did it in the *Atlantic Monthly* article. He began by saying that the drift to war was bewildering. "Faced by a situation which superficially seems so inexplicable," Dulles wrote, "we adopt the time-honored expedient of postulating a 'personal devil': Hitler, Mussolini and Japanese war lords in turn become the object of our suspicion." Not they, but our overheated imaginations were at fault. We must identify the "underlying forces . . . otherwise we are striking at shadows." The true explanation "of the imminence of war lies in . . . the fact that peace efforts have been directed toward the prevention of change."

Dulles made the desire for stability and peace seem somehow selfish. "Those whose lives fall in pleasant places," he wrote, "contemplate with equanimity an indefinite continuation of their present state. 'Peace' means to them that they should be left undisturbed. . . . 'Aggression' becomes the capital international crime." Notice how Dulles put "aggression" in quotation marks. It was "no mere coincidence," Dulles continued, warming up to his theme, "that it is the presently favored nations—France, Great Britain and the United States—whose governments have been most active in devising plans for perpetual peace." There followed an extraordinary sentence, which the German clients of Sullivan & Cromwell must have relished enormously, "If other countries, like Germany, Japan and Italy," Dulles went on, "adhere only reluctantly if at all to such projects, it is not because these nations are inherently warlike or bloodthirsty. They too want peace but they undoubtedly feel within themselves potentialities which are repressed and desire to keep open avenues of change."

It was all so simple when properly under-

stood. Dulles pleaded the necessity for "a sound body of public opinion ready to throw its influence in favor of appropriate periodical changes in national domains"—no doubt as in Poland and Czechoslovakia. Dulles worked himself up into a positive crescendo of righteousness. "Only in such a way," he concluded, "is it possible to end the unnatural alliance which now exists between liberals and reactionaries, both of whom seek to maintain the status quo, the liberals because they mistakenly think this means peace, and the reactionaries because it perpetuates their exploitation of that which they already have." A man capable of such an argument is a genius of a sort, but not the sort one welcomes as Secretary of State.

Dulles is a man of wily and subtle mind. It is difficult to believe that behind his unctuous manner he does not take a cynical amusement in his own monstrous pomposities. He gives the impression of a man who lives constantly behind a mask. Nowhere else did Dulles venture to indicate his real views on foreign policy as openly as in the article for the *Atlantic Monthly*; his 1939 book, *War, Peace and Change*, cloaks his pro-Axis sympathies in heavy abstractions. When that article is coupled with certain indiscreet outbursts in upstate New York speeches during his 1949 Senate campaign against Lehman, the corporation lawyer's real ideological orientation becomes clear. Dulles, who was never moved to denounce the "statism" of Hitler and Mussolini, said in a speech at Elizabethtown, N. Y., that "bloody" revolution might some day be necessary in this country to combat the "statism" of the New Dealers. The rash remark reflected just such a readiness to use force and violence against social reform as produced Fascism in Germany and Italy. The benign and "realistic" view Dulles took of Fascist expansion was not unrelated to a sympathy of outlook on domestic policy. His New York attacks in the 1949 campaign on "handouts for teachers" and "handouts for farmers," like his opposition to Federal aid for education, are indicative. The "liberation" with which Dulles is concerned is not liberation from dictatorship but liberation from the welfare state.

Barely eight years after the war against the Axis, a Senate committee has unanimously confirmed the nomination as Secretary of State of a man who was and continues to be both pro-German and pro-Japanese. He consistently misconceived and misrepresented the nature of German and Japanese aggression. The Nazi-Soviet pact and the Japanese attack on Pearl Harbor were facilitated by the mental outlook he typified. But no attempt was made at the hearing to explore his views in the past nor was he subject to real questioning as to the policies he proposed for the future. His obsessive hatred for socialism was the kind the Germans and Japanese exploited before and are exploiting again. It is fortunate for this country, Western Europe and China that he was not at the helm of foreign policy before the war. It is unfortunate that he should be now. The same errors may repeat themselves, in a more tragic form.

I. F. Stone's Weekly

• Editor and Publisher, I. F. STONE

Published Weekly at Room 225, 1416 F St., N.W., Washington 4, D. C., 50 times a year. Subscription rates: Domestic, \$5 a year; Canada, Mexico and elsewhere in the Western Hemisphere, \$6; England and Continental Europe, \$10 by 1st class mail, \$15 by air; for Israel, Asia, Australia and Africa, \$10 by first class mail, \$20 by air mail. Single copy, 15 cents. Telephone, STerling 3-0938.

Vol. 1, No. 2 January 24, 1953

COMMENT

Undiplomatic Diplomat

In his address to the Pennsylvania State Bar Association in Scranton, George F. Kennan not only took issue with the "liberation" views of the new Secretary of State but also took out after the witch hunters and stepped on the toes of the protectionists in Congress. Kennan seems determined to retire, but if he does it will be with honor. He termed the pet Dulles idea of stirring "subversion" in the Soviet bloc inconsistent with membership in the United Nations. Unkindest of all was his dry observation that the prospects for success "would be very small indeed, since the problem of civil obedience is not a great problem in the modern police dictatorship." Kennan dug up a magnificently pertinent warning by John Quincy Adams against going abroad "in search of monsters to destroy." He sideswiped protectionism as "inconsistent with the sort of international relationships we require at this juncture." He then threw down a direct challenge to the whole crew of Congressional witch hunters by saying that he could not "recall a single major decision of foreign policy" during his years in the State Department "which Communist influence could have had any appreciable part in determining." On the other hand, he said he had seen "serious damage done . . . to public confidence and to governmental morale by the mishandling of our own measures to counter precisely this problem of Communist penetration." He took a whack at "the inability of many people to distinguish between questions

of loyalty and questions of opinion." Kennan said that "As things stand today, I can see no reason why malicious people should have any particular difficulty in rendering unavailable for service to this country almost any person whom they might select for this treatment. All that is necessary is to release a spate of rumors and gossip and demands for investigation." It looks as if Kennan will soon be as persona non grata in Washington as in Moscow.

Gunning for Big Game

A showdown battle within the Republican party between the respectable elements around Eisenhower and the McCarthy type of crypto-Fascist is likely to be the big story of the coming Administration. There is reason to suspect that the fight will open much sooner than expected, and will center around the nomination of Eisenhower's friend, Gen. Walter Bedell Smith, to be Under Secretary of State. As if in preparation for the Senate debate on confirmation, Senator McCarran secretly reopened hearings a week before the inaugural in the loyalty case of John P. Davies. Davies was one of McCarthy's original targets in the State Department and was recently cleared by the Civil Service Loyalty Review Board. Davies was supported by General Smith, and the favorable verdict must have rankled with the McCarran committee which has been trying for some time to get the Justice Department to indict the diplomat for perjury. The attack on Davies focusses around the allegation that he urged the CIA to employ several alleged Communists, and McCarran seems determined to keep re-hashing it until he gets the verdict he wants. To "get" Davies would also be to "get" Smith, and to throw a chill into the Eisenhower circle itself. Jenner will take over the subcommittee from McCarran, and may be counted on to carry on in the same spirit. An indication of what may be expected on the Senate floor when Smith's name comes up for confirmation is the attack on him in last Saturday's *Chicago Tribune* and *Washington Times-Herald*. Smith is blamed for incompetent handling of intelligence as secretary of the Army General Staff the night before Pearl Harbor, and criticized for his testimony in the Davies case. "One of the tasks of the new administration," said an editorial pub-

lished by McCormick's Siamese twin newspapers, "will be to rout security risks from the (State) department. Smith's position in the Davies case may indicate a softness toward these people."

Whitewash and Red Smear

Whether Kurt Ponger and Otto Verber are guilty of espionage for the Russians is for the courts to determine. But there are obvious political dangers in the "dope" stories coming out of Frankfurt to the effect that the two men were part of a ring recruited during the Nurnberg trials. An anonymous "high American official" was quoted as saying that the arrest "ties in with information showing that too many of the Americans employed at Nurnberg were either Communists or were being used by Communists." Another also anonymous American official was quoted as saying that one of the men who prosecuted the case against Krupp was recently removed from government service as the result of a loyalty check. The effect of all this scuttlebutt is to create the impression that the prosecution was somehow or to some degree a Communist plot. No doubt many Germans will find this a congenial theory. The danger in spreading it is dramatized by the roundup of former Nazis on serious charges in the British zone and the indignation with which the arrests have been greeted by the West German press and government. Nazism is far from dead in Germany, as a new survey by the U. S. High Commissioner in Bonn indicates. It would be most irresponsible and alarming if the Ponger-Verber affair were allowed to become a peg for propaganda putting the whitewash on Nazi criminals by putting the Red smear on the Nurnberg trials.

Hat's Off

To Joseph and Stewart Alsop for their column of January 18 urging the new Attorney General to investigate our present crop of professional informers. Best tidbit they turned up: ex-Red Harvey Matusow recently charged that the Sunday section of the *New York Times* alone has "126 dues-paying Communists." The entire staff of the Sunday section, the Alsops found, only numbers 87, including two part-time office boys.

Help Wanted

The second issue of my weekly is now in your hands. By now you should have some idea of the kind of newspaper I am going to put out. Not the "lowdown," sensational even if untrue, but a sober analysis of facts too often left out or buried on the back pages of the commercial newspapers. I want this paper to form a valuable record of the next four momentous years. The response to my announcement of publication has been wonderfully heartening. You, who have already subscribed, can keep the ball rolling by getting a friend or two to do the same. And will those of you who have not yet gotten around to subscribing do it now by using the form on the back of this issue? Five dollars is not an insignificant sum in these years of inflation but I hope to pack five times five dollars worth of valuable information into these pages each year. With your help I'll be able to do that job.

I. F. Stone

Storm Warnings for the G.O.P.

Mr. Truman's final economic report is embodied in a document of 218 pages. One has to read more than half way through before one begins to get at the truth. The outgoing President's own report to Congress fills the first 27 pages with unabashed self-glorification. Marx ("the false conclusions which Marx drew from the defects of nineteenth century industrialism") bites the dust and the Democrats are credited with establishing something close to the Earthly Paradise. "We achieved in great measure," Mr. Truman said, "the kind of economic society of which the [Full Employment] Act is a symbol—a prosperous and growing economy of free men." It should have been a two color print job, to allow for blushes.

The Council of Economic Advisers begins its own annual economic review on page 35. Its wordy euphemisms are as discreet as those of a grand vizier reporting to a sultan with high blood pressure. At first nothing is said to disturb the glowing picture drawn by the President, but those who persevere will find themselves rewarded. By the time page 110 is reached the Council begins to get down to brass tacks. "Although consumption levels since 1945 have been high, total real per capita consumption has increased very little." One reason appears on page 112, "Contrary to the common impression, average hourly earnings in manufacturing . . . have not risen faster than the economy's general productivity gains, but instead apparently have lagged significantly." Page 113 informs us *sotto voce*, "study of data on corporate profits confirms the need for some relative shift of before-tax income from business to consumers." Manufacturing corporations averaged annually almost 25 percent profit before taxes on their stockholders' equity in the years 1947-50.

Those "defects of nineteenth century industrialism" on which Mr. Truman triumphantly blames the misapprehensions of Marx seem still to be with us. The classic lag of consumption behind output is still observable. While the national output rose 24 percent from 1947 to 1952, per capita income rose less than 10 percent. Consumption took 69 percent of production in the postwar years "up through 1950, and then, under the joint impact of the security program and a higher savings rate, tumbled to about 63 percent in 1951

and 1952." Various forms of foreign subsidy, military preparations and the Korean war have been filling that gap between consumption and output.

The years since the war have seen "an unbroken investment boom." The Council estimates that in 1952 alone about 10 billion dollars in new industrial facilities were made possible by accelerated tax amortization, i.e. paid for in large part by the U.S. Treasury through tax deductions. The vast expansion of American industrial capacity and the high level of employment achieved in the postwar years was due in considerable degree to Rooseveltianism turned upside down; a military WPA enabled business to lean profitably on golden shovels. As Mr. Truman said, one of the safeguards against an economic setback is "a level of public expenditures which, while we all want to see it lower as soon as world conditions permit, stabilizes demand and stimulates private investment." And what if world conditions permit these expenditures to be lowered? What if Stalin should mischievously make peace? Mr. Truman himself admits, "We may face in the future, particularly when defense spending can safely be reduced, more serious tests of our ability to avoid depression than those which have occurred since World War II."

There are other ways than war alarum to prime the pump of business and the Council touches upon them gingerly in the closing pages of its report. Social security payments are ludicrously and shamefully low. Almost two million miserable farm families need to be taken off submarginal lands. Every city has its open sore of slums. The country's highway system has seriously deteriorated. The schools need 600,000 more classrooms by 1958. There is a desperate shortage of hospital space and huge untapped reservoirs of power and mineral wealth to be opened up. Wistfully the Council calls for "full speed ahead with preparatory measures so that development projects . . . may be accelerated promptly as part of a total antirecession economic strategy." This, like the suggestion, that maybe business ought to pay higher wages and be satisfied with lower profits, is unlikely to find full-throated echo among the victorious Republicans. Don't look now while the festivities are on, but something may be waiting around the corner for Eisenhower as It waited for Hoover.

I. F. Stone's Weekly

1-24-53

Room 225 Kellogg Bldg.

1416 F Street, Washington 4, D. C.

Please enter the following subscription. \$5 for 1 year is enclosed. (See page 3 for foreign rates)

Name

Street

City Zone

State

I. F. Stone's Weekly

225 Kellogg Bldg.

1416 F St., Washington 4, D. C.

Sec. 34.66, P.L. and R.

U. S. Postage

PAID

Washington, D. C.

Permit No. 40221

I. F. Stone's Weekly

Vol. I NUMBER 3

January 31, 1953



WASHINGTON, D. C.

15 CENTS

What They Confirmed With Wilson

It would take a Balzac to do justice to the hearings on the nomination of Charles E. Wilson to be Secretary of Defense. The Business Man and the Politician confronted each other, each ready to turn a forgiving eye on the derelictions of his own kind. Senators who had just voted to seat a McCarthy were in no position to be righteous about Wilson's reluctance to dispose of his stock in General Motors. Wilson was taken aback. Had the Republicans not won the election? "I would like to tell you men," he told the Senators at one point, "there is a change in the country. The people are not afraid of businessmen like me right now."

The full transcript of the executive sessions showed that Wilson spoke not with arrogance but with naivete when he said he could not conceive of any conflict of interest in his new position "because for years I thought what was good for our country was good for General Motors, and vice versa." He was proud of his record in industry and proud of his company, as he had a right to be, and genuinely hurt that no one was giving him credit for leaving a \$200,000 a year job. "I am now risking a failure, in my old age," he said. "It is quite a challenge. Now, as far as I am concerned, General Motors is finished. I closed up my desk in Detroit Saturday with mingled feelings of regret and nostalgia." And here he was being treated with suspicion!

The retirement bonus provided that it would go on being paid only if the recipient did nothing inimical to GM's interest. Wilson had this specially changed (a fact which did not appear until the transcripts were released) to read that nothing he did in government service would be considered ineligibility to GM "so that no one would feel like I had any club over me." When Senator Russell still questioned the bonus arrangement at the second hearing, it was more than Wilson could bear. "I know what you are talking about," he said, "but I really feel you are giving me quite a pushing around. If I had come here to cheat, by God, I wouldn't be here."

From a big business man's point of view here were Senators whom he could buy and sell several times over, and perhaps some whom he had. Among their colleagues were men not averse to taking money by various subterfuges and sometimes in plain cash. Sure there were crooks in business as elsewhere, but hardly to match what went on in politics! One could almost hear Wilson's honest indignation.

On the other side, among the politicians, were conservatives like Byrd and Russell with an old-fashioned sense of rectitude and honor, to whom Wilson and his fellow business men must have seemed exasperatingly indifferent to elementary legal standards. The law forbade an official to have an interest in any company with which he negotiated on behalf of the government. Scandalous experience, often repeated, had shown the necessity for such safeguards. Their application was no personal reflection on Wilson; his record in business is, indeed,

an honorable one; no one questions his integrity. But how can you staff a government with business men who have no conception of the conditions necessary for public service!

In the clash between the two points of view, subtler and larger considerations were neglected. The conflict of interest the law sought to avoid required more than the divesting of stock, as Senators Morse, Lehman and Smith tried to make clear in the inadequate one day of debate by the Senate; a man cannot divest himself of his past, his point of view, his accustomed associations. Wilson himself volunteered at one point during the second hearing, "We had exactly the same problem in General Motors: We had a very strict rule that any of our purchasing agents and buyers, none of them should have any interest in any company that they bought from." Was it sound policy to go to the biggest company dealing with the armed forces, and pick its chief executive to head Defense?

Beyond this there was a larger area which went completely unexplored. This has to do with past experience in arms production and industrial mobilization. Wilson's GM and Wilson himself in the mobilization for World War II resisted conversion of automotive facilities to war production, insisted on "business as usual" for months after Pearl Harbor.

The man Wilson picked to be Secretary of the Army, Robert T. Stevens, a textile manufacturer doing a \$125,000,000 business with the Army, was a Colonel buying textiles in the Quartermaster Corps in the last war. When the resignation from the War Production Board of Robert R. Guthrie, in the spring of 1942, focussed attention on the lag in conversion to war, textiles was one of the horrid examples. Wool and jute were being wasted while the army was short of cotton duck. Facilities which could have produced the vital cloth were standing idle. Stevens at one point was prevailed on to force the grant of cotton duck contracts to idle carpet mills, but beyond this the business men in uniform would not go. The record should have been gone into and questions asked.

Above all questions should have been asked of Talbott, Wilson's choice to be Secretary of Air. The post is the most important one of all in many ways. The story disclosed on page two makes Talbott seem a shocking choice for it. Aviation is the one major American industry today which must live or die on war scares. Peace, real peace, would leave it withering on the vine. The air lobby today is what the armorplate and naval lobbies were before World Wars I and II. The Secretary for Air should be free in every way of industry ties; this one is reluctant to divest himself even of the obvious ones. Wilson's choice of Talbott reflects no credit on Wilson. What the Senate confirmed with Wilson was its readiness to acquiesce in handing over war production completely to big business. Experience with these same men and companies in World Wars I or II show that this is unwise from the standpoint of war production, and hazardous for the prospects of peace.

The "Flying Coffins" and Wilson's Air Secretary

Of all the scandals in World War I, the one which most shocked public opinion were the "flying coffins" turned out for the U. S. Air Force. The man who helped to build them is the man C. E. Wilson picked to be Secretary of the Air Force, Harold E. Talbott.

The record of the hearings before the Senate Armed Services Committee shows that Talbott was less than forthright about his past with Wilson and the committee.

Had it not been for Senator Russell of Georgia, the story would have stayed buried. Russell asked Wilson on his first appearance before the committee whether he had checked carefully into the background of the men he had chosen as Secretaries of Army, Navy and Air. Wilson said he had. The Senator from Georgia wanted to know if Wilson had found anything disturbing. Wilson said he had not. Russell asked whether he had looked into the report made by Charles Evans Hughes about Talbott's company, Dayton Wright Aircraft, in World War I.

Wilson said he knew about that: "Harold . . . was repeating it to me again coming over in the car this morning." The briefing seems to have been as simple-minded as it was tardy. "From his angle," Wilson explained, "It was all an attempted shake-down. It was finally all settled on the basis he had done no wrong." Senator Russell asked Wilson whether he thought Charles Evans Hughes would participate in a shake-down. "No, sir," Wilson replied staunchly, "I do not," and admitted he had never read the Hughes report.

Talbott's first description of the affair when before the committee was almost idyllic. Talbott told how his father and C. F. Kettering formed the Dayton Wright Company during World War I. He was then "a youngster" and "had nothing much to do with the negotiations" but "the result of it was that during the period of the war we produced, I think, more aircraft for the Signal Corps than all the rest of America put together." This, though true, was as we shall see nothing to boast about. Talbott didn't think there were "any other things of particular importance in that background."

Again it was Senator Russell who brought up the Hughes report. "The Hughes report on our work," Talbott admitted, "was not complimentary except as to our production." Talbott said "finally it came out in the newspapers that we had been war profiteers, and a suit was brought against us to recover improper profits" but they filed a "counter-suit" and recovered \$600,000 and "we were completely exonerated."

Talbott seems to have begun to worry about this rosy picture after he left the stand. Three days later he sent the Senate committee a letter admitting that the suit had nothing to do with the Hughes report. The Hughes report was in 1918. The government filed suit four years later to recover \$2,500,000 in alleged overpayments. The government finally lost in the Circuit Court of Appeals, but it could not truthfully be said that this verdict "completely exonerated" the Talbotts of the Hughes charges. Talbott also explained in his letter that the

action he referred to as a "counter-suit" was in fact concerned with excess profits taxes "and in no way connected with the litigation mentioned above." Thus, by his own admission, Talbott's picture of complete exoneration and a victorious counter-suit was a false one.

Left uncorrected but equally disingenuous was Talbott's statement that Hughes "was very complimentary as far as our work was concerned." The nearest approach to a compliment in the Hughes report was his dry remark, after a summary of the production snafus, "The provisions of the criminal statutes do not reach inefficiency." As misleading was Talbott's reference to himself as just "a youngster" in those days who "had nothing much to do with the negotiations." Talbott was then already well above the age of consent. He was thirty, and he admitted in response to a question by Russell that he was president of the Dayton Wright Company during World War I.

The fact is that the man now picked by the Republicans as Air Secretary in preparing for World War III was regarded by them thirty years ago as a horrid example of what went on under the Democrats in World War I. Talbott's company was severely criticized in three official investigations: by the Senate Military Affairs Committee inquiry into aircraft production in the early months of 1918, by Hughes in a special inquiry on behalf of the Attorney General later the same year, and by the Republican majority of the House special subcommittee on war expenditures in 1920.

This is the story, as told in the old reports. A man named Col. Edward A. Deeds had been closely associated in business in Dayton, Ohio, with C. F. Kettering and the elder Talbott. In April, 1917, Deeds was put on the Munitions Standards Board in Washington and in May on the Aircraft Production Board. On April 9 of that year Deeds, Kettering and the two Talbotts incorporated the Dayton Wright Airplane Company, but Deeds while an incorporator did not become a stockholder. By September, on the recommendation of the Aircraft Production Board, the new company had cost plus contracts aggregating more than \$30,000,000. In August Talbott senior put himself on the payroll at \$35,000 a year and Talbott junior at \$30,000 a year, though the former was already getting \$60,000 and the latter \$18,000 from the Dayton Metal Products Company which was the "holding company."

"Practically at the inception of the Government's aviation activity in connection with the war," Hughes reported, "and within the sphere of Colonel Deed's important, if not commanding influence, his former business associates were placed at once, through government contracts, in a position where they had the assurance of very large profits upon a relatively small investment of their own money and in addition were able to secure generous salaries which they charged against the Government's part of the cost of manufacturing."

The Senate report which preceded that by Hughes called attention to the fact that "enormous contracts" were given the Dayton Wright

Company "before its factories were completed" while "a number of plane manufacturers . . . in the business years prior to the war, have been unable to obtain contracts." The Senate report said that of the first 1,000 planes delivered many were in such bad shape that they "should never have been permitted to leave the factory in their defective condition." A cable from Pershing reporting the defects in the de Havilland 4's Talbott's company produced covers two full pages of small type in the Senate record. There is also a report forwarded by Josephus Daniels declaring the planes "not safe for flying." The chairman of the Aircraft Production Board was Howard E. Coffin. The planes became known as "flying coffins."

It was not merely the bad quality of the planes but the false reports about the quantity being produced which led to investigation. As early as February 1918 public opinion was led to believe that planes by the thousands were available but Pershing himself said it was not until August 7, 1918, three and a half months before the Armistice that the first squadron—18 planes—finally got into action. An official statement of February 21 that the "first American built battle planes are today en route to the front in France" had set off these over optimistic reports.

Before the Senate Military Affairs Committee on April 2, 1918, Deeds denied under oath that he had seen this statement before it was issued. But before the Hughes inquiry, Deeds admitted that he did see and revise this statement before its release. The Hughes report recommended that Colonel Deeds be court-martialled for giving information on Signal Corps business "in an improper manner" to his former business associates in the Dayton Wright Airplane Company and for giving out "a false and misleading statement with respect to the progress of aircraft production. . . ." The Republican majority of the House special committee on war expenditures complained two years later that Deeds had not been court-martialled. When Senator Russell asked Wilson his opinion of Deeds, Wilson said "A fair and honest man, a capable man also."

Maybe the Senate committee and the House committee and Charles Evans Hughes were wrong. A board of review appointed by the Judge Advocate General voted against court martial for Deeds. Newton D. Baker defended him. What one can say is that Wilson hardly investigated his choice for Air Secretary very thoroughly, and the Armed Services Committee was far from fully informed on the facts. The insistence of Talbott and his associates on keeping their stockholdings recalls what Hughes said in his aircraft report, "The absence of proper appreciation of the obvious impropriety of transactions by government officials and agents of firms or corporations in which they are interested compels the conclusion that public policy demands that the statutory provisions bearing upon this conduct should be strictly enforced." This, the issue involved in the new Eisenhower appointments, is where we came in as World War I drew to its close.

I. F. Stone's Weekly

• Editor and Publisher, I. F. STONE

Published weekly except the last two weeks of August at Room 225, 1416 F St., N.W., Washington 4, D. C. Subscription rates: Domestic, \$5 a year; Canada, Mexico and elsewhere in the Western Hemisphere, \$6; England and Continental Europe, \$10 by 1st class mail, \$15 by air; for Israel, Asia, Australia and Africa, \$10 by first class mail, \$20 by air mail. Single copy, 15 cents. Contents covered by copyright. Telephone, STerling 3-0938. Application for entry as Second Class matter is pending.

Vol. 1, No. 3  January 31, 1953

Wrong Way to Water The Tree of Liberty

The Emergency Civil Liberties Committee is holding a conference on the bill of rights in New York City this week-end. The conference has been attacked by the American Committee for Cultural Freedom of which Prof. George S. Counts of Columbia is chairman. Irving Kristol, its executive director, first attacked the Emergency Civil Liberties Committee as a Communist front and then lamely "admitted" (according to the New York Times of January 20) "that he had no knowledge that 'outright Communists' were among the sponsors and said it would have been more tactful to use the phrase 'popular front' instead of 'Communist front'." For these graceful amenities of political controversy in the USA, 1953, the editor as a member of the committee and a participant in the conference is grateful. He would feel more grateful if the American Committee for Cultural Freedom for once did something about cultural freedom in this country, where much can still be accomplished, and worried less about Berlin and points East thereof. The latter is one of those de luxe crusades which can be carried on in the warm assurance that neither McCarran nor McCarthy will ever disapprove.

As soon as a medal can be struck off, the Weekly will send one to James C. Bay, superintendent of public schools in Easton, Pa., for

his telegram to the Emergency Civil Liberties Committee, which answers Dr. Counts in the kind of terms called for by this high level controversy. "Strongly urge holding conference and forum as planned," Dr. Bay wired. "Program will be incomplete without exposure of background of Counts who was documented Red in 1935. Underwent brain washing and became uncivil opponent of civil rights. The withering tree of liberty should not be further wet by dogs who were once Communist pups, viz., Counts, Hook, Budenz, Bentley, Dodd."

Honorable mention in the controversy goes to the ever tart and courageous Prof. H. H. Wilson, who teaches politics at Princeton in the free tradition and will yet be heard from in a big way, as was another Wilson out of Princeton before him. On receiving a wire from Dr. Counts saying that he was "distressed" to learn that Wilson was taking part in the civil liberties conference, Prof. Wilson replied, "Regret your illness. Suggest immediate psychiatric care. Prospects of American democracy dim. Quote, the situation is made to order for the demagogic, the charlatan, the adventurer, the madman. Unquote." The quotation was from Dr. Counts' book, "The Prospects of American Democracy," published in 1938. It's bad enough to see liberals turn rabbit under pressure. It's worse to take rabbits seriously when they begin to hunt their old friends in packs, making like wolves.

Wigmore Himself

The Supreme Court's refusal of certiorari in the Baltimore-Washington Smith Act cases is discussed on page four of this issue. The verdict in the trial of the 13 Communists in New York will be the subject of comment next week. I have just finished reading Judge Dimock's charge to the jury and I doubt whether the great Wigmore himself ("Wigmore on Evidence") would understand it, much less an ordinary juror. This is no reflection on Judge Dimock, but the effort to explain the Talmudic subtleties of conspiracy to advocate on top of the more familiar difficulties of reconciling free speech with unlawful advocacy resulted in something close to parody. I hope to provide sufficient samplings next week to turn Max Beerbohm green with envy. The ef-

fort to treat unpopular political ideas as crime must end by making the Federal courts deservedly ludicrous.

Jim Crow in the Capital

Those with a taste for caviarish legal humor of the unintended variety will enjoy the 61 pages in which the nine judges of the U. S. Circuit Courts of Appeals for the District of Columbia decide 5-4 in three separate opinions that a local ordinance of 1872 forbidding restaurants to discriminate against colored persons is not valid. The majority among other things argues the proposition that Jim Crow laws are within the province of municipal government, but laws against Jim Crow are not. The majority also argues that the old ordinance if valid has lost its efficacy through disuse, learnedly citing *James v. Commonwealth* in which the Supreme Court of Pennsylvania decided 125 years ago that the ducking stool was no longer a proper mode of punishment, though still on the statute books. The majority also turned up with a decision out of the days of rugged individualism holding that the city of Washington had exceeded its proper powers as a municipality in ordering a freeborn American to shovel the snow off his sidewalk. Such were the majestic libertarian precedents marshalled by the revered senior judges of this Circuit in defense of the proposition that no decent fellow would want to have his sister forced to masticate a ham on rye beside a Nigra, suh. The younger Fair Deal and New Deal judges, Fahy, Edgerton, Bazelon and Washington, argued in vain against the South's peculiar prejudice, and the issue is now up to the Supreme Court.

Hat's Off

To Dr. James Bryant Conant, outgoing president of Harvard, on the eve of becoming U. S. High Commissioner in Germany, for his defense of dissent and his warning to the Congressional witch-hunters. Instead of being sent to Germany on the hopeless task of de-Nazifying the Germans, Dr. Conant ought to stay home and help us de-Nazify some of our fellow Americans. The District of Columbia could use a U. S. High Commissioner like Dr. Conant.

Neither Rain nor Snow But . . .

Weeklies go to press on Mondays or Tuesdays and are dated the following week-end when the paper is delivered. They are dated ahead to give the reader the illusion that he is getting his news by jet-propelled carrier pigeon. We engage in the same flim-flam. We are dated Saturday. Our final copy deadline is the previous Tuesday morning. We are mailed off in Washington on Wednesday afternoon, and there—with all due respect to the new Postmaster General—is where the trouble begins. Our first issue dated the 17th was mailed right on the dot of the 14th, but it did not begin to be delivered in New York until the following Wednesday. A second hand covered wagon could have done better.

The second issue dated January 24 was mailed on the 21st, right on schedule, but again the postman, whom rain, snow, hail, nor spring fever, delays, set no Olympic record in getting there most cities (except Washington itself). The first went out third class. This issue goes out on second class permit pending, and should arrive more swiftly. Send me your beefs. I will share them with the Postmaster General, who has little else to worry about now that inaugural is over. And don't forget to prod your friends into subscribing with that handy subscription blank on page 4, or give me their names and I'll send them a sample.

I. F. Stone

The Supreme Court Breaks Its Word

The U. S. Supreme Court made a promise in upholding the conviction of the top 11 Communist leaders under the Smith Act. The Court said that in future cases "Where there is doubt as to the intent of the defendants, the nature of their activities, or their power to bring about the evil, this Court will review the convictions with the scrupulous care demanded by our Constitution."

There were several reasons for this pledge. In the first case the Court passed only on the issue of constitutionality. The Court implied that it would grant review of the other issues in later cases. Another reason for the promise was to underscore the Court's insistence that it was not outlawing the Communist party nor making membership in it a crime. Future prosecutions were to require proof of each accused individual's own intent and activities. A third reason for the Court's promise of "scrupulous care" in later cases was to allay misgivings expressed in conservative circles (Washington Star, Sept. 20, 1952; NY Times, Aug. 7, 1952) lest conviction of the leaders open the way for mass prosecutions.

This promise, at its very first test, has been broken by the court, in refusing to review the convictions of six lesser Communists from Baltimore and Washington. The refusal to review is made striking by the character of the U. S. Circuit Court decision in these cases. The Fourth Circuit went further than any other court in Smith Act cases in making membership in the Communist party automatic grounds for conviction. The standards indicated by the Supreme Court—"intent . . . nature of their activities . . . power to bring about the evil"—were violated by the trial judge in instructing the jury and by the Circuit Court in upholding the convictions. There was no evidence produced to show that any of these six defendants intended the overthrow of the government by force, carried on activities to achieve that end or had the power to bring about the evil feared.

From the standpoint of the legal proprieties the question of intent was crucial. The Smith Act makes it a crime to advocate revolutionary doctrine or to organize a party for such advocacy. The statute does not require that this must be with intent to overthrow the government. Mere philosophical discussion could thus become a crime. Judge Medina shrewdly felt in

the first trial that without such a requirement the statute might be unconstitutional. He in effect revised the statute by instructing the jury that for conviction they must find intent. Chief Justice Vinson echoed Medina in saying "We hold that the statute requires as an essential element of the crime proof of the intent of those who are charged with its violation to overthrow the government by force and violence." But in the Baltimore-Washington cases the trial judge permitted the jury to infer intent from the fact of party membership.

The feebleness of this conviction-by-inference is thrown into sharp relief by the character of the testimony. The government produced five witnesses who had been in the Maryland-Washington district of the Communist party during the period of the indictment. Four had been working for the FBI while they were in the party. There was no evidence, however, that any defendant had advocated overthrow. On the contrary, two of the FBI informers testified that they had never heard any defendant suggest such doctrine. The case rested essentially, like all the Smith Act cases, on what Marx, Lenin and Stalin at various times wrote. This is guilt by association with ideas.

The judicial conscience is comfortably elastic, but the Baltimore-Washington cases stretched it a bit far even for Vinson and the Truman appointees. As for Jackson and Frankfurter, their failure to vote for review with Black and Douglas is a surrender to reaction. Their queasy concurring opinions in the first Communist case indicated with what misgivings they regard prosecutions of opinion when divorced, as these are, from the safeguards of the clear and present danger rule. Their eloquent warnings a few years ago in the Krulwich case against the historic political dangers in conspiracy prosecutions makes inexplicable their apparent failure to vote for review.

The muddy metaphysics of the law of "conspiracy" has traditionally been the favorite concealment for dirty business on the part of the prosecution. But there is in the Baltimore-Washington cases much which goes beyond even the flabby standards of proof normally allowed in conspiracy trials. To deny the pending petition for rehearing would make it seem that the Court was prepared to acquiesce in the removal of all restraint on wholesale Smith Act arrests.

I. F. Stone's Weekly 1-31-53
 Room 225 Kellogg Bldg.
 1416 F Street, Washington 4, D. C.

Please enter the following subscription. \$5 for 1 year is enclosed. (See page 3 for foreign rates)

Name

Street

City Zone

State

I. F. Stone's Weekly
 225 Kellogg Bldg.
 1416 F St., Washington 4, D. C.

Application for
 Second Class Entry
 Is Pending

I. F. Stone's Weekly

COPYRIGHT 1953 BY I. F. STONE'S WEEKLY, INC.

VOL. I NUMBER 4

FEBRUARY 7, 1953



WASHINGTON, D. C.

15 CENTS

Formosan Flea and Chinese Elephant

Only the ultra-respectable *Washington Star* told the truth about John Foster Dulles's first address as Secretary of State. The *Star* spoke of his "gross oversimplification and wishful thinking." The prize example was his hint that Eisenhower "will find the ways" to make the enemy "change his mind" about Korea and Indo-China. The remark tantalized Capitol Hill. When Dulles met two days later with Congressional leaders of both parties just before he left for Europe, he revealed what the new Administration had in mind. Next day the news leaked. The wraps were to be taken off Chiang.

The notion that the Korean war can be ended by "sicking" the Formosan flea on the Chinese elephant reflects an exuberant childishness for which the older hands of the State Department must blush. Only a few weeks ago the Brookings Institution, scholarly arm of American conservatism, published a book on the Formosan problem by Joseph W. Ballantine, long Director of the Department's Office of Far Eastern Affairs, and as ideologically impeccable as a D.A.R. soiree. Ballantine permitted himself an astringent footnote on the delusions so soon to turn up in the thinking of the new Administration.

The assumption, Ballantine wrote, "that Chiang Kai-shek is ready and eager to take his legions to fall upon the Chinese Communists and is being restrained from doing so only by the interposition of the U. S. Seventh Fleet would be fallacious". Ballantine said Chiang did not have the resources for an amphibious invasion of the mainland and declared "there is nothing in Chiang's past record to suggest that he would embark on such an undertaking unless his venture were substantially underwritten by the United States or the United Nations or both". Air and sea raids on a hit-and-run basis "could produce no decisive results", Ballantine warned. "Their chief effect would be to intensify Chinese Communist hostility to their authors and drive the Chinese people, especially those suffering from the raids, into the arms of the Communists".

The way in which Eisenhower unveiled the new policy to Congress was no doubt regarded by its authors as devilishly clever. The new President said he was "issuing instructions that the Seventh Fleet no longer be employed to shield Communist China". After that sentence, one half expected to hear that we were also shutting off Marshall Plan aid to Mao Tse-tung. The effort to make public opinion swallow such feeble stuff must add a slight nausea to the general alarm.

Several days before the President's message, Chiang's representative in the United Nations made a fiery speech saying "give us the tools" for "an independent offensive" against the "puppet regime on the mainland", but he cooled off very quickly once permission came. "Invasion by Chiang Held Not Imminent" was the *New York Times* headline over a new interview with that same Dr. T. F. Tsiang, and the news from Formosa was in the same key.

It must be remembered that the Korean war was immediately advantageous for Chiang because it diverted northward the troops the Communists had prepared for the invasion of Formosa. He has no wish to divert them back again. Chiang has opposed a cease-fire in Korea on the ground that this would merely encourage "new Red aggression" elsewhere. The "elsewhere" he fears is Formosa. What he wanted was to send a token force to Korea, with which he could buy himself a full place in the Western alliance and commit it to war against Communist China. There is no reason to believe he is anxious to expose his Formosan base to attack in order to end the war further North which was his salvation in 1950 and remains his last hope of a free ride back to power.

From the standpoint of our own forces in Korea, even large scale attacks on the mainland from Formosa would not be enough to change the situation on the 38th Parallel and the Yalu. The Chinese have been mobilized and equipped since 1950 to the point where they can maintain the Korean stalemate and still defend their coastal areas. We are pointing a popgun at Peiping's head. The new policy offers a maximum of provocation with a minimum of real annoyance to the enemy. As psychological warfare, it may be effective, indeed is already proving effective, but in the wrong places. Everywhere in Asia and Europe it has upset our friends.

The Japanese are happy to do the profitable business the Korean war has brought them, but have no wish to be engulfed in a widened conflict. The Burmese are afraid the new policy may encourage the unwelcome Nationalists on their territory to raid across the Chinese border. The Indians and Indonesians have feared from the beginning that American power would gradually be committed to reconquering China for Chiang.

The utmost candor on foreign policy is promised by Dulles and Eisenhower, but the key question was left unanswered. "Members of Congress," the *Associated Press* reported after the State of the Union address, "were greatly interested to learn what would be the use, if any, of the 7th Fleet, in the event the Chinese Communists attacked Formosa". Western Europe will be less patient than Congress in demanding the answer. Churchill has already done some premonitory grumbling about the folly of leading U. S. and UN armies into wandering endlessly about in the vast expanse of China. Here Bevan and Churchill see eye to eye.

Everywhere in Western Europe neutralism and fear of American rashness will be intensified. The blackmail implicit in the Dulles-Stassen tour of inspection will add to the growing strain on the Atlantic Alliance, on whose breakdown Stalin counts. The errors of the new American policy are so consistent as to appear calculated. One could almost suspect that under the Republicans the Communists really had infiltrated the State Department.

"Suppressed" Red Cross Reports on POW Disorders

The United Nations Command in Tokyo on January 29 released a five page statement and a 50-page intelligence report charging that riots in which more than 200 prisoners of war were killed in UN camps last year had been "deliberately planned and master-minded" by the top Communist armistice negotiators.

Similar charges had been made before but never in so official and formal a manner. It was the first time that responsibility for the disorders had been pinned directly on Gen. Nam Il, the senior Communist representative at the truce talks, and his deputy, Gen. Lee Sang Cho.

The charges may be intended to lay a basis for calling off the truce talks altogether, and for full-scale resumption of the war, perhaps on a wider basis than before. The cabled news summaries from Tokyo were sensational but tantalizingly vague. Until the release and the intelligence report are made available in full text, judgment must be suspended.

But the charges would be more credible if it were not for the fact that representatives of the Red Cross investigated these disorders on the spot last year and made a series of reports. In these the UN Command was criticized for mishandling and mistreating prisoners of war.

That there had been a series of such investigations and reports was disclosed only recently, when the International Committee of the Red Cross published two volumes of documents in Geneva on "The Korean Conflict". They appeared last December. A copy has just been obtained by this weekly from the Red Cross in Geneva after the editor's curiosity was piqued by an obscure press release put out by the State Department on December 22.

This was the second time in little more than half a year that Red Cross material bearing on the actual conditions surrounding POW camp disorders has been published in Geneva but effectively suppressed insofar as public opinion in the United States is concerned. The first occasion was last May when Reuters briefly reported that the April issue of the *Revue Internationale de la Croix Rouge* in Geneva had carried the report of a Red Cross inquiry into the "incident" of February 18 last on Koje Island. At that time one American soldier and 69 Korean POW's were killed, and 142 prisoners injured.

The editor of this weekly translated the Red Cross report from the French original and published the full text in his column in the *New York Daily Compass* last May 27 after his attention was called to it by an item in the *London Diary of the New Statesman and Nation* for May 24. That report on the Koje Island killings of February 18 and the two new volumes make it difficult to believe that the POW disorders were simply a Communist plot.

Another obstacle lies in the nature of the prisoners involved in the February 18 affair. Document No. 238 dated December 27, 1951, reports to the Red Cross "certain confidential information received . . . from the Department of the Army of the United States". Investigation of prisoners had "thus far disclosed the presence of 37,500 persons whose detention is attributable to various accidental circum-

stances attendant upon the confusion of hostilities and who were inaccurately classified as prisoners of war". These were almost entirely South Koreans. "They have been reclassified," the report to the Red Cross said, "as civilian internees and are segregated in camps distinct and apart from the prisoners of war".

If disorders were due solely to Communist fanatics in secret touch with the Communist command, one would not expect trouble with South Koreans accidentally captured in the war. But as a matter of fact the worst disorder, that of February 18, occurred in camps on Koje holding these very same "civilian internees".

The report published by the Red Cross last May after the February killings said that some of these internees had asked to be sent back to North Korea after the armistice and that the camp authorities thereupon ordered a new screening. A camp trusty told the Red Cross delegates that the internees "would not allow themselves to be questioned anew, alleging that pressure had been brought to bear on them during their first interrogation". The Red Cross delegates warned the commander against an attempt to rescreen by force. The killings occurred when armed troops moved into the camp without warning at 4 a.m. on February 18 in an effort to force each of these "civilian internees" to be rescreened individually. According to the camp trusty, the internees were "seized with fear, thinking they were all going to be killed. The internees went out to defend themselves and to see what was going on. The troops attacked them, using their arms".

That interrogations were not always peaceful efforts to poll the opinions of prisoners is indicated by the first Red Cross complaints recorded in the new volumes. Document No. 220 dated November 19, 1951, is a letter to the State Department enclosing copies of reports on visits by Red Cross delegates to six different POW camps. The texts of the reports themselves are not given but the letter refers to "the serious and regrettable incidents" in them. The letter calls attention among other things to "ill-treatment of POW during interrogation by Republic of Korea guards".

The Red Cross delegates seemed to acquire a poor opinion of the Korean guards employed in the POW camps. Document No. 341 dated March 13, 1952, refers to an incident of February 13 "where according to the statement of the Enclosure Commander a ROK-guard posted outside Compound 76 killed a POW inside the Compound using his firearm without any serious reason" and says this "shows once more the danger of serious incidents between ROK-guards and POW's." It is suggested that ROK guards not be used in handling Communist POW's and that "Katusas" (apparently some kind of Korean guards) "who are unable to refrain themselves from provoking incidents" should be transferred.

Document No. 349 dated May 12, 1952, is an aide memoire from the Red Cross to the American consul general in Geneva dealing with the "grave occurrences" in Camp No. 1 on Koje-do on March 13 and April 10 when prisoners were killed. The Red Cross says,

"In the dual circumstances it appears that the firing constitutes a violation of Article 42 of the Geneva convention of 1949". The Red Cross made two recommendations. One was that South Koreans be withdrawn as guards.

The other recommendation throws none too complimentary a light on the "political education" of POW's in the UN camps. The Red Cross asked "Avoidance of political demonstrations of any kind, and in particular of the continuance of the political program of the C.I.E. for the education of prisoners of war". The document adds, "Political questions do not in general concern the International Committee of the Red Cross, but it thought it should raise the present issue in view of its humanitarian aspects, political activities being a constant source of incidents".

Serious charges against the UN Command in handling sick POW's in a hospital compound are made in Document No. 351, dated May 24, 1951. This is a memorandum to the commander in chief of the UN forces. It declares "the withholding of food and water from the Prisoners of War in three hospital compounds of UN POW Enclosure No. 10 constitutes an infringement of article 26 of the Geneva convention" which forbids "collective disciplinary measures affecting food". The Red Cross memo adds, "The infringement is all the more serious as this measure was applied to hospital patients (post-operative cases, tuberculosis cases, mental cases and amputees)".

More drastic measures seem also to have been employed. "Furthermore," the memo continues, "concussion grenades were used against patients in compound No. 3 . . . which caused at least one death and several wounded". The memo insists that the Geneva convention requires "the most humane methods when dealing with hospital patients" and ends "Therefore the Chief of the delegation of the International Committee of the Red Cross has the honor to request from the Commander in Chief to refrain in future from making use of coercive measures of the kind mentioned above."

The reply from General Mark W. Clark is given in Document No. 353, dated June 12, 1952. The prisoners in the hospital compounds are accused of flagrantly defying orders. The denial of food and water to the rebellious is defended as "a much more lenient step than . . . the immediate application of armed force". When force proved necessary "only tear gas and concussion grenades" were used and "the relatively few casualties incurred is highly indicative of the efficient manner in which our disciplined troops conducted this action".

At this point the Communist plot theory made its debut. "It has become increasingly evident," General Clark went on, "that such incidents, deliberately planned by hard-core Communist leaders, have been designed solely to embarrass the United Nations Command and to affect current armistice negotiations". The theory recalls the familiar one which makes its appearance when pickets are beaten in strikes. How often it is implied that the strikers deliberately went and got themselves beaten up in order to embarrass the police!

I. F. Stone's Weekly

• Editor and Publisher, I. F. STONE

Published weekly except the last two weeks of August at Room 225, 1416 F St., N.W., Washington 4, D. C. Subscription rates: Domestic, \$5 a year; Canada, Mexico and elsewhere in the Western Hemisphere, \$6; England and Continental Europe, \$10 by 1st class mail, \$15 by air; for Israel, Asia, Australia and Africa, \$10 by first class mail, \$20 by air mail. Single copy, 15 cents. Contents covered by copyright. Telephone, STerling 3-0938. Application for entry as Second Class matter is pending.

Vol. 1, No. 4 February 7, 1953

Atomic Crisis

Washington, D. C.

The Trumans are a long-lived family and the ex-President in his sixties is developing into the nation's foremost *enfant terrible*. His offhand statement that he is not convinced the Russians have the atom bomb was the biggest explosion here in Washington since Hiroshima. If intended as psychological warfare, it was magnificent. The Russians must figure that any government Macchiavellian enough to pretend to act as goofily as the American government does must be up to super-sinister tricks.

Those of us who know official Washington's capacity for confusion will wonder. The original White House announcement in September, 1949, spoke of an atomic explosion. General Groves who was head of the A-bomb project during the war chimes in to say that nuclear explosions in Russia do not prove "they have the bomb in a workable form". Mr. Truman's actual words were "I am not convinced the Russians have achieved the know-how to put the complicated mechanism together to make the A-bomb work". He added, pointedly, "no-body knows anything about it".

In a rationally organized world, the possibility that the Russians do not yet have the bomb in full workable form would be seized on as occasion for another attempt to outlaw the device before we and they blow ourselves to smithereens. But in the U. S. as now organ-

ized, Mr. Truman's remark must have seemed terrifyingly dangerous to a large number of important people. It might almost be said, as it was said of God, that if there is no Russian atomic bomb, it will be necessary to invent one.

The American vested interest in a Russian atomic bomb is large. Thousands of American jobs and careers now depend upon it. Almost three billion dollars in the new budget is allocated to the manufacture of the A-bomb and its successor, the H-bomb. Nobody knows how many billions more are being spent on planes to deliver the bomb, naval carriers to deliver the planes, FBI men to guard the secret and baksheesh for the natives of such primitive areas as Morocco and Britain in which we have established atomic bases.

The political and financial consequences which would follow on the discovery that the Russians do not have the bomb after all are too terrible to contemplate. As a measure of precaution we suggest that our most hush-hush counter-espionage apparatus be alerted at once for its most daring mission. The security of the United States, indeed of the whole free world, men, now depends on delivering the secret, with sample and blueprint at Stalin's door.

One for The Voice of America

While we're on the subject, the new administration could win no greater political victory than by granting clemency to the Rosenbergs. In Eastern Europe, commutation of sentence broadcast by the Voice of America would provide a striking contrast to the trials in which so many Communists are being tried on the charge that (like the Rosenbergs) were of "bourgeois Jewish" origin. In Western Europe, clemency would demonstrate that the U. S. was still capable of just, humane and moderate action even where the A-bomb is concerned.

Whatever else one may think about the trial and the verdict, there can be no doubt among civilized men that the sentence was barbarous. The motives of the American government in commuting the sentence would be distorted by hostile propaganda, as magnanimity is always misrepresented by one's enemies. But

in the long run no calumny could mar the shining serenity of such an action.

Those Diabolic Doctors

We strongly endorse the appeal made by Dr. Aryeh L. Kubovy, recently declared persona non grata as Israeli Minister to Czechoslovakia and Poland, that physicians throughout the Western world ask the Soviet government to permit foreign observers to be present at the forthcoming public trial of the nine doctors recently arrested in Moscow. The charges on their face are too hideous to be credible; melodrama sometimes occurs in real life but is properly suspect until fully proven. The trial must shame and hurt the Jews of the Soviet world, whatever its motives. Those of us who are friends of the Soviet Union and fight for the rights of Communists have a right to demand that foreign medical and legal experts be allowed to attend. The Nazis even allowed foreign counsel to participate in the Leipzig trial. The Soviet Union owes it to itself and to the world socialist movement at least to allow qualified and independent foreign observers.

Before some of my readers fly off the handle about this suggestion, I ask them in all honesty to look again at the Rosenberg case. The trial and its atmosphere were far from fair but the Rosenbergs had counsel of their own, were not subject to torture for the extraction of confessions, were allowed to communicate with their friends. Despite the anti-Communism of the American government, Communists were allowed to organize and agitate freely for the Rosenbergs, even to picket the White House without being molested. We independents of the Left still smart from the arrogant and high-handed way Anna Louise Strong was branded a spy without proof after a lifetime of service to the world working class, and cast out of Moscow like a dog. The case against the doctors is too much to swallow without some independent means of checking the procedure and the verdict. The implications and repercussions for the Jews of Eastern Europe are too serious for silence. The Soviet Union owes it to itself and to its friends to demonstrate that this is a real case, and not a frame-up.

Thank You, Daniel Webster

We can say of ourselves much as Daniel Webster said of his alma mater in the famous Dartmouth College case, "It is only a small paper, sir, but there are those who love it". (There are also, we suspect, those who will denounce it alternate issues, when one of their own sacred cows has its tootsies stepped upon). We passed 6,000 circulation with the third issue, but need a few thousand more to be comfortable and to expand a bit. As a pepper-upper we offer a free copy of my forthcoming book, "The Truman Era", with every two subscriptions. The book is a collection of my best pieces from PM, the New York Star and the Compass during the post-war years and will sell at \$3.50. Those who would rather can buy it through the Weekly in advance of publication at \$2 a copy, or get a one year subscription and the book for \$6.

I. F. Stone

Counter Offensive for Civil Liberty

One happy by-product of the Republican victory was the displacement of Pat McCarran as chairman of the powerful Senate Judiciary Committee by William Langer of North Dakota, the only Republican who fought to uphold President Truman's veto of the McCarran Internal Security Act. This battle-scarred veteran of the old Non-Partisan League, who campaigned for La Follette in 1924, is the relic of heroic days in the history of American progressivism and may yet play a great role as the defender of fundamental American principles in these critical years. Langer dramatized the significance of his succession to the Judiciary chairmanship by picking the conference in New York last week-end of the Emergency Civil Liberties Committee for his first public speech since the election.

The speech made news. Senator Langer announced that he was implementing a forgotten provision of the La Follette-Monroney Act of 1946, giving the Judiciary Committee exclusive jurisdiction in the field of civil liberties. He disclosed that he had appointed a civil liberties subcommittee with himself as chairman. The other members will be Dirksen of Illinois and Hendrickson of New Jersey from the Republican side, with Kefauver of Tennessee and Hennings of Missouri from the Democratic side. The Senate Judiciary Committee, which concentrated on destroying civil liberty under McCarran, will now provide a vehicle for defending civil liberty, the first Senate committee of the kind since the pre-war La Follette Civil Liberties Committee.

Last week-end's conference was also made memorable by one of the rare public appearances of Alexander Meiklejohn. The emergence for the occasion of the distinguished educator and philosopher, who has been living in retirement in California, was a moral and political victory for the Emergency Civil Liberties Committee, the best answer to the attacks upon it by George Counts and the American Committee for Cultural Freedom. Dr. Meiklejohn took the offensive on a philosophical plane. His target was a passage in Mr. Justice Frankfurter's concurring opinion in the Dennis case, upholding the conviction of the top leadership of the Communist party under the Smith Alien and Sedition Act.

The passage which drew Dr. Meiklejohn's fire was that in which Mr. Justice Frankfurter cited the words in which an

earlier Supreme Court in *Robertson vs. Baldwin* disparaged and subtly nullified the Bill of Rights. The Court said the first ten amendments "were not intended to lay down any novel principles of government, but simply to embody certain guarantees and immunities which we had inherited from our English ancestors". This interpretation is as ancient as it is noxious. In relying upon it Mr. Justice Frankfurter lined himself up with the Federalist judges who expounded it during the Alien and Sedition period of the 1790's.

This view is historically inaccurate. The England of the time had an Established Church; its common law subjected freedom of speech and press to the onerous restrictions of seditious libel and constructive treason; its Parliament unlike Congress was and is supreme. From the English point of view not only the First Amendment but the treason provisions of the Constitution and its restrictions on legislative power were novel and revolutionary. The point is more than a distant abstraction, and was worth the gifts of exposition and scholarship Dr. Meiklejohn expended upon it. For the doctrine revived by Mr. Justice Frankfurter would cloak with a spurious intellectual respectability the drive to allow Congress to restrict freedom of speech, press and assembly, though the First Amendment clearly says Congress may not abridge them.

The fight being waged by the Emergency Civil Liberties Committee is the same fight the Jeffersonians waged more than a century and a half ago on precisely the same constitutional issue. They won then. We are not yet defeated today. The high calibre of the men who took part in the panels and the character of the discussion from the floor were inspiring. Among the thousand persons who attended were people from as far off as the State of Washington. The fact that they came so far in so difficult a period, despite smear attack, showed that the libertarian spirit is far from dead in this country. It is no small reward and no weak sustenance to feel, as those who participated must, that on us few, weak and inadequate as we may be, rests the fate of the traditions which have made our country great in the eyes of all mankind in the past. Such handfuls of men have determined the course of history before and can again. There will be another conference in March to speed organization at the grass roots, on a community level.

I. F. Stone's Weekly

2-7-53

Room 225 Kellogg Bldg.

1416 F Street, Washington 4, D. C.

Please enter the following subscription. \$5 for 1 year is enclosed. (See page 3 for foreign rates)

Name

Street

City Zone

State

I. F. Stone's Weekly

225 Kellogg Bldg.

1416 F St., Washington 4, D. C.

Application for
Second Class Entry
Is Pending

I. F. Stone's Weekly

COPYRIGHT 1953 BY I. F. STONE'S WEEKLY, INC.

VOL. I NUMBER 5

FEBRUARY 14, 1953



WASHINGTON, D. C.

15 CENTS

The Democrats Move Into Opposition

The big news of the week is that the Democratic party has begun to act as an opposition on foreign policy. The extent of that opposition is limited, its future course is uncertain, its leaders are timid. Yet the attack in the Senate by Sparkman and his colleagues on the foolhardy recklessness of the "bold new policy" in the Far East may prove of first-rate political importance. It made one major party in this country the sounding board for the same alarm which Western Europe and the Asian neutrals feel over the deneutralization of Formosa, the talk of blockading China and bombarding Manchuria. With the disappointing news Dulles and Stassen brought back from their European trip, opposition by the Democrats may help put a brake on an Administration moving giddily toward a general Asian and world conflict.

What rankled with the Democrats and made opposition an urgent matter of party politics was the too clever way Eisenhower described Truman's Formosa order in his State of the Union message. To say, as Eisenhower did, that its purpose was to protect the Communists on the mainland from the Nationalists on Formosa was too much for the most submissive Democrat to swallow. "Against the background of the accusation that our policy has been dominated by pro-Communists," Fulbright of Arkansas pointed out angrily, "such a statement certainly was unfortunate." Sparkman chimed in, "I certainly think it was, particularly when it is coupled with a very fine plea in behalf of a bipartisan foreign policy." Next as a source of irritation was the failure to consult the Democrats. Sparkman said they were warned that an announcement on Formosa was coming but "there was no consultation so far as developing a policy was concerned."

The debate, coming as it did three days after the Eisenhower message, had the marks of a well planned demonstration. There was an almost contrapuntal neatness about the interruptions with which Fulbright, Lehman, Kerr, Johnston of South Carolina, Gillette, Monroney, Magnuson and Douglas emphasized the main points of the Sparkman speech and helped develop the theme with just the right leading questions. Then there was a coy by-play which seemed more than coincidental. Magnuson asked the Senator from Alabama "whether the Joint Chiefs of Staff were consulted prior to this order," that is the order to deneutralize Formosa. Sparkman replied, "I have read an article by a columnist who says they were not consulted." Thereupon, without asking what columnist, Magnuson asked permission to put in the Congressional Record a column by Marquis Childs which had appeared in the Washington Post that morning. Sparkman joined in the request.

What Childs reported was indeed sensational. He said that the Joint Chiefs were told such a move was being considered but that Eisenhower would reject it and that paragraphs drafted for inclusion in the message on the subject "were torn up and thrown in the wastebasket." Childs said

this was the last the Joint Chiefs heard of the matter until they saw the Formosan recommendation in the State of the Union message. The answer to Magnuson's question, according to Childs, was that the "wraps" had been taken off Chiang "without the prior knowledge of the Joint Chiefs." Childs is one of the ablest men writing in the capital but it is hard to believe that this column appeared the very morning of the debate without the prior knowledge of Sparkman, or that Sparkman would have relied upon it unless he had verified the facts directly with the chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, General Omar Bradley. The Formosan move was a victory for MacArthur and his allies over Bradley, long an opponent of fighting the wrong war at the wrong time and the wrong place. The affair makes one suspect a hidden play from Bradley to Sparkman, with a "leak" to Childs just in time for the debate.

Always the cautious politician, Sparkman was almost ludicrous at times in his effort to lead the opposition and still protect his rear. At one point, as Wiley, chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee was about to leave the chamber, Sparkman said he wanted Wiley "to understand clearly that I have not said one word in criticism of the President's order. In fact, I said it was inevitable eventually." When Knowland challenged him, Sparkman hastened to say that he was not discussing the idea of a China blockade or "hot pursuit" across the Yalu. Sparkman is not the man to take unnecessary risks. He insisted he was merely asking questions. But the questions he asked were nonetheless deadly and the country is indebted to him and his colleagues for asking them. "Is this the first step toward enlarging the war in Asia," he asked in conclusion. "Is this the first step toward involving United States forces on the mainland of China? Is it the first step toward more casualties, instead of less? Is it the first step toward global war?" These were not simple queries, but the rhetoric of opposition.

The Republican excuse for not informing the country is in order not to "telegraph our punches" to the enemy, but the Formosa order itself was telegraphing a punch months before Chiang can possibly be strong enough to deliver it. If punches are not to be telegraphed in advance, what can be said in defense of Wiley's loose talk of bombing China's railways and Short's leak of Radford's private testimony about the possibilities of blockade? It is the American people, not the enemy, which is being kept in the dark. The most urgent question raised by Sparkman is "Who protects Formosa in the event Chiang's raids provoke a Communist attack upon the island?" The Republicans say the Korean war would have been avoided if Truman and Acheson had warned the Communists that an attack would bring American armed force into action. The doubt over Formosa is as dangerous, and makes it look as though some people would like to provoke an attack.

The Lattimore Case: Ben Franklin Was Prophetic

When the Framers of the Constitution were writing the treason provisions, Benjamin Franklin amended them to provide as an additional safeguard that two witnesses be required for each overt act. "Prosecutions for treason," Franklin said sagely, "were generally virulent, and perjury too easily made use of against innocence." A century and a half later perjury in new form has become a favorite weapon in American political prosecutions, in no case more strikingly than in that of Owen Lattimore.

The bare facts are eloquent. The China Lobby has long been gunning for Lattimore. McCarthy called him "the top Soviet agent" in the State Department. But when Whittaker Chambers was before the House Un-American Activities Committee on August 3, 1948 and was asked whether he knew Lattimore, Chambers replied "No, I don't." Even with McCarthy, Lattimore seems to have been an afterthought. In his original attack February 20, 1950, charging that the State Department was overrun by Communists, McCarthy did not mention Lattimore. It was not until a month later that he first named Lattimore, and then only as "pro-Communist." Within a week Lattimore's importance swelled enormously. On March 20 McCarthy told the press that a man "connected with" the State Department was "the top Russian espionage agent in the United States," giving Lattimore's name "off the record." But ten days later McCarthy was back-tracking. To the Senate on March 30, he said "I fear in the case of Lattimore I may have perhaps placed too much stress on whether or not he has been an espionage agent."

The reason for the hedging became clearer, when McCarthy was required to produce proof before the special Senate committee set up to investigate his charges. McCarthy called three witnesses—Louis Budenz, Freda Utley and a man named John J. Huber. Budenz, under questioning by the committee, admitted that McCarthy's charge against Lattimore was "technically . . . not accurate." All he had to report was hearsay and this did not allege that Lattimore was an espionage agent. Freda Utley after three hours on the stand admitted that she did not think Lattimore was Russia's "top espionage agent," that she did not think he was an agent of any kind and that she was not prepared to say of her own knowledge even that Lattimore was a Communist. The third witness, Huber, a former FBI informer, flew down from New York to testify for McCarthy against Lattimore but lost his nerve at the last moment and disappeared. McCarthy made no effort to find him.

What haunted Huber is what haunted Budenz. Huber was supposed to testify that he saw Lattimore at a party in 1946 at the home of Frederick V. Field. Huber had been an FBI informer at the time. J. Edgar Hoover had already shown several Senators on the Tydings committee a complete summary of the FBI file on Lattimore; no such incident appeared in it. Huber's two volume diary as an FBI informer had been handed over the year before to the McCarran committee. Huber spent three days

before the committee in September and October, 1949, naming hundreds of persons as Communist party members or sympathizers. He never mentioned Lattimore.

A similar shadow fell across the Budenz testimony. Budenz said he heard Earl Browder praise Lattimore for placing Communist writers in the Institute of Pacific Relations, that changes of party line were "transmitted" to Lattimore, and that he saw a secret Communist document on onion skin paper which referred to Lattimore as "L" or "XL."

Members of the Tydings committee wanted to know why none of this information was in the FBI summary J. Edgar Hoover had shown them, although Budenz had spent many weeks telling the FBI all he knew after he left the Communist party in 1945. Budenz admitted he had not gone to the FBI with this information until after he learned that the committee members had seen the FBI dossier.

Budenz was soon to give a striking example of how his memory could be improved with the years. Before the Tydings committee, Budenz said only of Wallace's trip to China in 1944 that it "was followed with very great care and detail by the Communist party," and of Lattimore "that at that time Jack Stachel advised me to consider Owen Lattimore as a Communist, which to me meant, because that was our method of discussing these matters, to treat as authoritative anything that he would say or advise." But a year later before the McCarran committee Budenz was asked by its counsel Robert Morris, "Did you hear at that time in official Communist party circles that John Carter Vincent and Owen Lattimore were members of the Communist party travelling with Wallace?" Budenz answered, "Yes, sir."

The story was growing, but Budenz was uncomfortable. When McCarran asked him to elaborate, Budenz's reply was a covert back-down. In elaborating, Budenz said the Communists followed the Wallace trip "with a great deal of interest," that in their discussions "it was pointed out that Mr. Wallace was more or less under good influences from the Communist viewpoint," that he had with him Vincent and Lattimore "both of whom were described as being in line with the Communist viewpoint, seeing eye to eye with it, and that they would guide Mr. Wallace largely along these paths." If both men were Communist party members why all this talk about "more or less" and "being in line with the Communist viewpoint"? Why was Budenz hedging? McCarran and Ferguson were annoyed. When Ferguson asked Budenz whether the Communists succeeded in carrying out their objective in the Wallace mission, Budenz replied "Absolutely it was carried out."

The wily Budenz had at last fallen into an unintended trap. Within a few weeks Wallace appeared before the committee with the columnist, Joseph Alsop, who had been in China at the time as aide to General Chennault. Alsop testified that "the first and basic untruth was Budenz's assertion that the Wallace mission to China carried out a Communist objec-

tive. In fact, it did the precise contrary." Alsop showed that the result of the Wallace trip was a cable to Roosevelt asking him to remove General Stilwell, who was friendly to the Chinese Communists, and replace him with General Wedemeyer, who was bitterly anti-Communist. That provided the climax to Budenz's tortuous testimony on Lattimore. It explains why the McCarran committee did not dare ask for Lattimore's indictment as a perjurer on those points where his testimony conflicted with that of their prize witness. To have done so would have required them to produce Budenz in court and subject him to cross-examination by counsel for Lattimore. The contradictions in the record were enough on their face to destroy his credibility.

So the McCarran committee waited several months and then last spring started off on a new tack. It subjected Lattimore to the longest interrogation in the history of Congressional investigation. For 12 days he was questioned, as heretics were once questioned in the vaults of the Inquisition. He was taken back many years over obscure details in an effort to trip him up. At the end McCarran told a reporter Lattimore had been caught in nine "significant untruths," but when reporters asked whether this meant the committee was charging Lattimore with perjury, the Senator replied lamely, "No. Perjury has various elements."

One of the elements is materiality. A false statement under oath must be material to be perjury. Here we touch on the central point of the drama which unfolds this week-end when the pre-trial legal motions are filed in the Lattimore case. Of the seven counts on which Lattimore was finally indicted last Fall, six deal with details as to matters which took place more than ten years ago. Whether these are important enough to be basis for a perjury conviction will be for the courts to decide. The other count is vague enough to convict any liberal or radical in the current atmosphere. It says Lattimore committed perjury when he asserted that he had "never been a sympathizer or any other kind of a promoter of Communism or Communist interests." This is so much a matter of opinion that in any other time and atmosphere it would almost certainly be thrown out by the courts without trial.

As the hullabaloo rises, the actual charge diminishes. How many people will realize that Lattimore is not charged with perjury for denying that he was "top espionage agent" for the Soviets, or even for denying that he was a Communist party member? The details are now cut so thin that one count of the indictment alleges that he perjured himself in denying that anybody told him before 1950 that a certain Ch'ao-tung Chi was a Communist. The witch hunters are willing to settle for any split hair, so long as they get any kind of a conviction. Their own political futures are at stake. The acquittal of Dreyfus finally ruined his accusers, and shook a rotten bureaucracy to its foundations.

I. F. Stone's Weekly

• Editor and Publisher, I. F. STONE

Published weekly except the last two weeks of August at Room 225, 1416 F St., N.W., Washington 4, D. C. Subscription rates: Domestic, \$5 a year; Canada, Mexico and elsewhere in the Western Hemisphere, \$6; England and Continental Europe, \$10 by 1st class mail, \$15 by air; for Israel, Asia, Australia and Africa, \$10 by first class mail, \$20 by air mail. Single copy, 15 cents. Contents covered by copyright. Telephone, STerling 3-0938. Application for entry as Second Class matter is pending.

Vo. 1, No. 5 February 14, 1953

COMMENT

Patriotic Economy Suggestion

Washington, D. C.

Senator Wiley has just introduced a bill to allow the Director of the FBI, the director of military intelligence, the director of air force intelligence and the chief of the Office of Naval Intelligence to tap telephone wires under certain rules and regulations "in the conduct of investigations to ascertain, prevent, or frustrate any interference . . . with the national security or defense by treason, sabotage, espionage, seditious conspiracy, violations of neutrality laws", etc. Stopping such legislation in this atmosphere would seem almost impossible; the wires are being tapped anyway; this bill would at least require a permit by a judge; the Department of Justice now taps wires on its own. At the moment we can only muster enough energy to be whimsical about it.

We wonder first of all why the Secret Service, the Treasury investigation bureau and Central Intelligence operatives are discriminated against in this bill. We also suggest, in this new and efficient Republican era, that maybe some provision ought to be made for a kind of traffic control on tapped wires. What happens when FBI, G-2, ONI, T-operatives and Secret

Service men all listen in on the same wires? Should the telephone subscriber be allowed some reduction in rate for inferior service? Swept up in the current enthusiasm for economy, the thought also strikes us—we lay it freely at the Eisenhower Administration's feet—that perhaps the cost of extensive wire-tapping could be reduced by combining the tap with a commercial answering service, of course at a fair fee. Some nights the secret agent might even help earn his salary by sitting up with the baby.

Still Higher Up

Now that the Secretaries of Defense, Army, Navy and Air have been confirmed, under special dispensation allowing them to pass onward and upward contracts in which they might have a financial interest, we see that Eisenhower—as if to forestall Congressional criticism—has put his own holdings in an irrevocable trust. The arrangement is that if Messrs. Talbott, Anderson, or Stevens see a contract of this kind, they will pass it on to their boss, Wilson. As for Wilson, he told the Senate Armed Services Committee that if some contract came to him "of a nature that could . . . be misunderstood" he would "step aside and have somebody else make that decision, if necessary, the President of the United States." And what happens if the President has a bit of stock stashed away in that irrevocable trust which would earn more if the decision went a certain way? To whom would the President pass on the contract for final action? God?

Since to judge by the speeches of so many of our generals, God is already enlisted in our armed forces, we see no reason why He should not pinch hit as super Secretary of Defense, except of course in those cases where there may be some conflict of interest.

The Unhappy Moor

There is a detective agency in New York specializing in domestic matters which advertises, "let us give you peace of mind". This implies that Othello might have lived happily ever after if only he had put enough gumshoe men on Desdemona's trail. But suspicion is a

poison which once injected thrives and destroys. Mistrust paralyzes normal relations where it does not actively breed misconduct. That detective agency slogan comes to mind as the Eisenhower Administration prepares to revamp the whole loyalty program. No judgment is possible until the new order has been made public. From advance indications it is supposed to have the virtue of allowing people to be dropped from government service without branding them for the rest of their lives as disloyal, though it is difficult to see how this can really be avoided. There would still be the tale-tale blur on one's employment record. Imagine explaining to the next prospective employer that you were just a security risk, not really disloyal, at least in your own opinion. . . .

One difficulty about the new program is that those Federal employes who have passed the "reasonable grounds" test first established under the Truman loyalty program and later the "reasonable doubt" test with which it was amended last year might have to run the gauntlet again to pass the new "security risk" standard. This will hardly be conducive to peace of mind in the Federal service. My own feeling is that this new setup will make discharge so easy that administrators will fire anybody who might possibly get them into trouble "on the Hill". Already the test of security is sometimes whether the retention of any particular subordinate would render the administrator politically insecure. That M which casts its shadow on the loyalty program is as often McCarthy or McCarran as Moscow.

Hat's Off

To Arthur Miller, for a brave and good play in "The Crucible", which I saw last Saturday in New York. The author of "Death of A Salesman" has made exciting theatre and moving drama of the Salem witch hunt. Without in any way straining for parallels, he has provided a parable for our own haunted times. I hope to discuss the play and the criticisms of it in a later issue, particularly that line about "but witches were purely imaginary, whereas today. . . ."

"Capsule Capital Commentary"

A bright reader in Cleveland, Ohio, pins that label on the Weekly in sending in another sub for a friend. People seem to like it, though the editor and publisher (who is also the office-boy) sometimes gets a little breathless. The first response to our book offer last week came from a Japanese, who sent in \$6 for a sub and a copy of "The Truman Era", a collection of my best pieces since 1945 in *PM*, the *New York Star* and the *Compass*, soon to be published by the enterprising *Monthly Review*, which also published (as its first venture of the kind) my "Hidden History of the Korean War". The latter has just appeared in Japanese translation, which may explain that first response. The book will sell at \$3.50 and can be obtained in advance of publication free with two subscriptions to the Weekly, or you can get a sub and the book for \$6. For the many encouraging letters, some of which I have not yet been able to answer personally, even on a double union day (16 hours), my thanks.

—I. F. Stone

Second Round at Foley Square

New York

The second Smith Act trial, just ended here, was an improvement over the first. Some modicum of justice began to be apparent in the gloomy skyscraper which houses the Federal Courts on Foley Square. For the first time in any of the Smith sedition prosecutions two defendants were acquitted.

A respected veteran of the federal bench, Judge Edward J. Dimock, conducted the trial with a decorum strikingly absent from the first proceedings, when Judge Harold Medina took it upon himself to act as a kind of picador, baiting high-strung counsel into contemptuous conduct, to the constant refrain of insinuations that they were engaged in a plot against his health. The four brave lawyers who ventured in the hateful atmosphere of present-day America to defend the so-called "second string" Communists had to contend neither with hypochondria nor an obvious hostility from the bench.

The lawyers deserve to be honorably mentioned. John T. McTernan, Frank Serri, Mary Kaufman and James T. Wright took on a heavy task in the shadow of the jail sentences and disbarment actions visited on defense counsel in the first Foley Square trial. To their names must be added that of Professor Thomas I. Emerson of Yale Law School who ably argued the constitutional issues on motion to dismiss.

The second New York trial was also the first of the current sedition prosecutions in which less than the maximum sentence was imposed, an outcome painfully reflected in the anguished protest of certain newspapers which have done their best to whip up a lynch spirit. Five years and \$10,000 fine is the maximum penalty now provided by the federal code for any conspiracy, whether to commit murder, smuggle narcotics or—as in this case—to advocate at some future time, "when the situation is ripe," the overthrow of the Government by force and violence. Judge Dimock felt so distant a political offense as "conspiracy to advocate" called for a lighter penalty than conspiracy to commit murder.

In this case also the repressionists began to be hoisted by one of their own petards. The directed acquittal of two defendants, Simon W. Gerson and Isadore Begun, both New York State officials of the Communist Party, was based in part on that provision of the McCarran Internal Security Act which

says no one shall be convicted merely for being a member or official of the Communist Party. The weird provision, of course, was necessary to buttress the registration provisions of that Act. Under the Fifth Amendment, it would be too clearly unconstitutional to force people to incriminate themselves by registering their political affiliations if such affiliations were themselves enough to convict them of crime.

The victories in Judge Dimock's court, small as they are, may be enough, if pressed on appeal to their acid conclusions, to dissolve the shoddy fabric of these prosecutions. It is difficult logically to reconcile the directed acquittal of two "second string" leaders with the conviction of the rest, since it was often only by piling dubious inference on demonstrated perjury that any kind of evidence was marshalled against them.

It was only by making this a conspiracy prosecution that some semblance of a case could be achieved. The Government thereby had the advantage of semantics—conspiracy always sounds sinister to a jury—and of the looser rules of evidence allowed in conspiracy trials. It was no longer necessary to prove advocacy but only "conspiracy to advocate."

The record is juicy with examples of the logical fallacies conspiracy trials invite. Again and again evidence was submitted as proof of conspiracy which was properly admissible only if a conspiracy had already been proven. Vague remarks made twenty years ago were adduced as evidence of a present attitude. General expressions of approval of certain Marxist classics were twisted into evidence that a defendant was proposing to do in the America of the 1950's what Lenin advocated in the Russia of 1905.

The subpoena of FBI records in one striking instance showed that the most sensational of the informers had lied to the court. A scandalous incident disclosed prejudice on the part of several jurors. As the voluminous record is opened to study on appeal, it will be seen that the chief victim of the prosecution is not the Communist Party but a growing list of historic constitutional and procedural safeguards. If these convictions stand, freedom of expression in America must dwindle, for by the standards being established in these prosecutions, there are few dissenters and little dissent which could not ultimately be brought within the nebulous purview of that strange thing called "conspiracy to advocate."

I. F. Stone's Weekly

2-14-53

Room 225 Kellogg Bldg.

1416 F Street, Washington 4, D. C.

Please enter the following subscription. \$5 for 1 year is enclosed. (See page 3 for foreign rates)

Name

Street

City Zone

State

I. F. Stone's Weekly

225 Kellogg Bldg.

1416 F St., Washington 4, D. C.

Application for
Second Class Entry
Is Pending

Should Communists Be Allowed to Teach? See Page 2.

I. F. Stone's Weekly

COPYRIGHT 1953 BY I. F. STONE'S WEEKLY, INC.

VOL. I NUMBER 6

FEBRUARY 21, 1953



WASHINGTON, D. C.

15 CENTS

Anti-Zionism or Anti-Semitism?

THE RUSSIANS FEAR WAR AND ARE SHUTTING the last windows on the West in preparation for it. That seems the most reasonable explanation for the anti-Zionist "show trials" which have begun in the Soviet world. The Jews are the last people in the U.S.S.R. and its satellites who still had some contact with the West through such Jewish philanthropic organizations as the Joint Distribution Committee.

Soviet policy never went beyond cultural autonomy; centripetal nationalist tendencies are as much feared as in the days of the Czars. Nationalism (except at times for Russians) is officially stigmatized as "bourgeois," though the constant attacks on "Titoism" in the satellites show how strongly it survives under communism. The Zionists, like the "bourgeois" nationalists among the Ukrainian, White Russian and other Soviet minorities, have been the frequent object of purge, arrest and imprisonment since the early years of the Revolution.

After the war, privately at Yalta, publicly later, Stalin took a more friendly attitude toward Jewish national aspiration and changed the anti-Zionist line traditional with the Marxist movement to vote for the partition of Palestine and the establishment of the Jewish State. Thanks to that change, Israel was able to circumvent the arms embargo imposed by the State Department and to buy arms and receive planes through Czechoslovakia—the ex post facto "crime" of the Slansky trial.

THE RELATIONS OF STATES ARE NOT DETERMINED BY SENTIMENT. Israel found favor in Moscow's eyes when it fought the British. It lost favor afterwards because of its Western orientation and its increasing reliance on American capital. Zionist longings are far from dead among the Jews of Russia, as the writer can attest from talks and observations on his own underground trip from Poland to Palestine in the spring of 1946. The recrudescence of anti-Semitism in Russia amid the miseries of World War II and its deliberate propagation by the Germans in the occupied areas of White Russia and the Ukraine provoked from not a few assimilated Russian Jews the same reaction of national pride that it once did in Pinsker and Herzl. The fact that Israel has become an American dependent must make Zionism seem more than ever dangerous to the rulers of the Kremlin.

The story is as old as the Bible, where we read that the Egyptians enslaved the Jews lest they aid an enemy in time of war. The same fate shadows all minorities, as our own Japanese Americans can testify, and its constant repetition must strengthen the case for Jewish nationhood. But the Bible repeats another lesson, equally terrible, and that is to keep out of the quarrels of Egypt and Nineveh. Israel lies now as then

at the crossroads of the world, where it can all too easily be trampled by contending armies. It needs peace. It cannot afford to fight the battles of the great Powers. For no nation would a new war be a greater tragedy than for tiny Israel on the edge of the petroleum fields which will be the first target of the air fleets. And no people needs peace more than the Jews, a minority everywhere. In a long conflict, the Jews on the Soviet side will be suspected of pro-Westernism and on the anti-Soviet side of pro-Communism.

NONE OF US KNOW WHAT IS REALLY HAPPENING IN EASTERN EUROPE. The vulnerable point of the Soviet regime in "psychological warfare" is its extreme suspicion. No one yet knows, perhaps no one will ever know, whether the Red generals executed before the war were guilty of treason or only the victims of German ingenuity in spreading suspicion. No one knows what planted whispers may have played a part in provoking these new trials. The Russian rulers have a way of erecting possibilities into actualities and then staging trials to "prove" what they fear. Their trials are political morality plays which cynically assume an audience too unintelligent to be impressed by anything less than melodrama. It is not enough to prove a man mistaken; he must be displayed as a monster. Ever since the 20's, the Soviet public has been fed on a heavy diet of conspiracy, treason, poisoning and murder in this political dramaturgy. This is the perspective in which one cannot help but see the Slansky trial and the fantastic charges against the nine Moscow doctors, six of them Jewish. Their purpose is to warn the Jews of the Soviet world to break all ties with the West and to stifle all nationalist feeling "or else." The repercussions may be less than anti-Semitic but are more than anti-Zionist. They must pander to the covert anti-Semitism which lingered on underground after the revolution.

THE SITUATION IS BAD, BUT MUCH TOO SERIOUS to be used as a kind of political sideshow for UJA fund-raising and the cold war. There are 3,000,000 Jews in Russia, the second largest Jewish community in the world. The Jews of America are very foolish and short-sighted if they jump on this affair gleefully to show that those lie who link Jew with Communist. Israel will be very irresponsible if it allows the fate of Russian Jewry to get involved at the UN in another endless cold war propaganda debate, where it will be exploited by many people who care very little for Jews in Russia or anywhere else. Wild talk about extermination, equating Hitler and Stalin, can only hurt Soviet Jewry. This is the time for Israel to demonstrate the most responsible kind of statesmanship, and to remember that Zion's historic mission is peace.

The Campus Witch-Hunt: The Attack on The Open Mind

Washington, D. C.

A QUESTION WHICH DESERVES IMMORTALITY was put by Senator Herman Welker, Republican, of Idaho. The scene was a room in the Senate Office Building. The occasion was the first of the college hearings by the Jenner subcommittee of the Senate Internal Security Committee. The witness, Oscar H. Shaftel, an assistant professor of English in New York's Queens College, was being obdurate about the \$64 question. "Do you think," Welker finally asked, in a stern voice, "that any member of this committee would hesitate to answer that question?" The witness was at a loss for an answer. He had been pinned to the mat at last.

Many were the feats of casuistry performed by the committee members that day as they wrestled with the problem of subversion in education. Shaftel, citing chapter and verse with the agility of a hardened heretic, had insisted that the Fifth amendment was intended to protect the innocent. Senator Willis Smith, of North Carolina, smote him hip and thigh. "Now you say," Smith began softly, "that this was intended to protect innocence. But if you were not a member of the Communist party, you wouldn't have to invoke the Fifth amendment, would you?"

IN THAT LONG AND ARDUOUS FIRST SESSION, one type of question was conspicuous by its absence. Though the declared purpose was to uncover the indoctrination of students by Communist teachers, no question was asked on the subject. The omission seemed strange. A teacher who denied that he had injected subversive ideas into the minds of the youth in his care could be prosecuted for perjury if witnesses turned up to testify against him. A teacher who denied that Communists were instructed to indoctrinate their students would risk the same penalty if an ex-Communist teacher testified to the contrary. The mere refusal to answer questions about indoctrination would have been impressive.

The range of the questions the committee did ask was wide. A witness was asked whether he had contributed to the defense of Morris Schappes more than a decade ago when Schappes was prosecuted for perjury as a result of the Rapp-Coudert school inquiry in New York. There was a question about the execution of the Polish Socialists, Ehrlich and Alter, in Russia during the war. A witness was asked whether he belonged to a Committee to Win The War in 1943-44. But no witness was asked whether he had ever tried to lead a student down the primrose path of Marxist doctrine. Or whether as a member of a Communist teacher's cell he had been instructed to engage in ideological seduction.

THE COMMITTEE SEEMED UNWILLING to get to the supposed point of the inquiry. Perhaps experience had taught it to tread warily. Against none of the teachers discharged in New York have witnesses been produced to testify that there had been indoctrination. The same Senate subcommittee last Fall received

31 exhibits and heard 41 witnesses, including three Communists who had recanted and turned informer. Its report last January 2 on "Subversive Influence in the Educational Process" does indeed say, "Evidence was adduced that the Communists made an effort to use the classroom to carry on a program of indoctrination. Thus Dr. Bella Dodd testified. She had no doubt whatsoever that she had used her position as a teacher to influence her students."

But in its report the Senate subcommittee withheld what the overwrought but conscientious Dr. Bella Dodd actually said in her testimony on this point. The passage is extraordinary in its revelation and deserves quotation in full. Here it is as it appears on pages 18 and 19 of the printed record:

"Senator FERGUSON. When you were a teacher and really a Communist, what did you do to the students and other teachers?"

"Mrs. DODD. God help me for what I did. I was not a member of the Communist party, but there was no doubt in my mind—"

"Senator FERGUSON. But you had a philosophy and you served the cause."

"Mrs. DODD. There is no doubt in my mind that I did a great deal of harm."

"Senator FERGUSON. And how did you function among the students?"

"Mrs. DODD. I was their faculty adviser on many problems. I worked with individual students. I was particularly keen about my students. I was very sympathetic, and I was very popular among my students."

"Senator FERGUSON. Do you think you may have convinced some of them to become Communists?"

"Mrs. DODD. I have no doubt that I did."

"Senator FERGUSON. Was that one of your purposes in life as a teacher?"

"Mrs. DODD. No. That is not true. My purpose at that time—I thought my purpose was to create an open mind, to create a clear-thinking people—people who would throw aside all preconceived prejudices, all preconceived thoughts. My thought was to teach people how to think."

"Well, I have discovered since then that the mind which is so open is often the mind which gets filled with the first evil wind that comes by; that what you have to do is to see the truth and the truth will help you to ward off those evil influences."

Thus the "indoctrination" to which Dr. Bella Dodd confessed with stricken conscience was not indoctrination in Marxism but in what we had been taught to believe was basic Americanism. She wanted her pupils to have an "open mind" and it is this which she now thinks wrong. Like so many ex-Communists she has swung from one authoritarianism to another. The Roman Catholic Church, to which she returned on leaving the party, has always believed that the open mind was a danger, that revealed truth and certified dogma were the only safeguards against error. The implications are those that the Very Rev.

Hunter Guthrie, S.J., president of Georgetown University, developed in his commencement address here in Washington in June, 1950, when he called academic freedom "the soft under-belly of our American way of life."

IF THE McCARRAN COMMITTEE WERE really interested in the "subversive" ideas which threaten American education, it would have explored Dr. Bella Dodd's remark. If the open mind is a danger, who is to close it? Against what ideas? Who is to determine which winds of doctrine are evil? She regrets her purpose was "to teach people how to think." Does she think it would be better to teach them blindly to believe?

To the authoritarian ideologies of the right, the educational witch-hunters turn a deaf ear. No subpoena has ever been issued for Allen Zoll, though his pro-Fascist activities before the war were notorious and his influence on American education is growing. When George A. Timone, of the New York Board of Education, was before the McCarran committee last Fall, no one asked him about the meeting he sponsored in 1939 at which Hitler, Mussolini and Father Coughlin were hailed as "enemies of communism." No one asked him why Gerald L. K. Smith wrote in his news letter of March 22, 1946, "Mayor O'Dwyer of New York is being congratulated by Christian Nationalists for naming a strong follower of Father Coughlin, Mr. Timone, to the Board of Education." Timone was received as an ally and friend by the McCarran committee. Neither McCarran's successor, Jenner, nor the Velde inquiry nor McCarthy is interested in this kind of "organized subversion," though already so effective in subverting free inquiry on the campus.

WHEN JAMES B. CONANT WAS BEFORE THE Senate Foreign Relations Committee on February 3, Senator Fulbright asked him whether "some good purpose can be served" by the Congressional investigations which are setting out on the supposed task "of determining whether or not there is communism in the schools." Conant's reply was "No. Frankly I do not."

To set up a bar against Communists in teaching, divorced from evidence of abuse in the classroom, is to venture on the endless task of determining who is really a Communist. This is to play into the hands of those who want thought control in America. It would make conformity necessary to avoid suspicion.

Few any longer have the temerity to say it, but defense of the right of Communists to teach is essential to academic freedom in America. This like all other liberties is indivisible. As Conant said to Senator Wiley at the same hearing "only the instigation of a police state within a university itself" would make it possible to determine who were the Communists. They could not be found "without destroying the life of the university." This is the life threatened by the campus witch-hunt.

I. F. Stone's Weekly

• Editor and Publisher, I. F. STONE

Published weekly except the last two weeks of August at Room 225, 1416 F St., N.W., Washington 4, D. C. Subscription rates: Domestic, \$5 a year; Canada, Mexico and elsewhere in the Western Hemisphere, \$6; England and Continental Europe, \$10 by 1st class mail, \$15 by air; for Israel, Asia, Australia and Africa, \$10 by first class mail, \$20 by air mail. Single copy, 15 cents. Contents covered by copyright. Telephone, STerling 3-0938. Application for entry as Second Class matter is pending.

Vol. 1, No. 6  February 21, 1953

COMMENT

The Pope Himself . . .

Washington, D. C.

THE TWO MESSAGES ON BEHALF OF THE Pope, one last December and the second last week-end, show how deeply opinion abroad has been stirred by the Rosenberg case. The President's denial of clemency is inhumane and politically stupid. Comparison with the sentences in the Fuchs and Allan Nunn May cases, where far more vital atomic information was involved, is enough to show how barbaric is the death sentence imposed on the Rosenbergs. When the Holy See itself feels impelled by "motives of charity" to transmit appeals through its Apostolic Delegate at Washington, one begins to get a faint idea of what a bad impression execution of the death sentence will create. Commutation of sentence would be a moral victory for the better America and there is still time for last-minute appeals to the White House.

Stevenson?

JUST IN CASE READERS INSIST ON knowing what we think of our late candidate's Jeffer-

son-Jackson Day speech: very witty, like a good after dinner speech; nice plug for civil liberty; but not yet adequate for leadership in these times when we are moving rapidly toward war. Formosa was not mentioned. Sparkman did better than that in the Senate. We wait hopefully for more.

From Brannan Plan to Benson Boner

THE TERRIBLE NEW DUST STORMS in the Middle West as we go to press only emphasize the storms of another and figurative but no less serious variety blowing up in the West and South for the new Administration. Agricultural employment is down three quarter of a million from last year. Prices received by farmers have been moving downward for two years and are now 18 percent below February, 1951, while prices paid by farmers are substantially unchanged. The Western livestock market is in a chaotic condition and cotton exports are down sharply. The situation is so bad that Taft and Thye, ordinarily no advocates of giving things away, especially to foreigners, have introduced a bill "For the relief of storm-stricken areas in the Netherlands, the British Isles and other areas of Western Europe." The bill would authorize the President to donate abroad any and all agricultural commodities "acquired through price support operations and determined to be in excess of domestic requirements." (If dairy prices keep falling, Thye is liable to turn Wallaceite and advocate giving milk to Hottentots.)

With beautiful Republican ineptness, the new Secretary of Agriculture chose this moment of farm history to make a speech before the Central Livestock Association in St. Paul saying brightly, "Farmers should not be placed in a position of working for government bounty rather than producing for a free market. . . . Furthermore, inefficiency should not be subsidized in agriculture." In the warm-up Benson—the old coin phraser—said, "I declare without fear of successful contradiction that our rural people are today the strongest bulwark we have against all that is aimed . . . at

the very destruction of our American way of life. . . . No other segment of our population knows so well that 'as ye sow, so shall ye reap.'"

None other also knows so well that it doesn't matter what you sow or reap if you can't get a fair price for it at the market.

Poor Solomon, Poor Sheba, Poor Socrates, Etc.

"WE ARE NOT AFRAID," Secretary of Commerce Sinclair Weeks told the annual Lincoln Night dinner of the Republican Middlesex Club in Boston, "to trust free enterprise to be enterprising. Through the stardust and sweat of the American system have come the highest standard of living in history. King Solomon in all his glory never drove to work in an automobile or watched a baseball game on television. The Queen of Sheba in all her splendor never enjoyed the luxury of nylon stockings."

And Socrates in all his wisdom had to drink hemlock instead of going to a nice shiny electric chair. And Columbus for all his genius had to take a slow boat instead of buying a ticket on TWA. And Cleopatra for all her wiles never had a really good deodorant. Who knows how much faster, further and more fragrantly they might all have progressed had they, too, trusted private enterprise.

The Dunce's Cap

TO SIDNEY HOOK, PROFESSOR OF Philosophy at New York University, pre-war Marxist and postwar Milquetoast, for telling a panel on "Freedom in Education" at the New York Civil Liberties Forum on Lincoln's Birthday, "It is not true that a state of fear exists in our colleges and that college teachers are less courageous and outspoken than they have been in the past. . . ."

You and The Postoffice

The Weekly goes to the postoffice at 3 p.m. every Wednesday afternoon, and—touch wood—we haven't missed a deadline yet. Since the third issue, it has been getting service under second class permit pending, but service is spotty. In downtown New York, many subscribers have been getting their issue on Friday, but in Brooklyn some readers complain they haven't been getting theirs until Monday or Tuesday, though in far-off California one reader reports that he gets his on Monday. Some places, by mistake, the Weekly may still be getting third class service. Let me know—and let your local postmaster know—about delays. In the meantime don't forget you can get a free copy of my new book, *The Truman Era*, with every two subs; for \$1, with one sub; or for \$2 in advance of publication. It will be published in April at \$3.50. I just finished reading the galleys—and though I say so as shouldn't, it's a darn good book.

—I. F. Stone

A New and Safe Form of Popular Front

NEW YORK

ROGER BALDWIN IN THE THIRTIES was a Popular Fronter. The annual luncheon of the New York Civil Liberties Union over which he presided here on Lincoln's Birthday was a Popular Front of a new kind. On the dais, among the liberals, were Robert Morris, counsel of the McCarran committee; Godfrey P. Schmidt, a professor of law at Fordham, who represented Bella Dodd before that committee; a staff writer for the *New Leader* and a man named Victor Hartnett, who was introduced by Baldwin as co-author of *Red Channels*, "one of our favorite works." Of course, everyone understood that Baldwin was joking, and there was a little titter with the applause from the well-behaved audience. But one wondered what such characters—and Roy Cohn, McCarthy's chief counsel on his new investigating committee—were doing at a civil liberties meeting. This was indeed infiltration and subversion, the infiltration of libertarian ranks by the witch-hunters, the subversion of basic libertarian principles by the social amenities of a friendly gathering with their enemies.

One panel chairman summing up at the end of the afternoon spoke of the "wisdom of having on one platform men of divergent views." This was eye-wash. No one spoke from the ranks of the purged teachers, the UN employes, the civil servants, the blacklisted artists or the Smith Act victims. But a platform was accorded their persecutors. They were admitted into respectable liberal company. They were listened to respectfully, and argument was muted, lest it impinge on the unctuous. From the prepared text of the one first rate speech at the conference, that of the Rev. Dr. John Paul Jones, there was omitted a mild reference to A Certain Senator, "Senator McCarthy, heading a committee to investigate 'Communist thinking' in the colleges of the land, does not increase our sense of security," as if not to offend such honored guests as McCarthy's counsel, Cohn. Only Osmond Fraenkel broke the conspiracy of politeness to mention Louis Budenz by name and to protest his smear of the late Louis S. Weiss and of Professor Walter S. Gellhorn as Communists.

THE DIRECTORS OF THE CIVIL LIBERTIES UNION have been sucking their thumbs for many months, unable to make up their minds about the Fifth amendment in the attack on academic freedom and the UN. At this annual meeting, the

old libertarian stalwarts like Fraenkel and Arthur Garfield Hays, who once spoke for the ACLU, now appeared merely as participants in a discussion under its auspices. Ernest Angell, who presided over the panel on "Congressional Investigations and Constitutional Protection of Citizens' Rights," explained that Fraenkel and Telford Taylor, though directors of the ACLU, were speaking for themselves alone. The organization is split between those who struggle with diminishing energy for a classic libertarian position and those looking for a bridge to respectability. The organization is deadlocked on urgent questions because part of its board, local and national, really agrees with the witch-hunters, and hankers for a safe and popular front with the Morris'es, the Cohns and the new crop of Liz Dillings who turn out Counter-Attack.

The net effect of the most important panel, that on Congressional investigations, was to give the witch hunters a new sounding board, not to rebut them. Cohn, Morris and Schmidt took the offensive with ability, while of the three liberals, only Fraenkel acquitted himself with precision, learning and distinction. All three liberals were on the defensive. None touched on the realities in these Congressional investigations—their origin and motivations, their excursions in perjury. No one mentioned Lattimore, Vincent, Service or their other victims.

THERE WERE INDICATIONS IN TAYLOR'S TALK of the line on which the ACLU may give up the battle. This is the line of "conspiracy." Free speech is protected by the Constitution unless what is said is part of a conspiracy. So runs this, the government's, argument in the Smith Act cases. But the concept of conspiracy when divorced from the context of crime and applied to speech becomes an easy means of nullifying the First Amendment. "The doctrine of conspiracy," Mr. Justice Douglas said in his dissent in the Dennis case, "has served divers and oppressive purposes and its broad reach can be made to do great evil. But never until today has anyone seriously thought that the ancient law of conspiracy could constitutionally be used to turn speech into seditious conduct." To cast loose from the traditional moorings of incitement, overt act and clear and present danger and to substitute "conspiracy" in this sense as a guide is to abandon the cause of civil liberty, and enlist in the service of repression.

I. F. Stone's Weekly

2-21-53

Room 225 Kellogg Bldg.

1416 F Street, N.W., Washington 4, D. C.

Please enter the following subscription. \$5 for 1 year is enclosed. (See page 3 for foreign rates)

Name

Street

City Zone

State

I. F. Stone's Weekly

225 Kellogg Bldg.

1416 F St., N.W., Washington 4, D. C.

Application for
Second Class Entry
Is Pending

I. F. Stone's Weekly

COPYRIGHT 1953 BY I. F. STONE'S WEEKLY, INC.

VOL. I NUMBER 7

FEBRUARY 28, 1953



WASHINGTON, D. C.

15 CENTS

This May Be The Last Chance

Washington, D. C.

THE CATCH WORD OF THE MOMENT in American foreign policy is "disengagement." The most important task of disengagement in the world today is for the United Nations to disengage itself from American domination. The second part of the Seventh session of the General Assembly opening in New York may prove to be the UN's last chance to save world peace. This can only be done if the organization moves out firmly on an independent line of its own.

It would no longer be fair to say that U. S. policy is not in the hands of sober men. Realities have been rapidly sobering the new Republican Administration, ever since Eisenhower himself came back from Korea with the bad news that there were no trick solutions. Unfortunately a swift succession of morning-afters have not been enough to keep the Administration from new binges in an effort to ingratiate itself with the roughs on Capitol Hill where sobriety is suspect. Never has a drunken diplomacy fired off so many duds as in the few weeks since Eisenhower and Dulles took office.

THERE IS MUCH TALK HERE in Washington of the need for keeping the Russians guessing. If that is the prime objective of the new Republican policy, it must be accounted a success. It has everybody guessing. The Russians indeed may be completely unnerved, like a chess master confronted with moves so eccentric he cannot tell whether he is playing an unknown genius or a flea circus idiot. By now Washington must look as much an enigma to Moscow as Moscow usually does to Washington. One week Eisenhower "takes the wraps" off Chiang in a dramatic move which makes sense only if it is the first step in engaging American power on the giant task of "liberating" China. A few weeks later the objective is to "disengage" from the relatively petty military tasks of liberating Korea.

From whatever direction one looks at this pattern it is difficult to assume—as a scientist might say—that it is the product of rationality. Korea is the classic land-bridge for invasions of China. It is our one bridgehead on the mainland. If the purpose is to liberate China from Communism, the bridgehead ought to be widened and more troops poured in for the next step, which would be Manchuria. To "disengage" from Korea while committing oneself to the reconquest of China would be like "disengaging" one's hold on Belgium while committing oneself to the reconquest of Western Europe.

The pattern is no less weird if one starts with the hypothesis that the sudden turn to "disengagement" reflects victory for those like General Bradley long opposed to the wrong war at the wrong place. If the purpose is to disengage American forces in Korea in order to build up strength for action

elsewhere against China or Russia, then it is hardly the wisdom of the serpent to disclose that strategy in advance by so much loud talk about never reconciling ourselves to Communist domination anywhere. The Chinese and the Russians will not let us "disengage" ourselves if they feel that the forces released on the 38th parallel may turn up closer home than Korea. The enemy will not let the eagle's talon out of the Korean trap unless assured that it will not strike elsewhere.

THERE IS EVERYTHING to be said of course for a real policy of "disengagement." The Korean conflict is a military stalemate and a military stalemate calls for a negotiated peace. The Korean conflict is a preview of the wider and more terrible stalemate into which a World War III would bog down. It should also be a warning to that larger "peninsula" at the other end of the Eurasian land-mass. All the horror visited on Korea by a great power duel fought so conveniently on small power territory may be repeated in Western Europe.

"Disengagement" is likewise called for when regarded from the standpoint of genuine American defense considerations. To the extent that America fears a possible Russian conflict, it is folly to tie down a major part of our armed forces in an unimportant sector. It is also folly to be drawn further along the road to full-scale war with China if one fears war with Russia. These considerations obviously play their part in the calculations which lie behind the Eisenhower-Dulles slogan of letting "Asians fight Asians." But the bulk of the Asians are either neutral or on the other side. It is exactly as if we were to raise the slogan of letting Europeans fight Europeans if all we had to rely on was a Norway torn like Indo China by civil war and a Franco regime which had been ousted from Spain and was ensconced in the Azores, while Germany and England were as neutral as India and Indonesia.

UNFORTUNATELY THE EISENHOWER ADMINISTRATION (see page four) is proving less the master in its own house than was Truman's. The China Lobby rides herd on the new Administration, while an impatient and peaceful people cast about for some quick and easy pushbutton to press for victory. Three years ago, on the eve of the Korean war, Truman and Acheson all but invited the UN to solve their problems by voting Communist China a seat in the UN and "forcing" them to recognize realities. Their successors as badly need to be forced into a Korean settlement, but dare not appear to be asking for it. The situation is one in which every day's delay invites the desperadoes around Chiang to precipitate the world conflict which is their hope. Allied with them are a handful of unscrupulous men here who believe that war is necessary and that only a Fascist America can fight it.

Horror or Hoax? The Spy Charges Against the UN

NEW YORK

AS USUAL, THE ACCUSATION was news but the reply made no headlines. Almost unnoticed by the press, counsel for 20 dismissed UN employes filed briefs on appeal here last week with the United Nations Administrative Tribunal. The cases, to be argued in April, will reverberate round the world. On the agenda of the General Assembly of the United Nations, which convenes again in New York this week, is the question of personnel policy. This, which at first sight would seem an obscure and innocuous question, involves the independence of the United Nations. Whether it will knuckle under to the current American witch-hunt will be decided by the decision of the Administrative Tribunal and the debate in the General Assembly.

The background is a propaganda campaign four years old to picture the UN to the American people as a nest of spies. No charge has been more frequently rebutted. None has more dramatically illustrated the power of reiteration in the technique of the Big Lie. The appendix to the main brief filed jointly by three law firms for nineteen discharged employees provides a quick summary of that long exploit in denigration, its refutations and repetitions. It began with the testimony of the assistant chief of the State Department's visa division in July, 1948; he made himself a favorite with the McCarran committee by declaring that several hundred foreign agents used jobs in the UN as a cover for their activity. Next day Secretary of State George Marshall told a press conference that he did not know of a single case of foreign espionage in the UN. He nevertheless appointed a special committee of three leading citizens, including the editor of the respected conservative Washington Star, to investigate. They not only found no substance in the charges but formally reported in September that they were shocked by the "irresponsible" way these charges had been made.

THIS DID NOT KEEP the McCarran committee from hashing them up again the following July, this time through the secret testimony of an unnamed witness identified only as No. 8. The bombardment was stepped up two days later with "UN Aide Accused as A Red Courier," though the aide, Mrs. Mary Jane Keeney, had declared under oath that she was not and never had been a Communist and denied that she was ever a courier. The "courier" incident had itself been picked up by the McCarran committee from an earlier horror story which made headlines for the House Un-American Activities Committee. Mrs. Keeney was alleged to have stepped off a ship from Europe on March 9, 1946, and passed a large manila envelope to a man "suspected of being engaged in Soviet espionage." The man's name was given, the statute of limitations had not run, both he and Mrs. Keeney were subject to prosecution if the charges were true. The fact that no indictment has ever been returned is the best comment on these wild charges, but that did not keep them from being used again by

McCarthy in his February 12, 1950, attack on the State Department. When Secretary General Trygve Lie discharged Mrs. Keeney the next year, the Administrative Tribunal after hearing her case ordered her reinstated.

LIKE A WELL-TIMED STINK BOMB, the old charges were blown up again last Fall by the McCarran Committee just three days before the Seventh General Assembly convened in New York. The American Legion Magazine appeared on the stands with a scare story about Red spies in the UN. Senator Herbert O'Connor, Democrat, of Maryland, after hearing ten witnesses made headlines with the charge that the committee had found "American traitors on the payroll of the United States and the United Nations."

Spies and traitors are strong words. If American intelligence had "tips" that certain UN employes were engaged in espionage, the tips were valuable. Followed up, they offered a means not only of prosecuting such people but of uncovering their associates. The FBI and other intelligence agencies have many ways of following through. Wires are tapped, "cover" is put on the mail of suspects. They can be followed and watched. Conversely there is also the presumption that when such charges have been kicked around privately and publicly for so many years without resulting in an indictment, there must be something wrong with the charges.

Assistant Secretary of State Hickerson tried to tell the McCarran committee last December 31, "The Department has not had evidence justifying the conclusion that there was spying or espionage on the part of American citizens employed by the United Nations." He added pointedly, "If either the Department of State or the Department of Justice had had evidence justifying such a conclusion, prompt action would have been taken under the criminal laws of the United States by the Department of Justice which has responsibility for enforcing those laws."

In any case, the Assistant Secretary of State told the committee, the UN "would probably be one of the last places" that an agent would be placed. "We transmit no classified information to the Secretariat," Hickerson explained.

A SPECIAL GRAND JURY HAD BEEN impaneled in June, 1951, in the Southern District of New York to look into "subversive activities and espionage." It sat for 18 months. It claimed in a "presentment" made public last December 2 to have uncovered "startling evidence" showing the "infiltration" of the UN by "scores of individuals" who were subversive. If the Grand Jury in its 18 months of work had collected "startling evidence" it was its duty to return indictments. None were returned. The most startling case described by it was that of "a United States citizen accused before us in sworn and uncontradicted testimony of having been a Soviet agent while employed by the United States government." Even in this case there was no indictment.

Either the Grand Jury was remiss in its duty or guilty of considerable overstatement. Some of the grand jurors hit the headlines a second time with the claim that government officials had tried to keep them from filing the presentment. When hearings were held on these new charges by a subcommittee of the House Judiciary Committee, they showed that government officials had indeed been divided on the wisdom of the grand jury's action. Charles P. Murray, Assistant Attorney General in charge of the Criminal Division of the U. S. Department of Justice testified that Roy M. Cohn, then a special assistant to the Attorney General, had urged issuance of the presentment "to beat the McCarran Committee to the headlines." Cohn has since been elevated to the post of chief counsel to the new McCarthy investigating committee.

Murray testified that he believed it the sole function of a grand jury "to indict or not to indict." He said he was against "presentments" which were really "statements by Grand Jurors which, for lack of evidence, fall short of accusing anybody of crime, and therefore cannot be defended by the persons who were named."

"Finally," Assistant Attorney General Murray said, "I believe that it is most important in times of emergency as well as in other times that the normal functions of government be pursued according to their normal course. I am against government by hysteria, (or) by alternate hysteria and lassitude. I believe that an even, fearless performance of functions allocated to the various agencies who mind their own business is the very best cure for Communism or any other evil."

A GRAND JURY CAN INDICT whom it pleases. The prosecuting official has great influence but cannot control it. A prima facie case on the basis of what the prosecution alone has to offer is enough and the grand jury is the ultimate judge of that. In this case obviously neither the Grand Jury nor Roy Cohn, the special prosecutor, had the nerve to indict anybody.

"What the Tribunal must already have suspected," says the brief for the 19 discharged UN employes, "should by now be inescapably clear. The charges of espionage, subversive activity and the like are but an elaborate and cruel hoax invented to conceal the fact that the applicants were terminated for reasons of alleged conviction, sentiment and affiliation alone. . . . Fear engendering claims of espionage, spy rings and sabotage are the invariable means of ensuring the political destruction of individuals whose sole offense is their political non-conformity."

Unless the FBI itself is infiltrated and sabotaging the enforcement of the laws, it is impossible to take these repeated charges seriously, except as part of a conspiracy to defame the UN and terrorize its employees.

Next Week: The UN and the Fifth Amendment.

I. F. Stone's Weekly

• Editor and Publisher, I. F. STONE

Published weekly except the last two weeks of August at Room 225, 1416 F St., N.W., Washington 4, D. C. Subscription rates: Domestic, \$5 a year; Canada, Mexico and elsewhere in the Western Hemisphere, \$6; England and Continental Europe, \$10 by 1st class mail, \$15 by air; for Israel, Asia, Australia and Africa, \$10 by first class mail, \$20 by air mail. Single copy, 15 cents. Contents covered by copyright. Telephone, STerling 3-0938. Entered as Second Class mail matter, Post Office, Washington, D. C.

Vol. 1, No. 7 February 28, 1953

COMMENT

Vacuous Velde

OUR HAT IS OFF this week to Mrs. Agnes E. Meyer for the speech she made in Atlantic City at the meeting of the American Association of School Administrators. The wife of the owner of the *Washington Post*, herself well known as a writer and social worker, Mrs. Meyer gave Velde, Jenner and McCarthy the drubbing they deserve. The best part of her speech went unnoticed by most newspapers. Mrs. Meyer said neither McCarthy nor Jenner nor Velde had "the moral or intellectual qualifications" to investigate the nation's colleges. As a sample of Velde's IQ, she pointed to a bill the ex-FBI man has introduced which would require the Librarian of Congress to mark all subversive matter in the Library of Congress. "The man doesn't make sense," Mrs. Meyer said briskly.

There are 9,000,000 volumes in the Library of Congress, and Velde's naive proposal leads to some interesting arithmetic. A staff of 200 employes smart enough to go through five volumes a day would require 30 years to do the job. It would be hard to get such mental giants at less than \$4,000 a year. At that rate the job would cost \$240,000,000.

More complicated would be the task of deciding in advance just what was a "subversive" book. The ex-FBI man does not seem to have realized that this was a problem at all. But once you got past Marx, Lenin and Stalin, with the smaller fry Communists, what would you do about the Socialists, the anarchists, the

subtler fellows who undermine faith in free enterprise, the atheists and agnostics and anti-clericals? What would you do about those writings of Jefferson, which advocate wetting the tree of liberty at regular intervals with the blood of tyrants? Or those papers in which Madison anticipated Marx in his economic class analysis of society? There are men who trace subversion back to 1917 and others who go back to 1789. There are some who think Freud and Einstein subversive as there were men who thought Bruno, Galileo and Spinoza subversive. The Catholics still have some of these great men on their Index; the Protestants, as the Scopes trial revealed, are not immune to a similar obscurantism. Which standard should guide the Librarian of Congress? I can see him nervously looking at Lobachevski's historic little pioneering paper in non-Euclidean geometry and wondering nervously just how he ought to list it. It subverted Euclid.

Nothing could better illustrate the vacuity of the witch hunters than this simple-minded idea of Velde's that all he had to do was introduce a bill and the Library of Congress could quickly stamp "subversive" on the books all right thinking Americans ought to avoid.

Senator Taft In Liberal Mood

OUR HAT IS ALSO OFF this week to Senator Taft for the views he expressed on academic freedom after a speech to the National Canners Association in Chicago. Indeed the Senator's views seemed sounder and more logical than Mrs. Meyer's. Mrs. Meyer thought Communists should be dismissed from faculties but Senator Taft told a press conference after the canners' meeting he felt it would be "inconsistent with freedom of thought" to dismiss a professor "simply for being a Communist" unless he was teaching Communism or trying to influence his students in that direction.

The weakness of Mrs. Meyer's view is that once you say Communists should be barred from teaching, the door is wide open to the witch hunters to determine who is a Communist. The ban at once leads to the assumption that any teachers who are Communists will naturally hide their views to keep their jobs. The only way to find them will then be by watching for tell-tale evidences of non-conformity. The strength of Senator Taft's view is that it does not compromise the basic principle of freedom

and leaves men to be judged by what they say and do, not by what some inquisitor thinks they are really thinking. That way leads straight to George Orwell's thought police.

Our Not So Independent Judiciary

THE TWELFTH ANNUAL CONVENTION of the National Lawyers Guild, which still miraculously survives and thrives, could not have picked a more deserving recipient for its Roosevelt Award than Delbert E. Metzger, who was denied reappointment to the U. S. District Court in Hawaii because he declined to knuckle under to the Department of Justice and refuse bail to Smith Sedition Act defendants. There has been no more blatant attack in our time on the independence of the judiciary than occurred last year in Metzger's case.

In accepting the award Judge Metzger said derisively that the FBI itself "after long investigation" found only 60 "subversives" among Hawaii's half million people. The Judge wanted to know how such a handful could constitute "a clear and present danger." He added, "My remarks I suppose make it clear why I was not reappointed to my Federal judgeship, particularly when judges who preside over Smith Act trials where there are convictions are promptly promoted, and Smith Act prosecutors are made judges".

New Ally, New Bank

IN A WORLD THAT SEEMS terribly impermanent it is good to hear that something goes on, as if forever. Dr. Hjalmar Horace Greeley Schacht has opened a new bank at Dusseldorf in the heart of the industrial Ruhr and another near the port of Hamburg. His namesake, Horace Greeley, advised the young man to go west, but Schacht's version is to go anywhere politically for a fast buck. He managed the feat of being a pillar of the Weimar Republic and then of the Third Reich. Now he re-enters the banking business just in time to participate in financing the liberation of Eastern Europe, unless of course the Soviet Union should take over Western Germany, in which case our stalwart new ally would no doubt manage to emerge as Commissar of Finance.

Call for Volunteers

The Weekly is now being distributed through several hundred stands in New York and Brooklyn. I hope soon to invade the Bronx, Queens, perhaps even Westchester and North Jersey. But distribution in other cities and smaller towns is much more difficult. There are usually only one or two stands in the smaller cities which handle liberal and literary papers and magazines. I would like to build a mailing list of such stands. I would appreciate it if those readers in the smaller towns who have the time would get in touch with stands of this kind for me and find out whether they would like to handle the Weekly.

—I. F. Stone

Another of Mc Carthy's Little Reichstag Fires

WASHINGTON, D. C.

ESPECIALLY IN FRANCE, where the sense of the ludicrous is strong and the public likes its fun well spiced with sex, the new Voice of America hearings must be a big success. The French will be delighted by the young lady with the trim figure who was "a little bit sort of stunned" when her superior made her what the *New York Daily News* called "a Marxist proposition." The English, their once impregnable sense of superiority sagging, will feel indebted to us for "Senators Also Told Girl Aid Was Asked to Bear 'Collective' Children," a *New York World-Telegram* headline which bears faint resemblance to the actual testimony, weird as that was. The café wits from Rome to Vienna will fully savor the moral sensitivity which led Senator McCarthy to shut off questioning of the maiden by his Senatorial colleagues with the warning that they were on television and little children might be listening in.

As an impresario, McCarthy is the best since Barnum. As a propagandist he is making Washington look worse than clownish. The crimes laid at Voice of America's door are as yet unclear, but if it had been broadcasting the Communist Manifesto 24 hours a day in 24 languages and enticing innocent schoolchildren with free pamphlets on surplus value, it could hardly have done America as much harm. The vagaries of American Senators were an old story to Europe in the days of the Trollopes, Mama and son, but this is something different. What has been broadcast to the world in the past week is that in dealing with the Eisenhower Administration, foreign countries are dealing with men who do not have the courage to be masters in their own house, though freshly installed by an overwhelming mandate.

THOSE LIKE WALTER LIPPMANN who hoped wistfully that victorious Republicans under a famous General would provide sufficient backing and backbone to put the wild men under control must be bitterly disappointed. A flurry of editorials congratulating Eisenhower on his first 30 days had hardly ended when he let the State Department knuckle under three (and perhaps four) times in a row to McCarthy. Two days after the inquiry into the Voice of America began, Secretary

of State Dulles accepted the resignation of its chief, Dr. Wilson M. Compton, although the latter was highly praised in the report just submitted by a U.S. Advisory Commission on Information Congress itself had created in 1948. Dulles explained that Dr. Compton had submitted his resignation "a month ago"; one suspects it was the pro forma resignation all top officials submit when a new Administration takes over.

In three other instances, there were naked acts of submission. An inaccurate and insubordinate security agent demoted for "blabbing" to McCarthy was reinstated by the State Department. An order that no employe need talk to McCarthy's investigators and that none were to permit removal of files without specific permission was rescinded. The effect was to give McCarthy the run of the State Department and to put its employes on notice that McCarthy is its reigning power. Most cowardly of all was the Dulles order which followed hastily on the appearance before the committee of the novelist Howard Fast, as famous abroad as he is maligned at home.

AN ADVISORY COMMISSION AS POLITICALLY PASTEURIZED as possible (it included three conservative publishers and a Catholic University professor) had recommended sensibly that when an author like Fast said something favorable about American policy that made the best kind of propaganda behind the Iron Curtain where Fast is a literary hero. Instead of standing up against the political idiocy of the McCarthy committee and its less than sensational discovery that Fast is pro-Communist, Dulles issued an order saying that no material was to be used if it came from "any controversial person, Communist, fellow traveller, etc." This clears the air ways for American Legion speeches and Knights of Columbus manifestoes. Can anyone be silly enough to believe that something nice about America from Fast is bad propaganda while one of those "Christian Crusade" speeches, threatening to blow hell out of Russia and turn it back to the Tartars, will make us friends?

McCarthy is not stupid. He knows what he is doing. This is one of a series of little "Reichstag fires" to light his own way to power.

I. F. Stone's Weekly 1-28-53

Room 225 Kellogg Bldg.
1416 F Street, N.W., Washington 4, D. C.

Please enter the following subscription. \$5 for 1 year is enclosed. (See page 3 for foreign rates)

Name

Street

City Zone

State

I. F. Stone's Weekly
225 Kellogg Bldg.
1416 F St., N.W., Washington 4, D. C.

Entered as
Second Class Mail
Matter
Post Office
Washington, D. C.

I. F. Stone's Weekly

COPYRIGHT 1953 BY I. F. STONE'S WEEKLY INC.

VOL. I, NUMBER 8

MARCH 7, 1953



WASHINGTON, D. C.

15 CENTS

Time to Leave That Tent at Panmunjom

IN THE SPEECH, "TEN FACTS," with which Henry Cabot Lodge Jr., reopened the Korean debate at the General Assembly, he said righteously of the Indian proposal on prisoners of war, "It seemed impossible that there could be rulers in this world who would object to this offer, but it soon appeared that there were. The regimes of China and of North Korea have turned it down. . . ." But on the press tables that very same day the representatives of the Republic of Korea placed copies of a statement by Syngman Rhee's Minister of Foreign Affairs, Dr. Y. T. Pyun. The copies bore the notation that delivery had been "blocked by Soviet and Indian objection." In that speech, Rhee's representative objected to the Indian proposal and accused India of fronting for the Russians.

Nationalist China, too, attacked the proposal as futile. And Mr. Lodge seems to have forgotten that last November 17, as soon as the Indian plan was put forward, it was strongly attacked by a U.S. spokesman. It was not until Mr. Vishinsky rejected the plan that Mr. Acheson accepted it. Had Mr. Vishinsky said "da," it is certain that Mr. Acheson would have said "nyet." On November 23 the New York Times reported that the State Department regarded the Indian proposal as "a cover-up and a sell-out," of course to the Russians. Four days later Mr. Vishinsky bitterly attacked the Indian plan as a cover-up and a sell-out to the Americans. Blessed the peacemakers may be—but not in this world.

IN EVERY QUARREL, there comes a point at which momentum has brought both sides to such a pitch that only the vigorous interposition of third parties can bring peace. The Korean quarrel has long passed this stage. The exchange has become one of recriminations, in which both sides have become entangled by fury in ludicrous contradictions. The United Nations exchanges communications with the Chinese Communist and North Korean regimes, but will not consent to hear them. The "unified command" at Panmunjom is forced to recognize that they exist, but the UN would still like to pretend with the U.S. that they are not really there.

Chou En-lai objects to the UN that the Indian resolution as adopted by the General Assembly is based "on the hypothesis that there are actually some among the Korean and Chinese captured personnel who 'refuse to return home.'" The Foreign Minister of Communist China says, "This does not accord in the slightest with human nature; still less does it square with the facts." But if Chou En-lai is so sure that all the prisoners would go home, why should he object to a plan which would hand them over to a Swedish-Swiss-Czech-Polish Commission, operating in a demilitarized zone with the aid of Red Cross teams from both sides, where they could decide freely whether they wished to return or not? The representative of Communist China objects feebly that in the

demilitarized zone the prisoners of war would still be subject to the influence of Chinese Nationalist and South Korean secret agents planted among them. The representative of Syngman Rhee objected in the same way that the Indian proposal was bad because the prisoners in the demilitarized zone would be subject to "terrorism" by Communist agents among them.

ONE DIFFICULTY IN THIS SITUATION arises from the nature of the "unified command" which speaks in the UN's name but over which the UN has no control. Even those nations with troops in Korea have no direct voice in the operations in which their men participate; the "liaison" committee at the State Department through which they are briefed reminds one of those "liaisons" which drag on long after love has fled.

At Panmunjom the truce talks have been carried on a la MacArthur, between the military men in the field. The only military men represented on our side are the U.S. and South Korean forces. The British, French, Canadians, Turks and other allies are not represented even by observers in the truce tent. The South Koreans have been opposed openly to the talks from the start. The hostility of the American military in Korea to a truce has been little more concealed. The POW issue did not make its appearance until the American military recognized that the enemy would get many more men back than we would if there was a mass exchange. The "moral" issue of voluntary repatriation then began to make its appearance. This has been bedevilled because two issues were confused. One was whether anti-Communist prisoners had a right to resist repatriation. The other was whether military captors have a right to subject prisoners in their custody to political interrogation. On the second the "unified command" has been clearly in the wrong. On the first it is true that "voluntary repatriation" was specifically rejected in the drafting of the Geneva convention (largely on the insistence of the United Kingdom), but if the roles were reversed the other side would be insisting on the right of "anti-Fascist" prisoners, as at Stalingrad, to claim asylum.

NEVER HAS SO MUCH CANT ABOUT SO FEW MEN held so much danger to world peace. Chinese soldiers have been switching sides with ease ever since the Chinese civil war began, and whole regiments have been sold over the counter to the Reds. The mercenaries are in no danger if returned, and no great loss to the Communists if not returned. The devoted Reds will go back: the others are not worth fighting over, much less worth the price of continuing the captivity of our own men in enemy hands. Is there no way for the UN to bring both sides to their senses? The first step might be to take the stalemated truce talks away from Panmunjom altogether and authorize a committee of neutral States to try a fresh start.

Surmise and Suspicion: The UN and The 5th Amendment

NEW YORK THE FIFTH AMENDMENT SAYS no one "shall be compelled in any criminal case to be a witness against himself." This is the privilege against self-incrimination. Question: If a man invokes the privilege against self-incrimination, does that mean he is guilty of some crime?

In the voluminous brief presented to the Administrative Tribunal of the United Nations by three lawyers on behalf of 19 dismissed UN employes, the question is answered with "a classical law school situation" recently cited by the U. S. Circuit Court of Appeals (193 F 2d 1002), "A workman on his way to his job finds his enemy lying by the road with a knife sticking in him. He pulls out the knife. Before the grand jury he claims his privilege not to answer the question, 'Were you standing beside the dead man with a knife in your hand?'" To answer truthfully would be to say "Yes." To admit that he had been standing beside the body of the dead man with a knife in his hand might incriminate him and lead to his conviction, though he was not guilty of the crime. It is in this sense that Wigmore, the leading authority on Evidence, says "The truth is that the privilege exists for the sake of the innocent—or at least for reasons irrespective of the guilt of the accused."

A similar example is cited from the leading New York case, (People ex rel. Taylor v. Forbes, 143 N.Y. 219). A student had been killed by gas. Foul play was suspected. Another student had invoked the privilege and refused to answer certain questions. He was held in contempt. The highest court of the state overruled the conviction. It said of the student who had refused to answer questions, "He belonged to the sophomore class and the class in chemistry. He boarded at the house from which the jugs [of gas] were taken by someone. His room mate, at least, seems to have been one of the persons suspected as being in some way connected with the transaction. He was so surrounded by elements of circumstantial proof that the answers to any of the questions might form a link in the chain sufficient to subject him to the hazard of a trial upon a criminal charge. . . . He was placed thus in a position where he might lawfully claim the protection of the law and remain silent."

A MORE RECENT DECISION by the Supreme Court of Illinois (In re Holland 377 Ill. 346) cited this New York case and said, "without such safeguard any person, judge, lawyer or layman, may be forced to answer questions upon the mere suspicion of the public prosecutor, or in furtherance of a misuse of his discretion for political or other improper purposes." The words might have been used of the McCarran committee long harassing the UN. (See last week's issue, "Horror or Hoax: The Spy Charges Against the UN".)

The same Illinois court, ruling in favor of a man who had invoked the privilege though claiming innocence, went on to say, "While it is not to be construed as the opinion of this court that respondent's fears of an unjust prose-

cutation are well founded, yet . . . the common knowledge of those familiar with the processes of the criminal law, that such processes have at times been used for purposes not founded on the furtherance of justice, must be considered in determining respondent's good faith in fearing indictment."

If this is true of the ordinary processes of the criminal law, it is doubly true of the current processes by which political questions are put to public officials by witch-hunting investigators, flanked by professional informers, in an atmosphere where accusation of "subversive" affiliations or sympathies is tantamount to conviction and denials are brushed aside as expected.

IS A PUBLIC OFFICIAL IN A DIFFERENT category from the ordinary citizen? Can he be dismissed for invoking his privilege? The answer is that he can, but only under certain circumstances.

In the absence of a specific legal provision, an office-holder cannot be deprived of his job for pleading his privilege under the Fifth Amendment. This is true even in the case of judicial officers, whether judges or lawyers. The Illinois case quoted above involved a judge; it was held that he could not be disciplined for pleading the privilege. The highest court of New York State similarly (Matter of Grace, 282 N.Y. 428) refused to discipline an attorney who had insisted on pleading the privilege. At present officers of New York State or New York City may be removed from office for invoking their privilege but this required an amendment to the State Constitution and of the New York City Charter.

These provisions, however, contain an important limitation which has been overlooked in the UN cases. A New York State office-holder may be dismissed only for refusing to testify "concerning the conduct of his office or the performance of his official duties."

In the UN hearings, of course, neither the grand jury nor the McCarran committee could arrogate to itself the right to question UN employes about the conduct of UN affairs. The McCarran inquiry was a fishing expedition. One of these nineteen suspended UN employes was asked whether he had ever advocated giving the atom bomb to the Soviet Union; another, "Have you ever expressed disapproval of the Soviet Union's army?" A third after denying membership in the Communist party was called on to say whether he had ever engaged in any activity against the Communist party. One prize question was whether Communists and Communist countries ought to be allowed in the UN. Ruth Crawford was asked whether she had been active with the National Committee to Repeal the McCarran Act.

ONE OF THE SILLIEST but most significant passages in the hearings was the angry interrogation of Frank C. Bancroft by Senators Smith and O'Connor:

Senator SMITH: I am not asking you about your father or grandfather. My ancestors were here 300 years ago, too. But to whom do you

look and give your greatest loyalty, the United States of America of which you are a citizen, or the United Nations? No man would have to ask me that but once, no matter what.

Mr. BANCROFT: You are not an international civil servant.

Senator SMITH: And I don't want to be, if I have to—

Senator O'CONNOR: Are you prepared to answer further? . . . Your regard for your United States citizenship is not such that you would be prepared to say now that you would always place that as highest?

Mr. BANCROFT: Sir, my regard for United States citizenship is so high that I am proud it belongs to an international organization for the preservation of peace in the world and I can't see any conflict between the two.

Senator O'CONNOR: But you will not, however, state that it is superior to any obligations of the international organization, in the event of conflict?

It seemed almost as if Mr. Bancroft were being asked whether he would be willing to bear arms against the United Nations. The Senators seemed completely unaware that the Charter was drafted to make the staff of the UN independent of all national influences. The oath they take is to their obligations as international civil servants. Similar regulations bound the staff of the League of Nations. A drafting subcommittee at San Francisco reported that this created "no practical difficulty except in the case of Fascist States."

THE EFFECT OF THE AMERICAN LOYALTY purge has been to drive non-conformists out of the government and staff its civil service with safely mediocre minds. The McCarran hearings represent an effort to extend the process to the United Nations, to make the international organization a captive body, subject to the weird judicial standards of the American witch hunt.

The nature of the "adverse" reports Trygve Lie had been receiving from the State Department and secretly applying to his staff is sufficiently indicated by a passage from Assistant Secretary of State Hickerson's testimony at the McCarran hearings. Senator Ferguson asked whether the word "adverse" in the private personnel reports to the UN meant that the person was a member of the Communist party "or was subject to the discipline of the Communists":

Mr. HICKERSON: Senator, it doesn't go quite that far. In some cases it indicated that there was a strong suspicion, or a likelihood.

Senator FERGUSON: In other words, the test of what you were trying to convey, whether it was absolute or doubtful, was that the person that you were giving adverse information on was either a Communist or was subject to the discipline of communism?

Mr. HICKERSON: Or likely to become so.

Senator FERGUSON: Or likely to become so.

Mr. HICKERSON: Or that we suspected. Of course, we didn't have the facilities for making a full investigation. . . .

I. F. Stone's Weekly

• Editor and Publisher, I. F. STONE

Published weekly except the last two weeks of August at Room 225, 1416 F St., N.W., Washington 4, D. C. Subscription rates: Domestic, \$5 a year; Canada, Mexico and elsewhere in the Western Hemisphere, \$6; England and Continental Europe, \$10 by 1st class mail, \$15 by air; for Israel, Asia, Australia and Africa, \$10 by first class mail, \$20 by air mail. Single copy, 15 cents. Contents covered by copyright. Telephone, STerling 3-0938. Entered as Second Class mail matter, Post Office, Washington, D. C.

Vol. 1, No. 8  March 7, 1953

Man Against Myth

IN REFUSING TO TELL the House Un-American Activities Committee anything more than his name, address and time and place of birth, Barrows Dunham has given Congressman Velde and his colleagues just about all they have a right to know about any college professor. Dr. Robert L. Johnson, president of Temple University, in suspending Dr. Dunham as head of its philosophy department, says every teacher has a duty to cooperate "with responsible government authority to preserve the freedom of our society." But the Velde witch hunt is not responsible authority. The House Committee is demonstrably irresponsible in its actions. It has no authority to inquire into education. Until these latter benighted years no one ever suggested that the way to "preserve the freedom of our society" was to harass and intimidate non-conformists.

The distinguished author of *Man Against Myth* has boldly entered the lists against the most dangerous myths of our time in challenging the right of the House committee to investigate education. His pusillanimous chief retires to become head of the Voice of America. But some day it will be recognized that the real voice of America spoke through the philosopher he has suspended. Dr. Dunham's "Man Against Myth" won the applause of minds as diverse as John Dewey, J.B.S. Haldane and Albert Einstein. His action deserves the support of every teacher and of everyone who believes in free education. The fight to reinstate Dunham will be a fight to reinstate freedom of education in America.

Suggestion

AS AN EX-FBI MAN, Congressman Velde is assumed to be a trained investigator. But the man who has set out to investigate America's colleges does not seem capable enough to investigate adequately the people he hires for his own staff. When Mrs. Agnes E. Meyer, wife of the chairman of the board of the *Washington Post*, criticized Velde's college witch hunt, the ex-FBI man retorted by declaring that Mrs. Meyer had written a pro-Soviet letter quoted by Pravda. When it turned out that the letter was written by a Mrs. G. S. Mayer of Port Clements, British Columbia, Velde announced he had fired the investigator responsible but declined to give his name.

It now appears that Velde might easily have learned that this investigator was unreliable. No wire-taps, mail-covers, informers, or fingerprints would have been required. A routine check back over newspaper clippings would have been enough. Last Sunday the *Washington Post's* crack reporter, Alfred Friendly, disclosed that the investigator was Robert R. "Bug-Eye" Barker, and added some interesting details. Barker was a star witness six years ago for those who tried to block the nomination of David E. Lilienthal as chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission.

"Bug-Eye" came forward with a letter he claimed to have filched in 1940 from Communist Party headquarters in Birmingham, Alabama, while working for Martin Dies. Barker claimed to have made two photostats before returning the letter to the files and testified that when he showed them to Dies the Texan ordered him to make a full dress investigation of TVA. The letter pictured Communism as rampant in the TVA under Lilienthal.

Martin Dies was queried about Barker's testimony by the *Washington Post* at the time but denied that he had ever heard of the document until it was printed in 1943 by the Knoxville, Tenn., *Journal*. Barker denied having sold the document to the *Journal* but two of its editors insisted that they bought it from him, but in mimeographed form. Barker could produce no photostats and Senate members of the joint committee mentioned the possibility of perjury charges but none were brought. Barker threatened the *Washington Post* at the time with suit for libel.

It would have taken no sleuth to check on

Barker's record before hiring him, and it takes no psychologist to see why Barker could so easily confuse a Mrs. G. S. Mayer of British Columbia with a Mrs. Agnes E. Meyer of Washington, D. C. Were Mrs. Meyer a poor college professor, of course, such "errors" might not have mattered. The smear would have stuck. A person less powerful than a publisher's wife would not have had the resources to track down the error nor the means to overtake falsehood with fact. *The Weekly* suggests that Velde call off his college inquiry and investigate his own staff instead. How many others like "Bug-Eye" are in his employ?

Ideological Controversy on the Floor of The House

MR. PATMAN. This bill (amendment to the National Housing Act to have the government guarantee home repair and improvement loans) comes nearer being vulnerable to the charge of being socialistic than any other law I know of that has been passed in recent years. However, I do not look upon it as socialistic at all. It serves a great need. . . .

MR. LANHAM. The gentleman admits it is socialistic?

MR. PATMAN. No, I am not admitting that.

MR. LANHAM. The gentleman says it is subject to that charge. Does not the gentleman mean, then, that it is good socialism?

MR. PATMAN. No; I did not say it is good socialism. I beg the gentleman's pardon. I say it is vulnerable to the charge of socialism. I do not say it is socialistic, I say it comes nearer being vulnerable to the charge or as near being vulnerable to the charge of socialism as any act this Congress has passed in 20 years.

MR. LANHAM. I think the gentleman is begging the question and that it is socialism, but that it is justified.

MR. PATMAN. The gentleman can place his own interpretation on it for himself. . . .

Hat's Off

TO THE ONLY TWO MEMBERS of the House of Representatives who had the nerve to vote against this year's \$300,000 appropriation for the House Un-American Activities Committee, Emanuel Celler of New York, and Roy W. Wier, of Minnesota.

Just A Phone Call to A Friend

With this issue the Weekly passes 6,800 subscribers. It needs 8,000 to be solidly in the black and to permit something less arduous than one-man-and-an-office-girl operation. Those who are buying it on the stands can save themselves \$2.50 by using the subscription blank on page four. Those who have already subscribed can put the Weekly over the top by getting one or two more subscribers. They can also obtain a free copy of my forthcoming book, *The Truman Era* (to sell at \$3.50 after publication in April) with two new subscribers, or get a copy for \$1 with one new subscriber. Just a phone call to a friend who may be intending to subscribe anyway will put the Weekly on a firm foundation. Won't you make that call today?

—I. F. Stone

The Man Who Refused to Be a Budenz

THEY HAD KNOWN EACH OTHER FOR MANY YEARS in the Communist party. When Bella Dodd phoned she said, "I don't suppose you'll want to talk to me, but it's urgent. I have a message from Roy Cohn. There's pressure from Washington to indict you. They don't want to do it. But you must make some gesture of cooperation. Will you call at the U.S. Attorney's office?" When he refused, she replied, "They'll send you to jail. They have an open and shut case."

Ten days later a Federal grand jury in New York handed up a perjury indictment against the man and his wife. Hearst's *Journal American* indicated that action was being taken because he had declined to "cooperate." The man who refused to be another Budenz was Earl Browder. In 1945 he was removed as head of the Communist Party, USA. In 1949 he lost his job as American representative for Soviet publishing houses. He had his first chance to tell all within two months of his ouster in 1945. Summoned before the House Un-American Activities Committee in September, 1945, Browder refused to talk. Browder's most dramatic episode in non-cooperation was his appearance in 1950 before the special Senate committee investigating the McCarthy charges against the State Department. Budenz had testified Browder told him Lattimore was a Communist. Browder denied this under oath.

AMID THE FIERCELY LILLIPUTIAN SECTARIANISMS of the left, only grudging recognition has been given Browder's record. He has eked out a precarious living in obscurity when he might have sold his memoirs for a small fortune to any one of a half dozen big magazines. On the heels of the perjury indictments last Fall, the Justice Department last week issued a warrant for deportation of his wife, mother of three American born sons.

"The place of justice is a hallowed place" it says on one of the stone carvings along the Pennsylvania avenue side of the Justice Department. There could be nothing less hallowed than this attempt to destroy a man and his wife because he refuses to become an informer. The Browders met in a cafeteria in Moscow in 1926, and were married there. She entered the U.S. from Canada in 1933. A warrant for her deportation was issued in 1940. All the facts involved in the

current deportation action and in the perjury indictment were gone over extensively in four years of administrative hearings. The deportation warrant was cancelled.

IN 1946 MRS. BROWDER APPLIED for citizenship. In that proceeding both she and her husband declared under oath that she had not been a Communist. The application was neither granted nor rejected but three years later the Browders were summoned by the Immigration and Naturalization Service and asked the same questions again, under oath, as if to keep the matter fresh. The statute of limitations in perjury is three years. By repeating the same questions and answers in 1949, the government extended for three years more the period in which a perjury prosecution might be initiated. The trap was sprung last Fall. The indictments were obtained exactly two weeks before the statute of limitations would again have barred prosecution.

"They have an open and shut case," Bella Dodd had said to Browder. But the government does not seem to think so. Trial of the Browders on the perjury indictment was repeatedly postponed on request of the government. On February 24 the government asked indefinite postponement, hinting that the case was being dropped. The defense agreed readily. Next day the warrant for deportation was issued.

THE SWITCH IN TACTICS IS A CRAFTY ONE. The indictment would have to be tried in a court of law, where it would be difficult to prove that Mrs. Browder lied about her beliefs and that her husband lied in saying she was not a member of the Communist party. There is a line of cases which says that a person cannot be held guilty of perjury on a matter which involves opinion or belief. Membership in the Communist party is a question on which proof would have to be submitted. By shifting to deportation, the government takes the whole matter into its own administrative tribunals where the rights of aliens are sharply limited. Should the government win, the Russians would not take Mrs. Browder back. She might be detained for the rest of her life as a deportable alien. This is how they put the screws on a man who refuses to be a Budenz.

I. F. Stone's Weekly 3-7-53

Room 225 Kellogg Bldg.
1416 F Street, N.W., Washington 4, D. C.

Please enter the following subscription. \$5 for 1 year is enclosed. (See page 3 for foreign rates)

Name

Street

City Zone

State

I. F. Stone's Weekly
225 Kellogg Bldg.
1416 F St., N.W., Washington 4, D. C.

NEWSPAPER

Entered as
Second Class Mail
Matter
Post Office
Washington, D. C.

I. F. Stone's Weekly

COPYRIGHT 1953 BY I. F. STONE'S WEEKLY INC.

VOL. I NUMBER 9

MARCH 14, 1953



WASHINGTON, D. C.

15 CENTS

Washington After Stalin

Amid the burst of bad manners and foolish speculation, there was remarkably little jubilation. A sudden chill descended on the capital. If Stalin was the aggressive monster painted in official propaganda, his death should have cheered Washington. Actually the unspoken premise of American policy has been that Stalin was so anxious for peace he would do nothing unless Soviet soil itself were violated. With his death, the baiting of the Russian bear—the favorite sport of American politics—suddenly seemed dangerous. Even Martin Dies rose in the House to say that while Stalin was “utterly cruel and ruthless, he was more cautious and conservative than the younger Bolsheviks.” Few would have dared a week earlier to dwell on the conservative and cautious temperament of the Soviet ruler, much less imply that this was favorable to world stability and peace. Now this theme leaked from every State Department briefing. There was apprehension that after Stalin there might come someone worse and more difficult to deal with.

The cold war clique was critical of Nehru for calling Stalin a man of peace, but Washington's own instinctive reactions said the same thing. The stress put by the White House on the fact that its condolences were merely “official” was small-minded and unworthy of a great power. After all, it is fortunate for America that when Stalin's regime met the ultimate test of war, it did not collapse like the Czar's. The war against the Axis would have lasted a lot longer and cost a great many more American lives if there had been a second Tannenberg instead of a Stalingrad. Stalin was one of the giant figures of our time, and will rank with Ivan, Peter, Catherine and Lenin among the builders of that huge edifice which is Russia. Magnanimous salute was called for on such an occasion. Syngman Rhee, ruler of a satellite State precariously engaged in fighting for its life against forces supplied by Russia, demonstrated a sense of fitness in his own condolences which Washington seemed afraid to show.

It is difficult to pursue dignified and rational policy when official propaganda has built up so distorted a picture of Russia. Many Americans fed constantly on the notion that the Soviet Union is a vast slave labor camp must have wondered why the masses did not rise now that the oppressor had vanished. The Bolshevik Revolution is still regarded here as a kind of diabolic accident. The necessities imposed on rulers by the character of the countries they rule is ignored. To understand it would be to put the problem of peaceful relations with Russia in quite a different perspective and to dissipate febrile delusions about “liberation.” The wisest of the anti-Communist Russian emigres of our generation, Berdyaev, in his *The Origin*

of Russian Communism has touched on the way Bolshevism succeeded because it was so deeply rooted in Russia's character and past. Bolshevism “made use,” Berdyaev wrote, “of the Russian traditions of government by imposition. . . . It made use of the characteristics of the Russian spirit . . . its search after social justice and the Kingdom of God upon earth . . . and also of its manifestations of coarseness and cruelty. It made use of Russian messianism. . . . It fitted in with the absence among the Russian people of the Roman view of property. . . . It fitted in with Russian collectivism which had its roots in religion.”

Every great leader is the reflection of the people he leads and Stalin in this sense was Russia. He was also the leader of something new in world history, a party: a party in a new sense, like nothing the world has known since the Society of Jesus, a party ruling a one-party state. It is this difference which makes nonsense of prediction by analogy based on the principle of legitimacy in monarchy or the later history of the Roman empire. Struggle among the party leaders occurred after the death of Lenin and may occur after the death of Stalin, but the party itself provides a cement strong enough to hold the state together despite such struggles. To regard this as a group of conspirators may prove a fatal error. This is a movement, with a philosophy comparable to the great religions in its capacity to evoke devotion, and based on certain economic realities which give it a constructive function. It has proved itself capable of industrializing Russia and opening new vistas to its masses, and this is its appeal to similar areas in Asia. This is a challenge which can only be met by peaceful competition, for only in peace can the West preserve what it has to offer, and that is the tradition of individual liberty and free thought.

The news from Communist China where party cadres had begun careful study of Malenkov's work weeks before Stalin died indicates that the succession was arranged in advance. There is little reason to expect a sudden fight among the leaders, and no reason to believe such a quarrel would make for world stability. It is time in the wake of Stalin's death to recognize two basic facts about the world we live in. One fact is Russia. The other is the Communist movement. The surest way to wreck what remains of capitalism and intellectual freedom in the non-Communist world today is blindly to go on refusing to recognize these facts and refusing to adjust ourselves to co-existence on the same planet with them. Eisenhower in leaving the door discreetly ajar to possible negotiations with Stalin's successor was wise, and the lesser powers should seize on the sobering moment to urge Washington and Moscow to get together.

Victory Over Perjury: The Ordeal of Scientist X

Washington, D. C.

The private passion of "Scientist X," Dr. Joseph W. Weinberg, is study of the life and work of Giordano Bruno. Unlike his hero, Dr. Weinberg has escaped martyrdom. His acquittal by a jury in Federal Court here last week may go down in the history of this period as the first great victory over perjury in the current American Inquisition.

The verdict was more than the vindication of a scholar after four years of calumny. It was a black eye for the House Un-American Activities Committee, and for the Tenney Committee in California and for the assorted informers and Federal agents on whom these committees relied. For if Dr. Weinberg is not guilty of perjury, then his accusers were and ought themselves to be prosecuted. And the House Committee is guilty of defaming an innocent man, destroying his reputation and driving him out of his university post for the sake of a pre-election sensation.

This is how it began. On September 28, 1948, on the eve of the 1948 election, the House Committee issued a "Report On Soviet Espionage Activities in Connection with The Atom Bomb." The 80th Congress then in session was Republican. J. Parnell Thomas was chairman of the committee. It alleged that "certain vital information . . . of assistance to the Russians in their development of the atomic bomb . . . was actually transmitted." And the report said "The failure to prosecute those who were engaged in this conspiracy is completely inexcusable." The pre-election message was clear. The Truman Administration had protected atomic spies.

The most exciting part of the report concerned a Scientist X. The report described how Scientist X met Steve Nelson, a Communist party official, at the latter's home in Berkeley, California, "late one night in March of 1943." Scientist X "read to Nelson a complicated formula which Nelson copied down" because the formula had to be returned to the university's Radiation Laboratories in the morning. These laboratories were "engaged in vital work in the development of the atomic bomb." A few nights later—so the report said—Nelson met a Soviet official in a park and "transferred something" to him. The committee said, "If the matter transferred included the formula Scientist X had given several days previous—and the inference is irresistible that it did—it was a formula of importance in the development of the atom bomb." This was as good as any Hollywood scenario.

Scientist X when summoned before the committee denied that he knew Nelson, denied that he had ever had any such meeting "with Nelson or anyone else" and denied that he had "ever given to any unauthorized person any formula or other classified information." The report countered, "This is in direct conflict with the testimony of two Federal agents who were assigned to the investigation." When the Committee on the word of "a very reliable and highly confidential informant" later identified

Scientist X as Weinberg, the newspaper verdict was guilty and Weinberg soon lost his post as assistant professor of physics. It was said that he had created a public relations problem for the University of Minnesota.

The day after the original House Committee report in 1948, the Department of Justice issued a statement saying that all the matter covered in the report had been "carefully studied . . . on two separate occasions" by the Criminal Division and prosecution found "unwarranted." The Department said the report had been assembled a year before from stray intelligence "leaks" and its release timed by the Committee for the eve of the 1948 elections. Little attention was paid to this, as to other denials.

But to those few who read the Committee report instead of relying on the headlines, there were tell-tale discrepancies and contradictions. The writer called attention to these in a series of articles for the New York Star and (after the 1949 report) in two columns for the New York Compass. While most took the charges at face value, their weaknesses must have been apparent to the Federal grand juries of 1950 and 1951 which considered them. Neither returned indictments. It was not until May of last year, just three days before the statute of limitations would have foreclosed prosecution, that the government finally got an indictment for perjury.

The indictment itself considerably deflated the original charges. If these were true, Weinberg was guilty of war-time espionage. On this there is no statute of limitations. But Weinberg was only indicted for perjury. The important perjuries lay in Weinberg's sworn statement that he had never given classified information to anyone, and that there never occurred any such meeting as the one in which he was alleged to have dictated a secret formula to Nelson. Neither figured in the indictment.

Weinberg was indicted on three counts, none of which had anything to do with atomic espionage. Count 1 was his denial that he had ever been a Communist. Count 2 was his statement that he recalled attending only one meeting of the Communist party, a public meeting under its auspices in Oakland. Count 3 was the statement that he had never met Nelson.

The indictment put an anti-climax on the report. The trial in turn reduced the indictment to a shred. Halfway through, the government withdrew Count 3. In withdrawing the allegation that Weinberg ever knew Nelson it took the last leg out from under the atomic espionage report. A few days later the Judge himself, Alexander Holtzoff, ruled out Count 2. This left only Count 1, the denial of membership in the Communist party.

Two witnesses were produced by the government. One was Joseph Samuel Biskind, a music teacher and part time statistician. He testified that he attended 40 meetings of the Campus branch of the Communist party in Berkeley from the spring of 1939 to June of 1940 and that Weinberg was at 20 of these meetings. When asked how he arrived at this

figure, he said there were 52 weeks in the year and 12 weeks of summer vacation. That left 40 meetings a year of the Campus branch. Defense counsel then wanted to know how he arrived at the figure of 20 for the meetings attended by Weinberg.

A. Well, I couldn't prove it from any matter of fact. I simple know that on 20 of these occasions I saw Mr. Weinberg. . . .

Q. Would you tell us the first occasion when you saw Mr. Weinberg?

A. Well, I couldn't recall that at all, sir.

Q. Will you tell us the second?

A. I know one occasion on which I saw him at a meeting

Q. You don't remember any other occasion, is that right?

A. No, sir.

The other witness, John Graham Backus, said he had "a visual image" of Weinberg lying on the floor at a Communist meeting but "this all happened 14 years ago and I could be wrong." When the prosecutor, William Hitz, angrily began (as he conceded) to impeach his own witness, Backus said, "I have been over this thing six or seven times with people from the FBI. I have had these two grand jury sessions. I have had sessions in your office, and things have become so confused by this time that what pictures I may have had are very vague."

Q. (By Hitz). Do you also mean to include the one single meeting about which you had this mental photograph. Is that vague?

A. Very vague.

The final blow to the government's rickety case was a surprise witness for the defense. Kenneth O. May, professor of mathematics at a small town college in the Middle West, had the humanity to risk his own position by testifying. May said he was a Communist party functionary in Berkeley at the time, that he roomed with Steve Nelson, that he attended meetings of the Campus branch regularly, that he never saw Weinberg at any of them. May said he was no longer a Communist and had never hid his views. He testified that when asked his profession on being inducted into the Army in 1942 he replied, "Communist party organizer."

The hours of waiting in the witness room at the Federal courthouse were but a sample in miniature of the long agony imposed on the brilliant young physicist and his wife. The acquittal finally made a dud of the sensation served up by the Committee on the eve of the 1948 elections. But how wipe out the suffering and the stain? Restore honor and employment? And are those to go forever unpunished who use Congressional power and immunity to deal in perjury and slander? Not a single person named in that atomic report has ever been indicted for espionage. It linked up with none of the real cases in the wake of the Fuchs affair. It was a fake from first to last, yet all those named in it live under a cloud.

I. F. Stone's Weekly

• Editor and Publisher, I. F. STONE

Published weekly except the last two weeks of August at Room 225, 1416 F St., N.W., Washington 4, D. C. Subscription rates: Domestic, \$5 a year; Canada, Mexico and elsewhere in the Western Hemisphere, \$6; England and Continental Europe, \$10 by 1st class mail, \$15 by air; for Israel, Asia, Australia and Africa, \$10 by first class mail, \$20 by air mail. Single copy, 15 cents. Contents covered by copyright. Telephone, STerling 3-0938. Entered as Second Class mail matter, Post Office, Washington, D. C.

Vol. 1, No. 9  March 14, 1953

Defeat for McCarthy

It would be hard to document the Secretary of State's assertion that John Carter Vincent's reporting and evaluation of the facts on China were substandard, and John Foster Dulles in his statement on the Vincent case does not try to do so. No one misjudged the nature of the Chinese Communist movement more completely than "Pat" Hurley and no one was more critical of Chiang Kai-shek than that other rightist favorite, Gen. Wedemeyer. A sober study of the White Paper on China will not bear out the popular charge that Foreign Service officers assigned to China were either misinformed or more prejudiced against Chiang than the facts warranted. Men like Vincent and John Stewart Service are guilty of nothing but the misfortune of being picked as targets by an utterly unscrupulous lobby.

But when that has been said it is necessary in the light of political realities to applaud the action taken by Mr. Dulles in the Vincent case. The Secretary of State's decision was a victory for decency and a defeat for McCarthy and McCarran. These two Senatorial vultures have been working for two years to pick clean the bones of Vincent's reputation. To have a Republican Secretary of State rule after all their charges and "testimony" that Vincent was neither disloyal nor a security risk is a bitter pill for them to swallow and must deepen the nascent hostility between the Eisenhower Administration and the crypto-Fascist bloc in Congress. The Secretary of State was thereby also calling their pet witness Louis Budenz a liar. In this respect the Secretary's finding

will help that other target of the two Mc C's, Owen Lattimore.

Those Christians!

Another unexpected pleasure of the week was hearing Miss Tima D. Ludins, the retired New York high school teacher, give the Jenner committee a piece of her mind. Miss Ludins told the committee among other things that she had dropped in the night before at the movie, *Androcles and The Lion*, now playing in Washington. She recommended it to the Committee. "In the movie," Miss Ludins pointedly related, "Caesar says that for every Christian we throw to the lions, two more spring up." Jenner and his colleagues ought to call off the education hearings while they reinvestigate Hollywood. Who had the bright idea of putting on *Androcles* just at this time? Everybody knows Shaw was a Red, and as for the early Christians the less said about them the better. While Jenner and his colleagues fiddle, it would be better to have no more movies showing how Rome burned.

What? No Parking Tickets?

From a Justice Department press release announcing denaturalization proceedings against a Communist: "that he failed to disclose that he was not attached to the principles of the Constitution of the United States, and that he did not reveal that he has (sic) been arrested in Lawrence, Massachusetts, November 10, 1931, on charges of disorderly conduct, unlawful assembly and obstruction of sidewalk."

Pedestrian Statue!

In November, 1951, General Van Fleet's Judge Advocate General gave out a sensational report on the mistreatment of prisoners of war by the Reds. "U. S. Reveals Reds Killed 5500 G.I. Captives in Korea" said one headline and another, "Reds Butchered More Americans Than Fell in '76." But when Congressman O'Konski asked General Van Fleet last week how our POW's were being treated by the enemy, the answer was that we had no information. None of the awed Congressmen on the House Military Affairs Committee had the nerve or knowledge to ask the returned hero about these earlier atrocity reports given out by the Eighth Army.

At the public hearing Van Fleet was in quite a "Pippa Passes" mood. The Eighth Army was the best equipped, clothed, housed and cared for army we ever had in the field.

Its men were "happy." The South Koreans "love us." Operation Smack was "highly successful as far as experience is concerned." Syngman Rhee was a great leader, scholar and poet. The silliest question asked him was to tell the committee, "if it wasn't secret information," just how the United Nations "transmuted" its orders to the Eighth Army.

Of course no one was rude enough to ask the General just what he meant when he told that visiting Filipino delegation in Korea January of last year, "Korea was a blessing. There had to be a Korea either here or some place in the world." Maybe somebody will be intrepid enough to ask the question if Van Fleet's conflicting statements on ammunition leads to a full dress investigation. Someone ought to do a statue of the general in characteristic pose with his foot in his mouth.

Non-Sequitur Award

After many years in the Justice Department as counsel to J. Edgar Hoover, it is not hard to understand why Federal Judge Alexander Holtzoff was shocked by the jury verdict acquitting Dr. Joseph W. Weinberg. The verdict was hardly a triumph for the FBI. But it was a striking non-sequitur to dwell on the supposed situation during the war at the Radiation Laboratories of the University of California and then add, "That may not have any bearing on the defendant's guilt or innocence." If the Judge was not sure it had any bearing on Dr. Weinberg's own guilt or innocence, was it fair to make a statement casting a new slur on a young scientist the government has long hounded without ever producing proof enough to convict? It's hard enough to get a fair trial in the District of Columbia without scolding juries which have the courage to disagree with the government.

Hat's Off

To Joseph A. Fannelli and Harry I. Rand, defense counsel for Dr. Weinberg, for their skill and devotion in winning a verdict of acquittal from a District of Columbia jury, a feat which recalls Lord Erskine's successes as counsel for accused radicals in a similar period in the England of the 1790's. Both Fannelli and Rand are former New Dealers (Justice and Interior). Fannelli as chairman of the Board of Immigration Appeals in 1941 handed down a famous decision (later reversed by then Attorney General Biddle but subsequently upheld by the U. S. Supreme Court) against the deportation of Harry Bridges.

The Age in Which The Peace Was Lost

This was the Truman era. I. F. Stone's *The Truman Era*, to be published May 4 by Monthly Review Press in the United States and by Turnstile Press in England, covers the period with the vividness of a diary and the charm of a series of familiar essays. The collected columns and dispatches which make up the book go back to some vivid reportage on the formation of the United Nations in San Francisco and include some of his best satirical pieces. The size of the advance sale has made it possible to reduce the price from \$3.50 to \$3. The pre-publication price is still \$2, and the book can be ordered at that price now through the Weekly, or obtained at \$1 with one new subscription or free with two new subscriptions. This is a book every PM and Compass fan will enjoy. If you are a news stand buyer of the Weekly you can save \$2.50 a year and get the book for \$1 by using the subscription blank on page four.

Morse Truckles to The Witch Hunters

Coming from Morse of Oregon the statement that academic freedom in America had nothing to fear from Congressional investigation provoked surprise at the Eighth National Conference on Higher Education in Chicago last week. For a Senator who is making independence and liberalism his stock in trade, Morse's blind spot is disturbing. It has been evident since January 30 when a resolution came before the Senate to give \$150,000 more to the Internal Security Subcommittee. This is the so-called "McCarran Committee" now investigating higher education under Jenner.

It was natural to expect that an independent liberal would take the floor to fight that appropriation. Morse told the Senate that ever since Jenner and McCarthy had requested additional money, Morse had been getting letters asking him to oppose them. The Senator said he would not be a party to any such effort and even doubted "whether the committees are asking for sufficient funds."

From the remarks which followed one might have thought that Jenner and McCarthy were characters newly arrived on the national scene. Morse said he would not assume that investigating committees would not live up to their "trust merely because some persons do not like some of the committee members personally." The Senator from Oregon said righteously that he would not "indulge in a presumption of guilt against anyone, including any colleague in the Senate."

Eisenhower merely allowed Jenner to embrace him. Morse embraces Jenner. "To the Senator from Indiana," Morse said, "I say I wish him well in the investigation." Morse cast suspicion on those who have been fighting the witch hunt. "Does the Senator agree with me," Morse asked Jenner, "that there are those in this country who seem to be in opposition to . . . any increase in funds for the investigation of subversive activities because, for their own reasons, none of which is good, they do not want the Congress to put itself in a position where it will have the funds to detect subversive activities"? The Senator from Indiana was delighted to agree.

When Lehman criticized McCarran in the Senate on February 20, Morse agreed that in the work of investigating com-

mittees "abuses have developed in the past." But Morse added charitably that this was to be expected "because members of Senate committees are human." This is the first time anyone has suggested that what is wrong with McCarran, McCarthy and Jenner is their humanity.

Morse, in submitting his resolution for the reform of investigating committee procedure, seemed to feel that only a set of rules was necessary to end abuses. But it is not lack of rules which is at fault. It is the notion that Congressional committees have a right to investigate private opinion. And it is the cowardice of other Senators which permits unscrupulous and self-seeking Senators to smear and terrorize with impunity. One might as well enact a code of conduct for Old Nick himself. McCarran was ready to agree that of course "so far as possible . . . fair procedures should be followed." The trident should never be hotter than so many degrees nor plunged more than so many inches into the subject.

Morse's subservience to the standards of the witch hunt reached a new stage last week when he not only supported the resolution to subject all Senate employes to loyalty clearance but proposed that this be extended to Senators as well. The amendment was shouted down by the Senate. "Loyalty" clearances will serve to do on the Hill what they have already done in the other branches of the government. They will make it difficult for liberals to work for Senators and Senate committees. Taft had the good sense to move that Senate employes be cleared only with the FBI and not as originally proposed with the House Un-American Activities Committee and Central Intelligence. But there are few liberals against whom something "derogatory" may not turn up in the unprocessed rubbish revealed by the Coplon case in the FBI files.

Morse would have had the Senate exclude anyone elected to the Senate "if the FBI knows that in fact he is not a good security risk, even though he may have fooled the people of his state into electing him." This would give a secret police, often politically illiterate and always reactionary, a veto power over the election of Senators. It is hard to believe that this was Wayne Morse of Oregon talking.

I. F. Stone's Weekly 3-14-53
 Room 225 Kellogg Bldg.
 1416 F Street, N.W., Washington 4, D. C.

Please enter the following subscription. \$5 for 1 year is enclosed. (See page 3 for foreign rates)

Name

Street

City Zone

State

I. F. Stone's Weekly
 225 Kellogg Bldg.
 1416 F St., N.W., Washington 4, D. C.

NEWSPAPER

Entered as
 Second Class Mail
 Matter
 Post Office
 Washington, D. C.

I. F. Stone's Weekly

COPYRIGHT 1953 BY I. F. STONE'S WEEKLY INC.

VOL. I NUMBER 10

MARCH 21, 1953



WASHINGTON, D. C.

15 CENTS

The Meaning of Malenkov

The West does not know when it is well off. Had the Russian Revolution like the French degenerated into a Napoleonic phase, the world would indeed have cause to tremble. The masses of Russia allied with those of China under a military despotism energized, as was France, by revolutionary social change—such a combination would be almost insuperable! It is fortunate for us that in the transition from Stalin to Malenkov, as in that from Lenin to Stalin, the civilian power emerged at the helm of the State. Once again it is the Party rather than the Army which remains at the controls, with the vast apparatus of the secret police as some check upon the military itself. Repugnant as most of us find this monolithic dictatorship, it is preferable to the emergence of a military adventurer, especially one of genius, like the great Corsican.

It is also fortunate for us that the Russian people, unlike the Germans, is basically peaceful and not susceptible to the Pied Piper of world conquest. The accents of a Bismarck, a Kaiser or a Hitler were noticeably absent from the speeches at Stalin's funeral and before the Supreme Soviet. There was no gospel of blood and iron, and none of the turgid demagoguery with which Der Fuehrer bewitched the Reich. The tone was sober, the content was peaceful. The voices were those of responsible men taking over a huge State in what was obviously a well planned succession. One may like or dislike the men and the doctrine they live by but so much must be admitted by objective observation. How quickly we have forgotten the ranting and the hysterics, the saber-rattling and the tantrums, heard from Berlin before World Wars I and II! By contrast the Malenkov speech at Stalin's funeral was calm to the point of being pedestrian. Its stress was on the development of industry and agriculture at home. Its theme in foreign policy was "the Lenin-Stalin axiom that peaceful co-existence and peaceful competition between two different systems—the capitalist and the Socialist systems—is possible." This is no neurotic Hitler, no posturing Mussolini.

The most striking thing of all about these two speeches by Malenkov is their attitude toward the United States. There was not one word of ill-will toward our own country. There was none of the demagoguery in which Soviet leaders have often indulged on the subject of "American warmongers," no Socialist soap-box phrases about our ruling class. In the speech before the Supreme Soviet, Malenkov specifically mentioned the United States in saying that there were no controversial issues with other nations which Moscow was not prepared to settle peacefully. A hand was extended, not a mailed fist.

What will be Eisenhower's answer to these overtures? "We have always been ready to negotiate," Anthony Eden

said in his farewell speech before the Foreign Policy Association last week. "We still are." This may be a British hope. It has not been American policy. The avoidance of all negotiations, the rejection of all overtures, has been Washington's policy. The whole point of the Truman-Acheson "total diplomacy" was to substitute the buildup of arms and tension as a substitute for patient exploration. The hope was to marshal such overwhelming power as to be able to dictate virtual surrender terms to Moscow, or crush the Soviet State with one big boom. It should be clear by now that this kind of policy belongs in the comic strips with Buck Rogers, and Eisenhower has in fact indicated that he might be willing to talk.

It is a pity that at this moment we should have no Ambassador in Moscow to make deeper soundings as to Russian policy and the possibility of successful negotiations. It may be no coincidence that such Senators as Bridges, McCarthy and McCarran have chosen this moment to fight the nomination of Charles E. Bohlen for the post. These Senators are the spokesmen for those who want war. It is fantastic that a career diplomat so far to the right as Bohlen should have to have his "loyalty" defended. This is a sideshow for us boobs of the public. These Senators simply do not want an American Ambassador in Moscow at this time. They are fearful lest peace break out. This would be the death of Chiang's hopes and of the American hysteria on which their own careers depend.

This is the moment which may determine the future. The dream of building up overwhelming strength is as absurd now as in the past. We are engaged in an arms race and an arms race can lead only to war. Both sides can only impoverish each other, especially when the tools of war are as complex and expensive as the jet plane, the big bomber and the atom bomb. In such a race, the Soviet States, accustomed to much lower living standards, used to a fierce and rigid discipline, have the advantage over us. Above all it is difficult to keep a free society with free traditions in a perpetual state of tension and mobilization. It is not an accident that the momentum of the cold war is driving us toward a Fascism of our own. Only a regimented America, in which all dissent has been cowed, can be expected to bear the stepped up burdens of an atomic arms race, and to submit to the annual spring scares staged by the military and the aviation lobby, like the new bogeyman story sent out last Monday by the Alsop brothers. The price of rejecting these new peace overtures must be the further erosion of basic American freedoms. The choice is between negotiation and a road which leads to mutual destruction.

When Is Contempt Not Contempt?

When A Big Business Lobbyist Defies A Committee

A unanimous Supreme Court last week held that Edward A. Rumely had been unjustly convicted of contempt. It ruled that a Congressional investigating committee had exceeded its powers in asking Rumely certain questions. This was the first time since 1881 that the Court had reversed a conviction for contempt on the ground that the questions asked a witness by Congressional investigators were beyond their powers.

The ruling in *U. S. v Rumely* was the first sign that the U. S. Supreme Court might intervene to help victims of such inquisitorial bodies as the House Un-American Activities Committee. Indeed Mr. Justice Frankfurter, in writing the decision, said the Court would have to be "blind" not to see that "there is wide concern, both in and out of Congress, over some aspects of the exercise of the Congressional power of investigation."

Ever since the case of the Hollywood Ten, the Court had managed to stay blind. It refused to hear the appeals in the Hollywood, Joint Anti-Fascist Refugee Committee and other contempt cases which raised squarely the problem of whether the House Un-American Activities Committee was violating the First Amendment.

The Rumely case is the first in which the present Court has passed on this question. The decision may prove useful. But certain astringent and fundamental observations are necessary to temper jubilation and restrain prediction. Now as so often in the past it was the danger to moneyed privilege and not to intellectual liberty which galvanized the Court into action. The story behind the decision again illustrates the Supreme Court's traditional ambivalence in dealing with the rights of property and the rights of man.

The law is that Congressional investigations are limited (1) by the Constitution and (2) by the resolutions under which they operate. These salutary principles were first laid down by the Supreme Court in 1881. The effect was to keep Congress from investigating the Jay Cooke receivership, No. 1 scandal in the financial crisis of the 70's, and to save from jail the company official who refused to produce its accounts.

The new decision is in a similar pattern. Its effect is to keep Congress from investigating the accounts of the Committee for Constitutional Government, one of big business's biggest lobbies, and to save its secretary, Edward A. Rumely, from going to jail for refusing to disclose the sources of \$2,000,000 spent by the Committee. It was for this that the First Amendment was finally taken out of deep freeze.

The Rumely decision and its background show how differently the courts treat "subversion" when it comes from the Right. The case derived from the efforts of Congress to control

lobbying. Lobbying in this context represents the effort of big moneyed men and corporations so to manipulate public opinion as to undermine democratic processes. At least as far back as 1913 President Wilson called attention to "an insidious body of tariff lobbyists" in the fight over the Underwood tariff.

There have been many investigations of lobbying. One of the most famous was the inquiry under the chairmanship of Senator (now Supreme Court Justice) Hugo Black into the lobby which tried to defeat the Utility Holding Company Act. Prize discovery: of 13,580 telegrams sent Congress from 20 different towns to protect the pending legislation on utility holding companies all but 13 were filed and paid for by utility company agents, often without consent of the person whose name was used.

The first Lobby Registration Act to contend with such evils was passed by Wisconsin in 1905 under the inspiration of the elder La Follette. His son and Congressman Mike Monroney put similar provisions into the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946. These require the registration of lobbyists and the reporting of their financial sources. A House committee was set up in 1949 to investigate operations under this legislation. A passage from its interim report in October 1950 may serve to show the philosophy behind the inquiry. It complained that big business "organizations seeking to protect a privileged status for their members at the expense of the general welfare of all Americans use terms like 'socialism,' 'statism' and 'welfare state' to forestall rational analysis of legislative proposals which they oppose." The report said "Political freedom cannot live in an atmosphere of such hysterical oversimplification."

One of the biggest wholesalers of these "hysterical oversimplifications" is the Committee for Constitutional Government. From 1937 to 1944 it sent out some 82,000,000 pieces of literature. From 1946 to 1950 it spent some \$2,000,000 fighting reforms of almost every variety from "socialized medicine" to rent control. It set up a system to avoid reporting its contributors. Rumely was cited for contempt in refusing to disclose.

Defense counsel argued that disclosure would interfere with exercise of rights guaranteed by the First Amendment. An anonymous "lady from Toledo" paid to send out 4,000 copies of John T. Flynn's *The Road Ahead*. "Surely," the defense argued in its brief, "she had a constitutional right to do this. But, if she had known that her name and address must be reported to Congress and would be sensationally publicized by a committee of Congress she might well have been deterred from making such a purchase." The brief argued that big employers had a similar right to anonymity in financing Taft-Hartley law pamphlets. "Enforced publicity . . . would inevitably deter many such employers from thus arousing an-

tagonisms that would surely embarrass their efforts to maintain cordial relations with their employees and union organizations."

The same argument was made on behalf of the Hollywood Ten and of the Joint Anti-Fascist Refugee Committee. It was said that the House Un-American Activities Committee by pillorying persons of liberal or radical views was effectively interfering with the First Amendment by making people afraid to speak freely.

The same Circuit Court heard the same argument in both the Rumely and Joint Anti-Fascist Refugee cases. The two decisions were written by the same judge, Prettyman. He admitted "the realistic effect of public embarrassment is a powerful interference with the free expression of views." But Judge Prettyman held that in the JAFRC case "the apparent nature of the Communist party created a public necessity for congressional inquiry," while in the Rumely case "no such dangerous factors are represented to us."

The difference in attitude could not have been confessed more baldly. The effect was to protect rightists fighting social reform while leaving unprotected those fighting to change the status quo.

While new forms of registration and exposure are being imposed on Leftists, the registration provisions of the Lobby Act are faring badly in the courts. Twice in the past year, once on appeal by the National Association of Manufacturers and again on appeal by a New York cotton broker, Federal Judge Alexander Holtzoff has declared the Lobbying Act unconstitutional. So deep is the animus against registering lobbyists that a court even threw out the one indictment of a Left lobbyist, William Patterson, of the Civil Rights Congress.

The Supreme Court must soon pass on the decisions holding the Lobbying Act unconstitutional. In the Rumely decision the majority, speaking through Mr. Justice Frankfurter, moved warily. It freed Rumely on a finely split hair, holding that the activities he declined to disclose were only "indirect" lobbying and therefore beyond the authority of the investigating committee.

Mr. Justice Douglas agreed that Rumely should go free but protested for himself and Mr. Justice Black that the conviction should have been upset on First Amendment grounds. They argued that if the government could demand that a publisher disclose the purchasers of his books, "the spectre of a government agent will look over the shoulder of everyone who reads."

But to accept the reasoning of the minority would be to protect the poor man's advocate as well as the rich man's hired lobbyist. It remains to be seen whether a majority of the Court is prepared to go that far.

I. F. Stone's Weekly

• Editor and Publisher, I. F. STONE

Published weekly except the last two weeks of August at Room 225, 1416 F St., N.W., Washington 4, D. C. Subscription rates: Domestic, \$5 a year; Canada, Mexico and elsewhere in the Western Hemisphere, \$6; England and Continental Europe, \$10 by 1st class mail, \$15 by air; for Israel, Asia, Australia and Africa, \$10 by first class mail, \$20 by air mail. Single copy, 15 cents. Contents covered by copyright. Telephone, STerling 3-0938. Entered as Second Class mail matter, Post Office, Washington, D. C.

Vol. 1, No. 10  March 21, 1953

What Churchmen Could Do

Washington, D. C.

Though the House Un-American Activities Committee has shelved any plans its chairman, Velde, may have had to investigate the churches, we see no reason why the churches should not go ahead and investigate Velde and the House Committee. Instead of limiting themselves to resolutions of protest, churchmen in various communities could perform a work of charity by setting up local boards to hear victims of the current witch-hunts, whether Velde's, Jenner's or McCarthy's.

These committees operate on a hit-and-run basis. They execute first and investigate, if at all, later. Any slander which serves to make a headline is good enough for them. There is need for unofficial local hearing bodies which might at least give the victims a chance to tell their side of the story, and to put their life and work in fuller context and perspective. A board made up of respected churchmen might serve a function of this kind admirably. There are many situations in which school superintendents and others might be able to defy the witch-hunters if they could mobilize some counterbalancing forces of this kind.

On a national basis, the time is overripe for the establishment of a commission of leading

churchmen to report on the excesses and abuses which have marked the witch hunt since the House Committee began its activities almost two decades ago. The distortions, perjuries and flim-flam deserve to be recorded and analyzed. Unless the churches investigate Velde, Jenner and McCarthy, they will sooner or later begin investigating the churches. The *gleichsbaltung* now under way in American life will not be complete until the pulpit, too, has been frightened into silence.

As the Rev. Dr. Russell Cartwright Stroup said last Sunday at the Georgetown Presbyterian Church in Washington in a sermon aimed at his fellow clergymen, "It is foolish if we imagine that liberty is divisible; that our freedom as ministers will somehow be preserved when the freedom of laymen is threatened. It is suicidal for us to keep silent until our ox is gored. . . . If it is permissible for the state to persecute opinion in the college it is permissible to persecute opinion in the church."

Visa Denied

If V., J. and Mc C. were really looking for saboteurs of American policy in the State Department, they ought to dig out the men responsible for the decision to deny a visa to Sidney Silverman. This doughty little Labor Party battler was to have addressed a Rosenberg clemency dinner at the Hotel Capitol in New York last Wednesday, but at press time there was still no last-minute miracle in sight which might get him there. The exact legal grounds are not clear, even under the McCarran-Walter Act. Silverman is a Laborite, not a Communist. The denial of a visa will do the Rosenbergs cause more good than a speech by Silverman, eloquent though he may be. The case is still page one news in Western Europe and the refusal of a visa to a respected British M.P. will make new headlines. These may yet help to save the Rosenbergs. The longer clemency is denied, the less credit we will get for it, the more it will seem to be a grudging move, extorted by foreign pressure.

Not A Secret Police?

Dr. Douglas Southall Freeman, the distinguished historian and editor, came up from

Richmond last week to speak at the Advertising Club in Washington and delivered himself of some shrewd observations on events foreign and domestic, including a warning against "what Elihu Root called 'government by suspicion.'" One remark he made, however, deserves an exception. He said "it is remarkable that the FBI, despite all the temptations, never became a secret police."

Just what Dr. Freeman meant by this is not clear. The FBI's powers fortunately are nowhere near as extensive as the secret police of Russia or of pre-war Fascist Germany, Italy and Japan. But it operates in secret. It engages in surveillance of political affairs. It gathers dossiers on all kinds of citizens, including many of very moderate liberal views. It has the power to destroy reputation and livelihood in all those growing areas where "loyalty" and "security" clearance are now needed, from private business scientific laboratories to jobs on the waterfront. It has the privilege of keeping its informants anonymous and of not disclosing the content of secret information to accused persons or even to their judges. This is certainly acting as a secret police, or what the Japanese called a "thought police."

Good Deed

At the risk of losing some of those new votes in Texas, the Eisenhower Administration through Attorney General Brownell has asked the Supreme Court to reverse a recent pro Jim Crow decision by the Circuit Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia (see "Jim Crow in The Capital" in the *Weekly* for January 31). At the risk of ruining the Attorney General with the Rightists and die-hards of his own party, the *Weekly* commends him for it.

Best News of The Week

Best news of the week on the civil liberties front was the Supreme Court's announcement that it will review the Bridges case. The labor leader the government has been trying to deport for 18 years still has a fighting chance. The *Weekly* will publish an article on the case in an early issue.

(Please mention the *Weekly* in dealing with advertisers)

• TO I. F. Stone's Weekly READERS •

When thinking of replenishing your wardrobe with a distinctive suit or topcoat, remember, no one in all New York offers Registered No. 6 Grade clothing—the finest tailoring possible in ready-to-wear—at this price. (Imported Harris Tweeds, Flannels, Gabardines, Worsteds, etc.)

REG. \$85 to \$115 NOW

\$59.97

TED BROOKS CLOTHING CO.

91 Fifth Ave. bet. 16 & 17 Sts., N.Y.C.
WA 4-9613 AL 5-6570

The Case of The Cooperative Teacher

The Voice of America last year asked Dr. Julius H. Hlavaty to make a broadcast in his native tongue, Slovak. He thought this might endanger relatives in the old country but agreed. He gave his services free. The script was prepared for him. It dealt with the Bronx High School of Science where Dr. Hlavaty is head of the mathematics department.

Someone in the Czechoslovak colony in New York disliked the idea of a broadcast by Dr. Hlavaty. A letter was sent Senator McCarthy. Last week Dr. Hlavaty came home one evening to hear that Roy M. Cohn, counsel to the McCarthy committee, had just phoned. Dr. Hlavaty was ordered to appear next morning at a hearing in Washington.

Now Dr. Hlavaty, gray-haired, thin-faced, distinguished looking, was before the committee. The exposure of New York City school teachers is no longer a sensation, and there were only a few spectators in the big Senate caucus room. Though the turnout was poor, the Senators did their best, like good troupers, to put on a performance. Dirksen, who relishes himself as a golden-voiced orator, was as deceptively dulcet as an Inquisitor about to consign a suspected heretic to the secular arm for slow broiling. McCarthy, in that cavernous marble-walled room, seemed to enjoy sounding like the Voice of Doom in a soap opera.

McCarthy wanted to know whether Dr. Hlavaty was "aware" that the Liberal Party in New York had broken away from the American Labor Party. Dr. Hlavaty was aware of it. McCarthy wanted to know whether he was aware that the ALP had been cited as subversive. Dr. Hlavaty was not aware of it. The ALP is not on the Attorney General's list. It soon appeared that McCarthy was referring to an obscure "citation" by the Tenney committee in California. Was Dr. Hlavaty aware that the ALP was Communist dominated? Dr. Hlavaty seemed to assent. Triumphant McCarthy asked him to identify two documents. These showed that Dr. Hlavaty and his wife had registered ALP in last year's election.

As an exploit in entrapment, this was good Senatorial sport. It was not clear just what it had to do with the Voice of America. A Senator wanted to know if the example set by Dr. Hlavaty's registration might not subvert his students. Dr.

Hlavaty tried to explain that he thought election registrations were a private matter. Perhaps the ALP was lugged in because at the morning session Dr. Hlavaty had denied present or recent membership in the Communist party but pleaded the Fifth amendment for 1948.

Symington of Missouri seemed to think the committee's jurisdiction extended to theology. "As a good American," he asked Dr. Hlavaty, "do you believe in God?" The mathematics teacher said he did. At one point Dirksen went off on a weird tangent. He wanted to know whether Dr. Hlavaty had been identified on the broadcast. He had been. Then Dirksen wanted to know what if the Voice had broadcast Earl Browder? Would this not encourage Communists abroad? "Were you," Dirksen asked pointedly, "known in Czechoslovakia?" Dr. Hlavaty said if he were known at all it was only as a poor boy who left in 1921 and became head of the mathematics department in a famous American high school. Dr. Hlavaty said he thought this was good propaganda for America. Dirksen desisted.

It was only toward the end of the hearing, on intervention by Senator McClellan, that Dr. Hlavaty was finally allowed to explain just how he came to make the broadcast. But McCarthy would not let him read the transcript into the record. McCarthy said the committee knew there was no Communist propaganda in the broadcast. If so, why had Dr. Hlavaty been called? Cohn jumped in to remedy the effect of McCarthy's admission. He asked Dr. Hlavaty whether there was anything *anti-Communist* in the broadcast. Hlavaty admitted there wasn't.

It was painful to watch. There was no allegation of wrongdoing. A teacher was being ruined because he had done a favor for a government agency. A committee sated with victims took him apart indifferently, like a small boy taking the wings off a beetle. Dr. Hlavaty has been in this country 32 years. He has been a teacher for 24. He has a national reputation as a teacher of mathematics. He is one of the best loved teachers on the faculty of the Bronx High School of Science. His chances to avoid dismissal are slight unless students and parents organize to support him.

I. F. Stone's Weekly

3-21-53

Room 225 Kellogg Bldg.

1416 F Street, N.W., Washington 4, D. C.

Please enter the following subscription. \$5 for 1 year is enclosed. (See page 3 for foreign rates)

Name

Street

City Zone

State

I. F. Stone's Weekly

225 Kellogg Bldg.

1416 F St., N.W., Washington 4, D. C.

NEWSPAPER

Entered as
Second Class Mail
Matter
Post Office
Washington, D. C.

I. F. Stone's Weekly

COPYRIGHT 1953 BY I. F. STONE'S WEEKLY INC.

VOL. I NUMBER 11

MARCH 28, 1953



WASHINGTON, D. C.

15 CENTS

An Evil Wind of their Own Sowing

Geography imposes a basic continuity on any country's foreign policy. An island kingdom like the British lives under urgent necessities which determine policy whether Tory or Laborite is in power. Russia is impelled to seek the open sea whether ruled by Czars or Commissars. This continuity frustrates idealists and politicians alike. It is frustration of this kind which plays a part in the Republican and rightist revolt against the nomination of Charles E. Bohlen to be Ambassador to Moscow.

Combined with it is the related frustration which springs from the need for a permanent bureaucracy to carry on any skilled function like foreign policy. Republican suspicion of the State Department and the Foreign Service is in this respect much like that which the New Dealers felt 20 years ago when they came to power. FDR himself never outgrew that distrust, and in many crucial instances bypassed normal channels to keep the reins of foreign policy in his own hands. Much the same group of officials then regarded as reactionary are now suspected of being "communistic." Bohlen is one of them.

To read the testimony given by Bohlen before two executive sessions of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee is to see that he aggravated this sense of frustration. A disdain for the extraordinary ignorance shown by some members of the committee is visible between the lines of the printed record as now released. A creditable unwillingness to barter self-respect for approval is evident. He offended such Senators as Ferguson, Hickenlooper, Knowland and the incredible Wiley by declining to acquiesce in the mythology of the victorious Republicans. He defended Roosevelt. He failed to say the right things when Hiss and Lattimore were mentioned. He had the temerity to say of the Yalta conference, "I found nothing in my experience there or my association with the men responsible for it, to indicate that there were any discreditable motivations of any kind."

Bohlen failed even to give satisfaction on the question of "containment" vs. "liberation." Senator Ferguson asked him almost desperately, "You don't dispute the Eisenhower-Dulles idea?" The answer was "No, sir, certainly not." Then Ferguson asked, "There is no change from what had been the situation under Acheson to what it now is under Dulles?" The reply must have been almost maddening, "That is not for me to say, Senator." Mr. Bohlen went on to suggest that he thought much of the debate "semantic," since "liberation" does not mean as in World War II "foreign armies coming in to liberate you. . . . I don't understand from Mr. Dulles and the President's own statement that we are contemplating a war of liberation." In alarm, almost as if referring to a bible, Ferguson asked, "Then you don't agree with Burnham?" Mr. Bohlen replied, "I haven't read his book."

There is a coalition of the simple-minded and the sinister in the fight on the Bohlen appointment. "There are a lot of people in this country," Chairman Wiley said at the start of the hearings, "who feel it is a mistake to have any Ambassador to Russia." Senators like McCarran, McCarthy and Bridges speak for those forces which not only believe war inevitable but want to be sure and make it so. They regard it as hazardous to have an Ambassador in Moscow while the new Malenkov regime is putting out feelers for a peace settlement. McCarran, McCarthy and Bridges are prepared to do business with any pumpkin for ammunition against Bohlen.

The Administration invited trouble when it appointed Bridges' assistant McLeod to be security officer of the State Department. McLeod spent most of his seven years as an FBI agent in Concord, New Hampshire, hardly the best post in which to train for surveillance of the Foreign Service. The Secretary of State at press conference admitted he had not asked McLeod whether in the Bohlen affair he had communicated over his head with Bridges, McCarthy or McCarran. Dulles when asked whether he would question McLeod said he didn't go on the basis that he had to be a security officer to run the security office. It sounded as if Dulles were too unsure of his subordinate's loyalty to inquire.

The Secretary of State may not be quoted directly, but here in indirect discourse are the words he used to defend Bohlen. Dulles said it was the business of the FBI to try to locate any possible gossip or suspicion which should alert one to danger. They go about, they talk to dismissed servants, to business competitors, they seek the good but they also are particularly anxious to locate any basis of possible suspicion. There is, the Secretary thought, no person of any importance or prominence in the United States who could be covered by a full FBI field check and not have in it some derogatory material. If whenever a person comes up to appointment in high office that stuff should be dragged out on the floor of the Senate, then he thought it would put an end to persons of repute and standing in the community ever accepting an office and going through that ordeal, which would be very damaging to their reputations.

But it is on the basis of just such a mish-mash of "derogatory" information from FBI files that teachers have been ruined, civil servants discharged, artists blacklisted and foreign-born citizens subjected to deportation and denaturalization. The respectables have for two decades encouraged the calumniators in the fight against social reform. If the hot blast of calumny now singses the new Secretary of State and beats upon the White House door, this is the wind they themselves sowed.

Behind The Glasser Case

The FBI Sets Out To "Get" Its Man

Washington, D. C.

I put the question to Congressman Velde when the hearing was over. I asked him whether, during the days when he was an FBI agent, he had participated in the investigation of the Abraham Glasser case. Glasser, an associate professor of law at Rutgers, had just finished a day on the stand before the House Un-American Activities Committee over which Velde presides. The chairman hesitated and then said, "I'm afraid it will have to be 'no comment.'" This is why the question was relevant:

A decade ago Glasser was suspended from his job as attorney in the anti-trust division of the Department of Justice. The suspension was ordered as a result of reports from the FBI. But after an extended investigation a special departmental hearing board cleared Glasser. There is reason to believe that the FBI has never forgiven that defeat. Either that or the FBI has been guilty of an extraordinary series of oversights.

The first occurred soon after Glasser had been cleared. The suspension was on June 17, 1941. The decision clearing him was handed down on October 24, 1941. Glasser was allowed to resign without prejudice and transfer to the OPA. Yet a month later, under date of December 31, 1941, J. Edgar Hoover, director of the FBI, wrote to the Office of Emergency Management, which had general supervision of the OPA. Hoover repeated the original charges against Glasser but failed to mention that there had been a departmental hearing and that Glasser had been cleared.

"Thereafter," according to the brief filed with Rutgers on the accused professor's behalf, Glasser was "informed by his superior officers in the OPA that on a number of additional occasions between 1942 and 1944 or 1945 the FBI had repeatedly been sending to OEM or to OPA the same old 1941 Department of Justice charges, and that the FBI in doing this seemingly had failed consistently to state that there had been a hearing and a dismissal of the charges in the Department of Justice." Again, late in 1945, Glasser was told by A. D. Vanech, then assistant to the Attorney General, "that the departmental personnel file in the Professor's case contained no indication whatever that he had had a hearing and had been cleared in 1941!"

That was no routine clearance by obscure officials. The Attorney General named two special assistants and an assistant solicitor general to sift the FBI charge. The three were Charles Fahy, now on the U.S. Circuit Court of Appeals; Ugo Carusi, now Commissioner of Immigration and Naturalization; and Edwin M. Dickinson, Dean of the University of California Law School.

The care they exercised is indicated by two letters written five years later by two of these men when a new investigation was ordered by the Civil Service Commission. Ugo Carusi wrote the Commission that the board had made

a "painstaking" study of the charges and added, "I personally do not consider Mr. Glasser unfit for employment by the Federal government." Dean Dickinson wrote Glasser expressing regret over the revival of the old charges. "No case within the purview of my experience," Dickinson said, "was more thoroughly investigated by the FBI. . . . No case was given more attentive and thorough consideration by the departmental hearing board. . . . In the result you were completely exonerated on all charges except the charge of negligent or careless disclosure in personal discussions. . . . There was no evidence that you were a Communist or associated with so-called Communist fronts."

The unauthorized disclosures dealt with Spanish Loyalist matters. Glasser's assignment required him to study the files on the arms embargo during the Spanish Civil War. He had a room-mate who was later killed fighting on the Loyalist side in Spain. Glasser avowed his pro Loyalist sympathies at the departmental hearing and admitted he might have been indiscreet in his discussions outside the Department.

Until Velde became its chairman, these facts had twice come informally before the House Un-American Activities Committee. In August, 1941, Thurman Arnold discussed the matter with Martin Dies, then chairman of the House Committee. Judge Arnold was head of the anti-trust division in which Glasser was employed. Arnold laid the facts before Dies and obtained his approval of Glasser's contemplated transfer to the OPA. In October, 1949, Glasser was subpoenaed by the House Committee but the subpoena was dropped by the Committee after Glasser's counsel had laid before Committee counsel the facts as to the past investigation and adjudication.

This year, with Velde as chairman of the House committee, a renewed attack began. On February 10, Glasser was subpoenaed. Two days later he was again questioned about the old charges by two FBI men. On February 23, agents of the committee visited the Administrative offices of the Rutgers law school, inspected lists of students he had taught, wrote down the names and addresses of seven and subpoenaed at least one. Shortly afterward Glasser was advised that a member of the legal staff of the House committee informed a representative of the University that the Committee had a memorandum from "two Federal judges" which it would put in evidence against the Professor.

The Fifth Amendment says no person shall "be subject for the same offense to be twice put in jeopardy of life or limb." This, the famous "double jeopardy" clause, forbids the government to try a man twice for the same offense. But nominally the House committee is not engaged in a criminal proceeding. Though the effect be to destroy Glasser's reputation and end his career as a teacher, the House committee ostensibly is engaged in a mere legislative inquiry.

The House committee can reopen a case as

often as it pleases until the victim is ruined, no matter how many times he has been cleared in judicial or administrative hearings. Charges which do not stand up under judicial or quasi-judicial scrutiny may be good enough for headlines. The chairmanship of the House committee gave the ex-FBI man, Velde, powerful leverage. Three officials linked with the FBI in the old investigation have since been appointed Federal Judges in the District of Columbia. With or without their permission their names might be invoked with enhanced prestige in a new proceeding. Judge Matthew M. McGuire, then an assistant attorney general, was liaison between the legal staff of the Justice Department and the FBI at the time of the Glasser inquiry. Judge Alexander H. Holtzoff was McGuire's aide. Judge Edward Tamm was a high official of the FBI at the time.

The sensation of the Glasser hearing last week was the submission in evidence of a memorandum from Holtzoff to McGuire dated July 23, 1941, which embodied the original charges. It was read into the record and at 11:50 a.m. when the reading was finished Velde called a ten minute recess. The timing and the recess made this a perfect story for the afternoon editions. It was not until after the recess that the Committee put into the record the memorandum dated October 24 of that year in which Carusi, Fahy and Dickinson cleared Glasser of the charges made in the Holtzoff memorandum to McGuire. It was unfair not to release the two documents together. The timing of the recess was a dirty piece of business.

The Holtzoff memorandum did not say that Glasser was a Communist but that there were "at least some Communists" among his friends and acquaintances. More serious was the memo's charge that a Soviet agent "X" confessed in Canada that he had received information, most of it about the Spanish war, from Glasser. The three man hearing board, in passing on these charges, said that Glasser's alleged contacts with this agent, "if they existed," were "not inspired by motives of disloyalty, nor by the desire knowingly to misuse his official position." The charges, if true, were charges for a grand jury. To rehash them after all these years, when they had been thoroughly investigated and discredited within the Department itself, is vindictive. Glasser, manfully standing his ground before the committee, tried to ask Velde whether he had participated in the earlier investigation. In that event, Glasser wished to move that Velde disqualify himself from the proceeding. But Glasser was hammered down by the chairman's gavel when he tried to raise the question. In Velde's opinion it was relevant to ask Glasser, a native of New Brunswick, where his parents were born. But it was not relevant for Glasser to explore the possibility that his name and career were to be destroyed to satisfy an old grudge, and erase an old defeat.

I. F. Stone's Weekly

• Editor and Publisher, I. F. STONE

Published weekly except the last two weeks of August at Room 225, 1416 F St., N.W., Washington 4, D. C. Subscription rates: Domestic, \$5 a year; Canada, Mexico and elsewhere in the Western Hemisphere, \$6; England and Continental Europe, \$10 by 1st class mail, \$15 by air; for Israel, Asia, Australia and Africa, \$10 by first class mail, \$20 by air mail. Single copy, 15 cents. Contents covered by copyright. Telephone, STerling 3-0938. Entered as Second Class mail matter, Post Office, Washington, D. C.

Vol. 1, No. 11  March 28, 1953

Dastardly Incident

(From Our Special Correspondent)

Moscow, March 28—A Soviet bomber was shot at by fighter planes of the American imperialist Air Force today off Long Island, though the Soviet plane was more than 25 miles from American territory at the time.

The Soviet Air Force explained that the plane was on a routine weather reconnaissance flight from a Murmask air base, that it was unarmed and that the unprovoked assault upon it showed the necessity for building a 120-group Soviet Air Force as soon as possible to defend the Soviet Union from capitalist aggression.

The incident occurred just when certain members of the Supreme Soviet were discussing the possibility of reducing taxes and military expenditures. These members will now be sent to corrective labor camps.

Portrait in Action Of The Senate Foreign Relations Chairman

From the hearings before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee on the nomination of Charles E. Bohlen to be Ambassador to Moscow:

The CHAIRMAN (Wiley of Wisconsin). What date was the Cairo conference?

Mr. BOHLEN. Cairo was in the fall of 1943, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Is it not a fact that at Cairo, Roosevelt and Churchill promised Chiang Kai-shek that all of the territories in China would be returned to her, particularly Manchuria, yet 14 months later, they turned around and proceeded to give the Soviet Union, Mongolia and South Sakhalin?

Mr. BOHLEN. Senator, I was not present at the Cairo conference, so I have no first hand knowledge.

Senator MANSFIELD. Mr. Chairman, may I say that Sakhalin was taken from Japan and that so far as Mongolia was concerned, there were agreements going back to the early 1920's by which it had a semi-autonomous nature.

Senator SPARKMAN. I am looking at the Cairo agreement; it does not mention Mongolia. It mentions Manchuria, Formosa and the Pescadores.

The CHAIRMAN. It relates to Port Arthur and two key Manchurian railroads, which opened the door to all Manchuria, plus the Kuriles. But I wanted to get this gentleman's understanding based upon what we understand is about the only knowledge there is—he is about the only one who has any first hand information of what went on. If we have any misinformation, why he ought to be able to correct that.

Given sufficient time, and a geography primer.

Notable Discovery In History

While the Chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee was discovering that the Manchurian railways opened the door to the Kuriles, an equally notable advance in the related field of history was being made last week on the other side of Capitol Hill.

"In 1848, in a Paris attic," Congressman Jackson of California told the House, "two Russian emigres, Karl Marx and Friederich Engels, sat down together to draft a blueprint for world domination. Their blueprint was the Communist Manifesto. . . ."

Old-fashioned readers brought up in the belief that Marx and Engels were Germans and that they wrote the Manifesto in London (neither in an attic—both being too fond of bourgeois comfort) are warned against rushing into correspondence with Congressman Jackson. Communists also hold to the older view.

Whether one believes with Jackson that Marx and Engels were Russians or with the Communists that they were Germans may become a convenient way for the House Committee to determine whether a man advocates overthrow of the government by force and violence. A witness can hardly plead the Fifth amendment when asked whether he thinks the Manifesto was written over vodka in a Parisian attic or over beer in a London drawing room. The only safe course is to assume that Congressman Jackson is America's foremost Marxist scholar.

Shrewd Maneuver To Win Over India

Among other momentous legislation proposed to Congress last week was Senate Joint Resolution No. 58 introduced by Ives of New York. As a public service we here reprint it in full text:

"Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the 18th day of August of each year is hereby designated as National Holstein-Friesian Day in commemoration of the anniversary of the first registered Holstein female entered in the first published herd book of this breed in America, and the President of the United States is authorized and requested to issue annually a proclamation inviting the people of the United States to observe such day, in schools and other suitable places, with appropriate ceremonies."

The resolution had us puzzled until we recalled the fierce propaganda battle being waged for the affections of stubbornly neutralist India. India reveres the cow as sacred. Under the guise of a special concern for the Holstein, Ives may be moving to make an American holiday of a National Cow Day. Christians and Moslems may be disarmed by the apparent emphasis on the one special breed of cow, but Hindus will see the strategic significance of his bill as an entering wedge for the cult in America. For the benefit of our Indian readers we add that the Mahatma Ives is senior Swami from New York and may be reached any week-day at his *ashram* in the Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

Vital Statistics

The Weekly passed its tenth "birthday" with the last issue and we thought readers might like to know (we were curious ourselves) how extensive is its circulation. Our shiny new card catalogue of subscribers turned up the welcome news that we now reach every State of the Union, the territories of Alaska, Hawaii and Puerto Rico and six Provinces of Canada. There are subscribers in Mexico, Panama, Colombia, Brazil and Jamaica; in Norway, Sweden, Belgium, England, France, Austria, the British zone of Berlin, and Israel. There seems to be only one subscriber behind the Iron Curtain, in Poland, but last week a tattered sub came in from Hungary badly mutilated with the money order missing. We have a new subscriber—our first—in Japan. The best State of course is New York. The poorest? We have only one each in Arkansas and Nevada (cherished subscribers both, to whom we send greetings). We are sorry to report that in Canada we have not a single subscriber in Newfoundland or the Yukon. As soon as we can get the dog team hitched, our circulation department mushes northward.

I. F. Stone

Detention for Life—On Undisclosed Charges

The anonymous informant has become an American institution. He figures in all kinds of loyalty and security procedures. Last week the U. S. Supreme Court widened the orbit of his power. It ruled 5-4 that a man might be imprisoned for the rest of his life on the basis of undisclosed accusations from undisclosed sources.

Nominally the case of *Shaughnessy v. Mazei* concerned an alien denied admission, and interned two years on Ellis Island. Actually Ignatz Mazei was a legal resident of Buffalo, N. Y., and had been in this country 25 years. "If the procedures used to judge this alien are fair and just," Mr. Justice Jackson protested in a dissent joined by Mr. Justice Frankfurter, "no good reason can be given why they should not be extended to simplify the condemnation of citizens."

Mazei, a British subject, came to this country in 1923, married an American citizen, raised a family of four children on his earnings as a carpenter. He was past 50 when his troubles began. In 1948 he went abroad to visit his dying mother in Rumania, but ran into difficulties. He got as far as Hungary, was denied entrance to Rumania, waited months for an exit permit to leave Hungary. When he returned home on a regular visa, the Attorney General ordered him excluded without a hearing on the basis of "information of a confidential nature, the disclosure of which would be prejudicial to the public interest."

Mazei was twice shipped abroad, but came back each time when no other country would accept him. After two years on Ellis Island and four unsuccessful efforts to win freedom on habeas corpus, Mazei applied again, this time to Federal Judge Irving Kaufman. The Judge asked the government at least to divulge the evidence against Mazei *in camera*. When the government refused, Judge Kaufman set Mazei free. The U. S. Circuit Court of Appeals upheld him 2-1. The lone dissenter, Learned Hand, was more acid than the majority in his comment. "Think what we may," he said, "of a statute based upon such fears, when passed by a society which professes to put its faith in the free interchange of ideas, a court has no warrant for refusing to enforce it. If that society chooses to flinch when its principles are put to the test, courts are not set up to give it derring do."

When the government appealed to the Supreme Court, Mazei's counsel asserted that the only reason for "flinching" in the case of this obscure carpenter is that he once joined the International Workers Order, a fraternal organization, for its insurance privileges. The government in its response did not deny that. On the Supreme Court it encountered congenial theories of jurisprudence. The majority decision upholding Mazei's indefinite detention without hearing or disclosure of charges was written by Mr. Justice Tom Clark. It was Clark who as Attorney General put the International Workers Order on the subversive list the same way without notice, hearing or charges. It was also he who as Attorney General handed down the ruling in the famous *Ellen Knauff* case excluding that German bride of an American official from the country as a security risk while declining to reveal the source and content of the accusations against her.

When public interest forced Clark's successor, McGrath, to allow a hearing in the *Knauff* case, the evidence against her was found to be spurious—"hearsay on hearsay." The plea of information too confidential to be disclosed proved merely to be a cover for information too flimsy to survive a real hearing. In the *Mazei* case, Mr. Justice Jackson harked back to his experiences as prosecutor at Nuremberg, quoted Goering's explanation for the use of concentration camps and commented, "Quite unconsciously, I am sure, the Government's theory of custody for 'safekeeping' without disclosure to the victim of charges, evidence, informers or reasons . . . has unmistakable overtones of the 'protective custody' of the Nazis."

"Individual liberty," said Mr. Justice Black in a separate dissent for himself and Mr. Justice Douglas, "is too highly prized in this country to allow executive officials to imprison and hold people on the basis of information kept secret from the courts." This is an expression of hope, not a statement of fact. It remains to be seen whether individual liberty is that highly prized in the cowed and confused U.S.A. of 1953. In the *Knauff* case, public opinion compelled the Department of Justice to hold a hearing, to make its evidence public and to revoke the exclusion order. Will the people of Buffalo and of New York State generally show a similar spirit in the *Mazei* case? Justice Tom Clark's ruling, if allowed to become precedent, will cast a long and sinister shadow.

I. F. Stone's Weekly 3-28-53
 Room 225 Kellogg Bldg.
 1416 F Street, N.W., Washington 4, D. C.

Please enter the following subscription. \$5 for 1 year is enclosed. (See page 3 for foreign rates)

Name

Street

City Zone

State

I. F. Stone's Weekly
 225 Kellogg Bldg.
 1416 F St., N.W., Washington 4, D. C.

NEWSPAPER

Entered as
Second Class Mail
Matter
Post Office
Washington, D. C.

I. F. Stone's Weekly

COPYRIGHT 1953 BY I. F. STONE'S WEEKLY INC

VOL. I NUMBER 12

APRIL 4, 1953



WASHINGTON, D. C.

15 CENTS

That Familiar Chill on the Brink of Peace

A disregard for human life is supposed to be an Oriental characteristic. Judging by the pace of negotiations in the Korean truce talks, all military men must be Oriental. Last December the Red Cross called on both sides in the Korean conflict for an immediate exchange of sick and wounded prisoners of war. It took two months before General Clark passed this proposal on to the Communist command. It took a month more before the latter replied, accepting. The acceptance in turn asserts that both sides had reached agreement on this particular point many months earlier in Paragraph 53 of the draft armistice agreement, and says implementation had been held up "solely because the Korean armistice negotiations were suspended."

This is almost but not quite true. Actually Paragraph 53 merely provided priority for the repatriation of the sick and wounded when an armistice was reached. This new readiness to allow voluntary repatriation of the sick and wounded in accordance with the Geneva convention *before* an armistice has been achieved represents a new concession. It fits into the conciliatory pattern woven by a whole series of moves since the Malenkov succession. The Communist reply "fully agrees" to General Clark's proposal. The State Department terms it an "unconditional acceptance." The Department's favorite chestnut in dealing with any Soviet peace proposal is to ask for deeds, not words. But now as in the past when deeds are offered, a chill descends on Washington and on military headquarters in Tokyo. There is talk of a trap. Difficulties begin to be exfoliated. The military seems to have a lawyer-like genius for conjuring up the nicest points of possible future disagreements, as if drawing up contracts for a 30-year lease.

In this vein the *New York Times* correspondent in Tokyo notes that the Clark letter of February 22 called for "impartial verification" of the condition of ailing prisoners and "a possible snag was anticipated"—how these snags accumulate!—"if the Communists suggested that each side be left to determine for itself" which prisoners were to be included in the sick and wounded category. Yet this would seem to be the most expeditious way to handle the repatriation. To judge by the past, the problem of providing "impartial verification" could consume interminable months of haggling.

The exchange of the sick and wounded is not made contingent on resumption of truce negotiations, but the good feeling created by such an exchange would make it difficult to reject the Communist request for renewed talks. These were broken off last October 18 by the "unified command" in Tokyo with the statement that talks would not be resumed unless the American position on voluntary repatriation were accepted.

The Chou En-lai broadcast as we go to press indicates that the Communists are now prepared to give in on voluntary repatriation, but the State Department already finds "glaring

ambiguities" in the broadcast and one wonders what ingenious new deadlocks may be in the making.

Among the American military in the Far East there has always been a strong if not dominant faction which did not want the truce talks to succeed.

General Van Fleet spoke for this group when he told the Senate Armed Services Committee last month "the only solution is a military victory in Korea . . . anything short of that would be a defeat . . . all you do is to leave an intolerable situation in Korea and postpone the agony, because you have an Iron Curtain across the middle of Korea . . . they could overrun the country at any later time of their own choosing . . . and with airfields built all over North Korea that could threaten Japan. All we would be doing would be to postpone the trouble by signing an armistice." The reference to airfields recalls an earlier dispute which may be revived even if the POW issue is settled. The State Department emphasizes that the "draft agreement" submitted to the UN last October is a draft but in no sense an agreement.

Those who think a showdown necessary may still find ample obstacles to a settlement. Van Fleet provided a full glimpse of this mentality when he told the Senate committee "what we need to reestablish American might and prestige, not only in the Pacific but throughout the world, is a military victory to show that we are supreme and the Communist arms are nothing." He made it clear that he considered the present stalemate a defeat. When asked in executive session later that day (as the released text now reveals) whether the war would not go on even if a new offensive succeeded in reestablishing a line further north, Van Fleet replied, "Yes. You will never get a political solution; there will always be an Iron Curtain until you have it out with Russia."

Van Fleet is a lesser MacArthur and does not speak for all the American military; the failure to keep him on in Korea after his retirement deadline of 60, as could have been done, is indicative. There are more sober counsels, and these seem to have the greater weight with Generals like Bradley and Collins, and with Eisenhower himself. But the hesitations over the new offer are characteristic and revealing. The tactic of "neither war nor peace," which is supposed to be a Communist invention, seems to be currently an American policy. Should peace begin to break out in Korea, so run the familiar speculations, how keep up the pressure on France for German rearmament? And what happens to the drive for bigger air force and air defense appropriations? And how explain away to Republicans brought up on the mythology of Yalta the "appeasement" involved in recognizing the new realities in Asia?

The Chou broadcast recalls the agreement for a political conference in three months on the broader problems involved in making peace. And that leads straight to Formosa.

Time for A Deportation—To Wisconsin

McCarthy will never be beaten on the defensive. He loses one fight and starts two new ones. Charges are always more exciting than their refutation, and he thereby dominates the front pages. He is becoming the biggest thing on the national landscape, and frontal collision with the President and his own party leadership adds to his prestige. He has hardly begun to hit his stride as master of the Big Lie. Like Hitler and Goebbels, he knows the value of ceaseless reiteration. He has their complete lack of scruple, and sets as low an estimate as they on the popular mind's capacity to remember. His defeat in the fight against Bohlen is a minor episode in the perspective of his ambition and his potentialities.

If—the fatal *if* that shadows democratic governments in their contest with fascist pretenders—if this Administration had guts, it would move now to act on the findings of the buried McCarthy report submitted by the Senate subcommittee on privileges and elections. The new Attorney General, in a cheap and vulgar St. Patrick's day speech, announced a heightened deportation campaign against so-called "subversives." The most subversive force in America today is Joe McCarthy. No one is so effectively importing alien conceptions into American government. No one is doing so much to damage the country's prestige abroad and its power to act effectively at home. If "subversion" is to be met by deportation, then it is time to deport McCarthy back to Wisconsin. Families are being broken up, long-time residents driven into exile, men face permanent detention, on charges which are far more tenuous than those made against McCarthy by the Senate inquiry under the Benton resolution.

Far stronger than the inference of guilt McCarthy sees in every invocation of the Fifth amendment is the inference created by his own failure six times to show up when invited by the subcommittee to rebut the charges made against him. His repeated fliers in stock and commodity speculation, the unexplained \$105,000 in his bank accounts and those of his administrative assistant, the diversion to speculation of funds contributed to fight Communism, his hectic borrowings and his ability to bank more than \$170,000 in four years on a Senator's salary (his assistant banked another \$96,000 in the same period)—all this cries out for investigation. The subcommittee raises serious question as to whether Wisconsin banking and Federal election laws have been violated. Here lies the means of stopping McCarthy before he has grown too big to be stopped.

There may never be a more favorable opportunity. Young William Randolph Hearst, who has several times put the damper on Pegler, last week got off the McCarthy bandwagon and declared (New

York Journal, March 26), "We've had enough of this kind of malicious mischief in American life. Joe McCarthy has pulled a strategical boner with his opposition to the Bohlen appointment." The hitherto favorable Scripps-Howard press (Washington News, March 26) attacked McCarthy for his "back-alley tactics" and said "The amazing thing is that this loud-mouthed rowdy has attracted a Senate following, which has assisted him in dragging that body into the gutter with him." The magisterial Washington Star, the most influential paper in the capital, said of McCarthy and McCarran in the Bohlen fight (March 29), "Their attack was vicious and thoroughly unprincipled. Their weapons were the familiar ones of sly hint and ugly insinuation. . . . With this dirtiest of dirty business there should be no compromise."

Though McCarthy at one point in his career was happy to have Communist support, he now likes to picture himself as a remorseless foe of Communism. But the affair of the Greek shipowners last week shows how differently McCarthy treats suspected Communist collaborators who are men of means from the way he treats poor schoolteachers. These shipowners—the breed of the wily Ulysses—have been supplying Communist customers in ships acquired cut-rate from America. Owners of 242 such ships have gotten an immunity bath from McCarthy in return for a paper promise he admits is unenforceable. These subtle-minded Greek operators are men who know their way around politically.

One would have expected McCarthy to denounce them for having grown wealthy by taking America's favors and supplying America's enemies. Yet they are not to be exposed, harassed or punished. The Attorney General is not to be denounced for failure to recover these ships. Instead these shipowners by their private deal with McCarthy may find therein some protection against the seizures and mortgage foreclosures the Eisenhower Administration had begun to institute in these cases. McCarthy's mandate from the Senate to investigate the operations of government may be broad but it is not broad enough to allow him to invade the sphere of foreign policy and to arrange "agreements" by which possible law violations may be excused. It is no wonder he kept his negotiations secret from the State and Justice Departments! His sudden emergence as a combination Secretary of State and Attorney General in this arrangement with the Greek shipowners calls for investigation.

Ever since that famous \$10,000 pamphlet for Lustron (let's hope it doesn't turn out that McCarthy is also writing pamphlets now on the Greek merchant marine), the Senator has been moving more and more

into the domain of literature. His inquiry last week into the overseas information program should give the State Department a lesson in diplomacy. The Department has placed 2,000,000 books abroad by more than 85,000 authors, among them Owen Lattimore's "Ordeal by Slander." But when McCarthy asked whether any of his own books were in the overseas libraries, it appeared there was not a single one on the list. The State Department never committed a greater *faux pas*.

Louis Budenz was on hand as an expert witness, and the often incredible Roy Cohn put this to him:

Mr. COHN. I will ask you this question, Professor Budenz: Have you at the request of the committee examined a partial list of some authors whose books we have been advised by the Library of Congress are currently being used by the State Department in its information program?

Mr. BUDENZ. Yes, sir, I have gone over that list.

Mr. COHN. On that list, did you find any authors who were known to you as Communists?

Mr. BUDENZ. Yes sir, I did.

Mr. COHN. Approximately how many?

Mr. BUDENZ. At least 75. And four that had very close connections with the Communist party.

The answer is intriguing, since it implies that one can be a Communist without having "very close connections with the Communist party." Naturally Cohn did not press him on the point. After all a lot of people named by Budenz as Communists never had "very close connections" with the party.

The FBI ought to check one unexplored angle of McCarthy's interrogation of Earl Browder, some of whose books were in libraries abroad. In 1950 International Publishers put on sale a book about the Rajk trial in Hungary called "Tito's Plot Against Europe." It was written by Derek Kartun, the foreign editor of the London Daily Worker. In it on pages 20-21, Kartun says a counter-revolutionary group in 1944 were primed for dirty work in Hungary by the OSS which gave them copies of Browder's books "Teheran" and "Victory and After."

Kartun explains that Browder's theories "would have emasculated the revolutionary movement. The U. S. intelligence service understood immediately the value of the Browder theories in confusing and paralyzing the European Communist parties, and had distributed large numbers of the Browder books. . . ." If this is correct, then McCarthy in discouraging the State Department from circulating these books abroad must be acting as a Communist agent. How the plots do thicken!

I. F. Stone's Weekly

• Editor and Publisher, I. F. STONE

Published weekly except the last two weeks of August at Room 225, 1416 P St., N.W., Washington 4, D. C. Subscription rates: Domestic, \$5 a year; Canada, Mexico and elsewhere in the Western Hemisphere, \$6; England and Continental Europe, \$10 by 1st class mail, \$15 by air; for Israel, Asia, Australia and Africa, \$10 by first class mail, \$20 by air mail. Single copy, 15 cents. Contents covered by copyright. Telephone, STerling 3-0938. Entered as Second Class mail matter, Post Office, Washington, D. C.

April 4, 1953  Vol. 1, No. 12

The Good Old Days Are Back —In FTC at Least

Elsewhere Republicans may be disgruntled with their own Eisenhower Administration, but at the Federal Trade Commission all is as it should be with the G.O.P. back in power. There is a whiff of the good old days before 1929 in the announcement that Edward F. Howrey has been appointed chairman of the Federal Trade Commission, where he succeeds John Carson.

The shift from Carson to Howrey must be intensely satisfying to the Old Guard. Once a crusading newspaperman, Carson became secretary in 1924 to the millionaire maverick Senator, Couzens of Michigan, and remained with him until 1936. In the years when Couzens was the hair-shirt of the Republicans, Howrey was starting in practice as a protege and law partner of Coolidge's old secretary, Everett Sanders.

While Carson served as consumer counsel on the Bituminous Coal Commission and later as director of information for the Cooperative League before being appointed to the F.T.C. by Truman in 1949, Howrey was working the other side of the street. The new F.T.C. chairman has for a quarter of a century represented some of America's most important business concerns in fight-

ing the Commission and its somewhat slow and somnolent efforts to curb monopoly practices.

At the hearing on the nomination before the Senate Commerce Committee, when Howrey was asked just why he wanted the job, he said, "I think I have a latent feeling in my breast that I would like to serve the public interest sometime in my life." Senator Potter of Michigan was ungracious enough to inquire further into that "latent feeling" and the following colloquy took place, which we pass on to our readers for a chuckle:

Senator POTTER. I don't mean to ask embarrassing questions. You were first motivated to become a candidate for this office how? Was your motivation stimulated by your political activities or your business interests?

Mr. HOWREY. Well, I don't know what motivated me. I have been interested and have specialized in this field of the law. I thought it was an opportunity to serve in this field.

Senator POTTER. What I am trying to get at, Firestone or some other company didn't come to you and say, "Now, we would like to have you on the Federal Trade Commission?"

Mr. HOWREY. No, I had the support of all of my clients, including Firestone. But I don't think they had any ulterior motives at all of putting me on the Commission because they knew very well once I got on, I can certainly never help them any.

New Cover for An Old Anti-Union Tactic

Even a labor movement short-sightedly obsessed with its own internecine political quarrels ought to see the danger in the conviction of Abram Flaxer of the Public Workers for contempt. If the conviction stands, a Congressional committee may move into any industry or strike situation and demand membership lists. The easy excuse of investigating Communism may become a means of reviving the blacklist, with the question of "loyalty" as pseudo patriotic cover for some of the worst anti trade union practices of the past.

Flaxer was willing to produce the financial and other records of his union. But he was not willing to give the McCarran committee the names and addresses of its 50,000 members. The committee in its own report admitted that it considered most of the members loyal Americans. Why, then, should they be exposed to harassment? The lives of government workers are especially difficult these days and Flaxer did his duty as a trade union official in defying the Committee. Is there anyone in the labor movement still foolish enough to believe that such attacks on the right to privacy in union membership are a danger only to the Left?

Claque on Capitol Hill

Our research assistant had occasion to go to the Senate last week to page a Senator off the floor. Her call card, indicating that she represented *I. F. Stone's Weekly*, was picked up by one of the pages (cute looking, she says). The page glanced at it briefly and dashed off in lukewarm pursuit of the Senator. He returned shortly sans Senator but with a gleam in his eye. "Is this the I. F. Stone," he asked, "who used to work for PM?" Our assistant, a long-time resident of D. C., was about to invoke the Fifth amendment but thought better of it and answered diffidently that it was. "Gee, he's a terrific writer," said the page and was off before our girl could do more than flutter her eye-lashes at him.

Hat's Off

In these topsy-turvy times when we find ourselves in the same corner with John Foster Dulles, defending Charles E. Bohlen, we take our hat off this week (rubbing our eyes) to another one-time target of the Left, Lady Nancy Astor for her "too-bad-it-isn't-poison" crack about that cocktail sipped by McCarthy. (Will the ushers please throw out that man in the rear who muttered something about "Cliveden Set?") As we were saying, we knew Lady Astor was a Virginian but we hadn't realized she was a militant Jeffersonian as well.

Jennings Perry Joins The Weekly

It is with the greatest of pleasure that I add a page this week by Jennings Perry, my old comrade-in-arms of PM, the New York Star and the Daily Compass. I will feel a little less like the Last of the Mohicans around the Capitol these days with Jennings back in production. The task of writing four pages and handling the business details has proven incredibly heavy; this will lighten the burden. I could not hand over a page to a newspaperman I love, trust and admire more than Jennings Perry. He will write from his home in Nashville, Tenn., or anywhere else he happens or wishes to be. His first piece is out of Key West, one of his favorite fishing places. Jennings is a kind of spiritual Gibraltar of true Americanism in these degenerate times. I welcome him, and I know we will all enjoy reading him again.

—I. F. Stone

JENNINGS PERRY'S PAGE

The Kingfish Run and The Human Race Still Wrangles

Key West, Florida

As I was saying, the Earth itself is lovely and careless; and the answer to what is a good place for a flame to go when its candle is snuffed is down here, at land's end, in the utterly insouciant sun.

I came down here when PM was snuffed, and we went out to the Contents and took cero mackerel on feathers, and had them broiled in butter, with paprika for decoration and lime juice for tang. When the Star fell, we were bolder and pushed out over the Big Reef for blue dolphins on the blue Stream.

This time, on the passing of the Compass, I hied straight-way again to these pretty islands with a new reel, my old rod and a gaudy, frivolous plug called Leaping Lena. With Lena I managed to convince the first tarpon boated in the Keys by daylight this season, and thereupon to experience the sin of Pride.

In February there came the finest run of kingfish on the Reef in seven years. We were in them off the Dry Docks, and off Satan Shoal and once inside Cosgrove Light, off the Marquesas—which was as far as we could follow the run in an open small boat named the Free World.

The upshot is that the pre-Thanksgiving week I came down for now has stretched to over four months. The spring tides are here. The poincianas have begun to open. It is time to return to the United States to see how the cotton is coming up under Eisenhower.

The graciously uninhabited outer islands here have been full of peace and industry. I am able to report that on the fringes of the Reef the indefatigable polyps are as busily extending the land as they have been for ages (some of the coral is red,

some only pink), and that the centipede mangroves are as diligently as ever growing new islands for us all.

Ashore, the people have been pleasantly impressive in the exercise of that habitual self-sufficiency, that rather serene aloofness from the "crises" which agitate the statesmen, which becomes the inhabitants of remote islands surrounded by the warm, ancient, indifferent sea. In such an atmosphere even the tourists, one observes, make a truce with the strife that troubled them at home.

The skies over Key West almost constantly rumble with the sorties of the Navy's jets, blimps and helicopters; yet the people never harp upon the association of this armada with the rumors of war. Perhaps it is their adjustment, as islanders, to the knowledge that in any case they have nowhere to run. Perhaps it is a fatalism bred of living in the hurricane latitudes; but it is restful. . . .

The local press notices only what happens in the neighborhood; the alarms of the mainland's radio pundits make small stir in an air preempted by Cuban broadcasts pushing familiar American goods in Cuban Spanish. McCarthy, McCarran, Jenner and Velde are names which down here echo too faintly to rouse an emotion.

Coming in from the placid passes in the little outer islands, I have found it actually amazing that in a new April the mainland papers should be as full of the "two worlds" wrangling as I left them last November. It had been possible to fancy, out there, that, if only from surfeit of the old epithets, the race would have come to terms with itself.

There are fresh whispers of hope; it may be that reason is gaining on the traces of folly. In that effort I gladly will continue on this page, in good and familiar company, what I was saying before.

I. F. Stone's Weekly 4-4-53
 Room 225 Kallogg Bldg.
 1416 F Street, N.W., Washington 4, D. C.

Please enter the following subscription. \$5 for 1 year is enclosed. (See page 3 for foreign rates)

Name

Street

City Zone

State

I. F. Stone's Weekly
 225 Kallogg Bldg.
 1416 F St., N.W., Washington 4, D. C.

Entered as
 Second Class Mail
 Matter
 Post Office
 Washington, D. C.

NEWSPAPER

I. F. Stone's Weekly

COPYRIGHT 1953 BY I. F. STONE'S WEEKLY INC.

VOL. I NUMBER 13

APRIL 11, 1953



WASHINGTON, D. C.

15 CENTS

The Greatest Confession of Them All

One of Marx's favorite maxims was "Doubt everything." His Communist followers have too long operated on the opposite theory. They have been trained to believe everything they are told, so long as it comes from Moscow and party higher-ups. The beginnings of such an attitude must already have been evident in Marx's lifetime, since Marx is reported once to have said with distaste that he was not a Marxist. A few readers who are Marxists in this un-Marxist sense wrote in angrily to protest the astringent observations in our issues of February 7 and February 21 on the subject of the charges against the Moscow doctors. We thought the charges "too hideous to be credible," urged that foreign observers be allowed at the trials and observed, "The Russian rulers have a way of erecting possibilities into actualities and then staging trials to 'prove' what they fear. Their trials are political morality plays which cynically assume an audience too unintelligent to be impressed by anything less than melodrama. It is not enough to prove that a man is mistaken; he must be displayed as a monster."

In this as in so many other matters a new and cleaner wind seems to be blowing through the Russian capital. Of all the confessions which have marked the Soviet regime's long series of "show trials" back to the 20's no confession is more startling, more unexpected and more worthy of belief than the confession by the Ministry of Internal Affairs that the doctors had been arrested on false charges and held up to the world as guilty on the basis of confessions extorted by "impermissible" means. The international implications are striking enough—these doctors were alleged to have poisoned Soviet leaders on orders of American "imperialism" directed through its "bourgeois Jewish nationalist" hirelings in the American Jewish Joint Distribution Committee and the Zionist movement. If the charges were false in the case of the doctors, six of them Jewish; might not similar charges in the Slansky and other trials have been equally false? There were indications of a wider revision in a Pravda editorial which said "careful verification" had established that similar means had been used to slander "an honest public leader, the people's artist of the U.S.S.R., Mikhoels. . . ." This was the Yiddish actor, Solomon Mikhoels, of whom nothing had been heard in some time.

Jewish readers in the Soviet Union must see in that a hope that the new government will put a damper on a campaign against "Zionists" which had led to the suppression of many Jewish cultural activities and pandered to anti-Semitic feeling. The general message at home, however, must be far more startling. The admission that the secret police had committed a deliberate wrong, that confessions had been wrung by "impermissible" means from innocent persons, must seem an almost revolutionary development to thoughtful citizens of the Soviet Union and the satellite countries where people are

accustomed to regard the secret police as all-powerful. This is a development far outside the orbit of the paranoid speculations of Washington about the new Soviet "peace offensive." This is a domestic matter, which opens a door that can never completely be closed again. If the secret police used "impermissible" means in this case, what of others? Which means are "impermissible"? Just how were the confessions extorted? What steps can be taken to prevent such occurrences in the future? Most explosive of all is a question which must follow: what was wrong with Stalin's regime that such miscarriages of justice could occur under it? And how many unjustly accused or framed political prisoners may there be in the penal labor camps of the U.S.S.R.?

Russian policy has too long operated on the half-truth that the Soviet Union was ringed with enemies. The new regime if it continues on this path will discover that the Soviet Union is also ringed with friends. Even in "reactionary" circles in the West there is evident an almost wistful readiness to believe that perhaps peace may be achieved. There are other circles, friendly to socialism, with a great respect for the Russian people, which have been shamed and antagonized by much that has occurred since the Revolution. Amid the gigantic achievements obscured by the mists of hateful propaganda, there has also been an indifference to mass suffering and individual injustice, a sycophancy and an iron-clad conformity, that has disgraced the socialist ideal. The atmosphere bred at home by unlimited dictatorship has been reflected abroad in an unnecessary rudeness and crudeness in dealing with other nations. Part of the Soviet Union's troubles has been of its own creation, just as part of our difficulties in dealing with the U.S.S.R. have been of our own making. The world for nations as for men is often a mirror that reflects their own image, returning hate for hate, good will for good will.

There are forces in the world which do not want peace. There are forces which fear socialism and wish to destroy it even at the risk of self-destruction. These forces play their part now in every Western capital and seek to prevent peace from breaking out. But the new Soviet regime will also find that there is a large, a much larger, body of opinion in the West, which can be won for peace and co-existence and humane relationships if the effort is made. The signs of a change at home will do much to harness this potential for peace. Were the new Soviet regime to follow up its confession about the doctors with steps to make such frame-ups less likely in the future, it would awe the world. Russia needs habeas corpus, the right to counsel and the doctrine of overt act as the test of guilt if it is to dissipate the murk of conspiracy on which its secret police has grown great. Internal changes of this kind would go far to dissipate those fears on which the warmongers depend.

ECONOMICS AND PEACE:

Does The Kremlin Want A Slump In America?

Should peace break out too suddenly the consequences may be disastrous. The world outside the Soviet bloc is in the position of a dope addict who dare not too abruptly be denied his abnormal stimulation. A slow levelling off of tension would have its advantages. It may seem cynical to say so but fortunately the relaxation of tension will be slow, if indeed it is not upset altogether by those who do not want peace.

The same commentators who were saying last year that the Soviets were trying to get us to spend ourselves into disaster now suggest that Moscow's idea may be to create an economic depression in the West, and so give the Communists a chance to "take over." These are the alternative cliches of those who find it safest to regard the world as a continuous conspiracy from the Kremlin.

Flanders of Vermont, an intelligent business man and an intelligent Senator, fell back on this variant of the bogeyman theory in pleading the need of plan for peace. "I think we may be certain," he told the Senate, "that our new and our old friends in Russia confidently expect us to go into a tailspin if we stop our high expenditures for war."

But it would be worth the while of the Soviet bloc to do the planning for us free of charge rather than see a serious slump here in the wake of peace. A depression serious enough to create the mere possibility of revolutionary situations in Japan, India or Western Europe would almost certainly bring American armed intervention on a scale far beyond that in Korea. Imagine the repercussions here of a Communist putsch in Italy or Japan. Imagine the shiver of apprehension which would run through American capitalism if it looked as if India might go the way of China.

All the crypto-Fascist forces nurtured by the loss of China to the Communists would be immensely strengthened. America would be frightened into something close to full mobilization. Repression would be intensified, and the prospect of using a new crusade against communism as a means of stimulating business would be irresistible. The drive toward World War III which the Russian and Chinese Communists are obviously trying to avoid would take on swifter momentum. Peace can only be preserved if a certain measure of economic stability can be achieved in the wake of any political settlement. The Soviet bloc, in its pursuit of peace, can no more afford a slump in America than can Western Europe.

But the chances for economic stability are not very good. This is the situation as it looks from Washington:

The new Administration seems to have but one consistent economic policy. This is to raise the level of interest rates—and at the same time loosen the restrictions on speculation. This makes sense from the standpoint of the banks. It raises the price of their chief commodity, which is credit, and it encourages more speculative activity on credit. The fall in government bonds, the steady rise in yields and interest rates, are the banker's payoff for a Republican victory.

Theoretically, such a policy is deflationary. By increasing the cost of credit, it puts a brake on business expansion and consumer buying. But there is a wide gap between theory and actuality in economics.

Is the new Administration deliberately following a deflationary policy? Is it trying for a "healthy readjustment" in price and wage levels? Such purposes would follow logically from its money policies. But there seem to be few if any informed observers here who think there is any such broader plan behind the events in the money market. The general opinion seems to be that the purpose is simply to raise interest rates and bank earnings.

Should progress be quickly made, toward a Korean settlement, however, the steady tightening of credit would have an additional effect on business activity.

One of the ways to counteract a lessening of military expenditures—and the swift fear of such reduction—would be by cheapening credit. This might encourage civilian expansion and borrowing by cities and states for public works. But this would run up against resistance from the banking crowd.

The easy first step for a Republican Administration would be to reduce taxes. Unfortunately there is little reason to believe from the experience of the early 30's that tax reduction will stimulate either consumer buying or capital investment against an adverse economic tide.

The Administration, for all its shortcomings, is considerably more enlightened than Congress. And in Congress the Senate is somewhat more forward looking than the House, which has prior hold on the purse-strings. This was dramatized last week when the Council of Economic Advisers died for lack of funds the day after the Communist about-face on the prisoner of war issue sent a premonitory chill through the stock and commodity markets. This agency was set up by the Employment Act of 1946 to help cope with just such situations. But the funds needed to continue the Council were blocked without debate by the House after an appropriation had been approved in the Senate.

The climate of opinion in Washington as regards "economic planning" is not what it was a few years ago. Senator Taft, who took the word "full" out of the Full Employment Act before voting for it in 1946, illustrates the change. He explained to the Senate recently, without wincing, that the purpose of the Council of Economic Advisers is to "plan economic policy, just as the National Security Council plans long range military and foreign policy." But the senior Senator from Ohio is an enlightened conservative and for the rank and file of his party economic planning is still synonymous with socialism. The Administration need only wage a militant fight for the Council—on the heels of its appointment of a Yalta apologist to the Embassy in Moscow—to make the average Republican Congressman feel that Eisenhower ran for office on the wrong ticket, and is boring from within the G.O.P.

In terms of mere arithmetic a truce in Korea, even a full settlement there and the withdrawal of American troops, would not be enough to cause much of a recession in the American economy. From an economic point of view, the Korean affair is distinctly a "police action," not a major war. But the U.S. is a very volatile country and an armistice may set off as sharp a wave of selling as the onset of the Korean war set off a wave of buying. This may have serious repercussions abroad, where the economic margins are thin and precarious. The most dangerous spot is Japan, which would have been in the most serious kind of difficulties without the business created for it by the war in Korea. A Japanese slump would adversely effect world markets in which the Japanese compete, especially the already depressed textile market.

The position of Britain, France and Germany is not much better. A slight slump here plus a reduction in foreign aid plus the possibility of a general relaxation of tension could have a disastrous effect in Western Europe and in the entire sterling area. The fact is that the crisis of West European capitalism has only been staved off by American aid and American aid has only been obtainable by playing on fear of Russia. An economy minded Congress, eager above all for tax cuts, might react swiftly to a diminution of tension. This Congress will be as quick to cut foreign aid as it will be slow to prime the pump of business with public works in the event of a slump, while the American bankers generally may be foolish enough to welcome the prospect of a little "healthy deflation."

I. F. Stone's Weekly

• Editor and Publisher, I. F. STONE

Published weekly except the last two weeks of August at Room 225, 1416 F St., N.W., Washington 4, D. C. Subscription rates: Domestic, \$5 a year; Canada, Mexico and elsewhere in the Western Hemisphere, \$6; England and Continental Europe, \$10 by 1st class mail, \$15 by air; for Israel, Asia, Australia and Africa, \$10 by first class mail, \$20 by air mail. Single copy, 15 cents. Contents covered by copyright. Telephone, STerling 3-0938. Entered as Second Class mail matter, Post Office, Washington, D. C.

Vol. 1, No. 13  7 April 11, 1953

Time for A Change

Every year about this time the House Appropriations Committee releases the annual testimony of J. Edgar Hoover on the FBI budget. Each year he gives the committee the latest figure on the membership of the Communist party—an exact count, down to the last subversive digit, as if the comrades had been herded through a special turnstile by the FBI. The membership figures as he has given them during the last five years follow:

1949	54,174
1950	52,669
1951	43,217
1952	31,608
1953	24,796

As anyone can see by running his eye down the figures, the Communist party, according to Hoover, has lost more than 50 percent of its members in the last five years.

But while the number of Communists has been dwindling, the number of FBI men employed to watch them has been growing. The FBI budget has been rising at just about the same rate that Communist party membership has been falling. In the fiscal year ended June 30, 1948, the FBI budget was less than \$30,000,000. For the fiscal year beginning next July 1 Hoover is asking \$77,000,000. The number of Communists is less than half what it was five years ago but the FBI budget is more than double what it was then.

Not Doing So Well

This is not because the FBI is spending more time chasing bank robbers. Its main business is "internal security," i.e. acting as a political police. Some readers will recall that last year just about this time Attorney General McGranery fired Newbold Morris as special investigator of corruption in government, declaring that if he saw any corruption around he would "straighten it out" himself with the aid of the FBI.

Morris replied that the FBI was too busy to investigate corruption. He said Hoover "told me it was impossible for his depart-

ment to do anything except the task before them of counter-espionage."

It would appear from Hoover's testimony this year that the FBI is not doing too well at that task. Hoover told the House committee "the enemy espionage rings are more intensively operated today than they have been at any previous time in the history of the country."

A statement of this kind, from any other official so long a part of the Roosevelt-Truman Administration, would provoke a storm in Congress, if not an investigation to determine whether Hoover himself might not be . . . well, you never can tell.

The number of Communists has been cut in half, the FBI budget has been doubled, the government has been turned turvy by one loyalty purge after another, yet Hoover says enemy spy rings are working here more intensively than ever before. Either the enemy must be devilishly clever or the FBI must be devilishly full of *dummkopfs*.

The question which rises is: if Hoover knows that enemy spy rings are working here so intensively, why doesn't he break them up? Either the director of the FBI is talking through his hat or—as the Republicans would say of any other holdover from the last Administration—it is time for a change.

Hat's Off

In this connection the *Weekly* takes its hat off this week to Dean Carl W. Ackerman of the Columbia University School of Journalism for declaring that he will no longer freely open his files to FBI and other investigators of student "loyalty."

Dean Ackerman thinks students should be free to talk "without fear that someone may make a record which may be investigated secretly, upon which he may be tried secretly, and also be convicted secretly, either by a governmental official or a prospective employer."

A whole generation of students is being brought up to believe what some of us like to think is the most un-American doctrine imaginable. They are being brought up to believe that it is best to keep one's mouth shut.

Un-Russian Activity

This business of keeping tabs on students and their "loyalty" is a good old Russian custom. Students were closely watched under the Czars and have been as closely watched for dangerous "deviations" under their Communist successors. Our professional anti-Communists are following the same pattern. The self-proclaimed defenders of Americanism are themselves spreading the most noxiously un-American ideas and people who should know better dutifully echo the kind of nonsense necessary for political respectability.

An example is the theory of "lawful limits" on free expression propounded last

week by the stuffed-shirt Association of American Universities in its statement on the "rights and responsibilities" of university faculties. The statement regards the First Amendment much as Vishinsky in his book on Soviet Law interprets the freedoms of speech, press and assembly as "guaranteed" by the Soviet Constitution.

The AAA says in effect that the First and Fourteenth Amendments confer limited rights only and "When the speech, writing or other actions of a member of a faculty exceed lawful limits, he is subject to the same penalties as other persons." The italics are ours. The idea that there are "lawful limits" on speech or writing other than those which punish libel or actual incitement to crime was rejected by the Framers of the Constitution.

Disloyal "Founding Father"

We suggest that the FBI (if it has not already done so) rush agents up to Princeton where that University's chapter of the American Association of University Professors have just adopted a quite different statement on academic freedom, basing themselves on "the convictions of one of our Founding Fathers who declared: 'The opinions of men are not the object of civil government, nor under its jurisdiction' and 'to suffer the civil magistrate to intrude his powers into the field of opinion and to restrain the profession or propagation of principles on supposition of their ill tendency is a dangerous fallacy.'"

We decline to snitch on a Founding Father and leave the source of those quotations unidentified. If J——— M——— should be marked down as disloyal and unfit for government employment, the fault will not be ours.

Subversive Senator

We wonder, however, after reading Hoover's testimony criticizing those persons who defend the right of Communists to teach, whether there is now a loyalty file on a certain Senator from Ohio.

Come To Think of It

From an extension of remarks by the Hon. B. W. (Pat) Kennedy of New York in the House of Representatives on Eddie Cantor's Campaign for Red Cross Bloodbank:

MR. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker . . . Last evening on this television program which runs from coast to coast he (Eddie Cantor) dedicated a song entitled 'My Sweetheart Mamie' . . . to the wife of the President of the United States. . . . This was done in typical Cantor fashion, and once more demonstrated to the world the close bonds of harmony which exist between the American people, their Chief Executive and his wife.

This is probably the only country in the world where . . . freethinking and independent-acting citizens may refer to the First Lady of the land by her first name. . . .

JENNINGS PERRY'S PAGE

The Way to Succeed This Time at Panmunjom

It has been a full year and seven months since I hopefully pointed out to Admiral Joy and his truce-seeking opposites at Panmunjom that if they would arrange for the boundaries of the neutral zone to be pushed out one mile every day they failed to agree on a truce, they would get a peace whether or not they ever got an agreement.

Unfortunately no such arrangement was made, even though, it will be recalled, fixing the boundaries of the neutral zone was one of the matters left entirely to the commanders in the field. Perhaps the idea seemed too simple or the device too mechanical. It would have served to backstop the truce talks, nevertheless, and it is hard to see how indeed it would not have got a peace.

The armies long ago would have been out of contact with each other, and by now would be some 1200 miles apart, ours in Japan or Okinawa and the Chinese back in China. Our bombers would have nothing to bomb. In the slowly expanding neutral zone the Koreans could have planted and harvested two crops, and could have held at least the first of the national elections in which their choice of government must in the end be made.

At the old tent at Panmunjom meanwhile, there need not have been more progress in the negotiation of a truce than there has been in the presence of the stalemated battle—though in all probability there would have been more: it would have been difficult not to recognize the armistice-in-fact. In Washington the supporters of Gen. MacArthur and of Gen. Van Fleet could have maintained as endlessly and as romantically what their heroes might have done, given the men, the guns—and the word, to work a conclusive victory over the hated foe. Sen. Smith as keenly could have pressed her inquiry into who had (or had not) the ammunition. . . .

The thing is that by a fair and honorable contrivance the actual battle could have been disjoined; the young men who have been required to kill each other would have been spared the necessity of killing each other; the people and the land of Korea could have been by degrees relieved of the disaster of war. By this spring, the slopes of Old Baldy could have been green and quiet again.

The granny-knot Admiral Joy could not untangle now has passed to Admiral Daniel; there is a new and more promising

atmosphere at Panmunjom. The ceasefire all have hoped for may be decided in the tent before another summer comes. Not many more of the young men may have to be obliterated for the sake of taking or holding an unheard of height to keep the war alive.

I suggest again that the peace is more important than the parley; and that the world, in particular the world in the trenches, ought to have a firmer earnest of it than the talks going at the table. I suggest again that the negotiators met in the tent with whatever good will can put the hopes of the world in no better train than by starting a regular, measured expansion of the Panmunjom sanctuary which will continue to inch back the actual battlefield every day that a formal armistice is delayed.

We tell ourselves that it is inconceivable that men lack the intelligence to terminate an armed strife without some sort of "arbitrament at arms," but the proof waits on the event. And it is stupid during the waiting not to abate the bloodshed if we know how. Certainly in Korea, where we have crucially committed ourselves to turn from a resort to arms to a resort to sense, it would be stupid not to try to taper off the battle, and there is no sure way to do this save by separating the combatants.

It could be of course that the Panmunjom talks once more will end in deadlock, and we may consider what then will happen to the war if in the meantime we shall have put all of Korea, piece by piece, out of bounds for battle? Will the war simply dry up and cease for lack of contact between the forces? The answer undoubtedly is that it would; and furthermore that, if no happier answer can be found through negotiation, mutual accommodation and agreement, the resulting "peace" would still be to be cherished.

The worst that could happen to the world in that case would be the discovery that the prolongation of a war in which both sides had been put out of each other's reach would be unbearably silly. And that knowledge could lead — who knows?—to the healthy realization that in our times war is silly however it is permitted to come.

I. F. Stone's Weekly 4-11-53
 Room 225 Kellogg Bldg.
 1416 F Street, N.W., Washington 4, D. C.

Please enter the following subscription. \$5 for 1 year is enclosed. (See page 3 for foreign rates)

Name
 Street
 City Zone
 State

I. F. Stone's Weekly
 225 Kellogg Bldg.
 1416 F St., N.W., Washington 4, D. C.

NEWSPAPER

Entered as
 Second Class Mail
 Matter
 Post Office
 Washington, D. C.

I. F. Stone's Weekly

VOL. I NUMBER 14

APRIL 18, 1953



WASHINGTON, D. C.

15 CENTS

The Dulles Affair: Stupidity or Sabotage?

The notion that John Foster Dulles's little talk with a group of favored Washington correspondents was intended to launch a trial balloon will not bear close examination. No trial balloon was needed to learn that Chiang and his Republican friends in Congress would react violently to the idea of a UN trusteeship over Formosa. No test run was required to discover that the intransigent Syngman Rhee would object to anything less than the surrender of all North Korea. The reaction of Western Europe was easily foreseeable: there the news fed the suspicion that the United States does not want to settle the Korean war, and was therefore making politically impossible demands. If the Eisenhower Administration was seriously considering division of Korea at the "waist" and a Formosan trusteeship, it had everything to lose by premature disclosure.

If these proposals were intended to block peace, they were well framed. The North Koreans, after extraordinary suffering and heroism, would be asked to give up their capital and most of their territory. The Chinese, flushed with their success in fighting a major Western military power to a standstill for the first time in their history, would be asked to relinquish an island province they regard and we recognize as theirs. But if the purpose of these terms was to upset the peace talks, why disclose them in advance? The timing alerted and infuriated our allies and at the same time intensified unrest within Republican ranks in Congress. The effect of Dulles's talk with the correspondents was to weaken the Administration's power to hold in line its followers at home and its allies abroad, while forewarning the enemy.

The trial balloon theory rests on the assumption that Eisenhower and Dulles see eye to eye on foreign policy. But what if this assumption is untrue? Their first reactions to the "peace offensive" were strikingly different. Eisenhower said he would take conciliatory moves at face value until proven otherwise; Dulles said nothing had changed or could change as long as Russia was a Soviet dictatorship. The President's attitude reflected a readiness to negotiate; the Secretary of State indicated a belief that co-existence with the present Russian government was impossible. From such different premises must flow different attitudes toward peace in Korea.

Differences in outlook are accompanied in this case by differences in temperament. Eisenhower is a simple man, while Dulles is pompous, subtle and crafty. The latter pushed his way into the job of Secretary of State. Eisenhower has never particularly liked Dulles; the lawyer did not declare for Eisenhower until his nomination was absolutely assured. The gossip in Washington—gossip Dulles also hears—is that the President would have preferred Clay or McCloy in the job of Secretary

of State, and intends to replace him. Dulles is close to MacArthur, while Eisenhower leans on the more sober military like Bradley.

Dulles has had ignominiously to tone down those ideas of "liberation" and a bold new foreign policy which he expressed last year. The watered down resolution "repudiating" Yalta which Dulles was forced to sponsor on the Hill must have been as disappointing to him as to the right wing Republicans. All that Dulles stands for must lead him to reject the idea of peace in Korea. The Adenauer visit must remind him that German rearmament, a project Acheson was able to launch only because of the war in Korea, would be endangered by its cessation. A rearmed Western Germany, securely linked to the Atlantic Pact by the hope of recovering the Eastern lands, is essential for that rollback of the Russians to their old borders on which Dulles and the "liberationists" have set their hearts.

What if Dulles deliberately upset the apple-cart? This hypothesis is more logical than that of the trial balloon. It does not require us to believe that so shrewd an old lawyer as Dulles would not realize the consequences of "spilling" so momentous a story. The calculated leak is a familiar weapon in the intramural feuds of American Administrations. There is evidence of a sharp difference of opinion within Eisenhower's official family over the tempo and magnitude of rearmament.

Eisenhower's Defense Secretary, Wilson, and his budget director, the able Detroit banker, Dodge, have antagonized the military by their plans for stretching out and reducing the arms program. Antagonism has grown to the point where Eisenhower has warned Congressmen against "military lobbyists". While the Air Force feeds out horror stories and paints the Russian air fleet in the most fearful colors (just as rival Anglo-German naval lobbies used to do before World War I), some of the bankers and big business men in this Administration (quite unlike the picture painted of them in Pravda) are fighting government by alarm and pressing hard for economy. This calls for relaxation of tension and peace, not "liberation".

Eisenhower and his aides may well have discussed the idea of a division of Korea at the "waist" and the old idea of a Formosan trusteeship as possible ways of solving the political problems with which a cease-fire will confront them. The Dulles off-the-record talk may have made these ideas seem more concrete than they were. In any case by disclosing them prematurely and as actual proposals, Dulles has made the task of achieving peace immensely more difficult. Whether this was done by obtuseness or design, it must make Eisenhower anxious to get himself a new Secretary of State. Perhaps Dulles felt his days in that office were numbered anyway.

New Light on Malenkov's More "Liberal" Line

In trying to understand the new internal developments in the Soviet Union, it is useful to go back and restudy the report made by Malenkov last October to the Nineteenth Congress of the Communist Party of the U.S.S.R.

Interest abroad has focused on the clues this reported provided as to Soviet foreign policy: Malenkov stressed the possibility of peaceful co-existence. Too little attention has been paid to the domestic aspects of that report. These are of especial interest now in assessing so startling a development as the announcement in which the accused Soviet doctors were cleared and the secret police declared guilty of a frame-up.

There is no way of knowing whether this official exposure of the secret police portends basic shifts in internal policy. But something of the sort may have been foreshadowed by the Malenkov report last October. In this, the main address to the first Communist party Congress held in the U.S.S.R. since 1939, Malenkov over and over again emphasized the importance of encouraging "critics from below".

Vengeance on Critics

The Malenkov report stressed the need for such criticism to put a check on bureaucratic elements. He had a good deal to say of those party "functionaries who . . . are intolerant of criticism from below, stifle it and wreak vengeance on the critics." These passages are given new interest now because one way to prevent such vengeance and to encourage plain speaking "from below" would be to give the ordinary Soviet citizen greater protection against arbitrary officials and the police.

The Malenkov report provides some acid portraits of the Soviet bureaucracy. Of the situation in agriculture, Malenkov said, "Some workers in Party, Soviet and agricultural bodies instead of guarding the interests of the collective farms' common enterprise themselves engage in pilfering collective farm property . . . These workers take advantage of their official position to occupy collective farm land, make collective farm boards and chairmen supply them with grain, meat, milk and other commodities free of charge or at low price. They exchange their own low productive stock for high productive and more valuable cattle belonging to the collective farms."

Commissars as Entrepreneurs

Malenkov drew a picture of similar conditions in some sectors of industry. Malenkov spoke of "business executives, with the connivance of party organizations, submitting obviously inflated lists of required raw materials and supplies, and . . . doctoring output reports to conceal non-fulfilment of production programmes.

Quite a few functionaries," Malenkov continued, "forgetting that the enterprises entrusted to their supervision and leadership are state enterprises, try to turn them into their own private domains . . ."

"Another major evil," Malenkov said, "is that we have not a few individuals who seem to think that Party decisions and Soviet laws are not binding on them and imagine that we have two kinds of discipline: one for the rank and file, the other for the leaders. These 'leaders' think that everything is permitted them . . . and engage on all kinds of arbitrary action."

Stifling Criticism

Malenkov complained that "leaders of Party, Soviet and economic organizations not infrequently turn meetings . . . into ceremonial affairs, into occasions for self-praise . . . and this simply adds to the complacency and smugness." He emphasized the need for "criticism from below" as a means of correcting errors and as "an expression of the creative initiative and activity of millions of working people." He declared that "meetings must become real open forums for bold and trenchant criticism of shortcomings."

Such real forums, Malenkov said, were not to be had for the asking. He attacked "the view that criticism from below can develop of itself, automatically . . ." He declared that "It can develop . . . only on the conditions that every person who offers sound criticism can be confident that he will find support in our organizations and that the shortcomings he reveals will actually be eliminated." He asserted that it was "particularly important at this juncture . . . relentlessly to combat, as the Party's bitterest enemy, everyone who obstructs the development of criticism of our shortcomings, stifles criticism and permits persecution and reprisals for criticism."

The Need for Satire

Malenkov spoke as the secretary of the Central Committee of the Party, Stalin's old post. He covered the whole of Soviet life in his report, and his observations on the state of Soviet literature and science were in keeping with those he expressed on agriculture and industry. He complained, for example, that in Soviet fiction, drama and films there was no satire. In science Malenkov called for "promoting criticism and the conflict of opinions in scientific work."

Communism and Free Speech

There is no reason to suspect that Malenkov is a crypto-liberal. But his report indicates that it may be dawning on Soviet leaders that some real freedom of speech and some real safeguards against arbitrary police action are necessary for the healthy working of their society.

The whole system of planning may break down if statistics can be distorted by officials to hide their own shortcomings. Bureaucratic arteriosclerosis may spread if officials can make it hazardous for underlings and ordinary workers to speak out. The bureaucracy may become too powerful for the efficient working of the state.

Malenkov said "one of the most dangerous and pernicious infringements of Party and State discipline is concealment by some functionaries of the true state of affairs in the enterprises and offices under their charge". He asserted that "one of the most widespread and deeply rooted shortcomings in the practical work of Soviet, economic and Party organizations" was the "lack of proper verification" of whether directives had been carried out.

"Our organizations and establishments," Malenkov continued, "issue decisions, directives and orders in far greater numbers than is required, but they are little concerned about whether and how these decisions are carried out." Malenkov said, "Only verification of fulfilment from the top combined with control from below by the Party and non-party masses will ensure the timely elimination of shortcomings."

A Soviet Habeas Corpus?

But if rank-and-file party members and ordinary workers are to help check on conditions in industry, they must be freed from the fear of being punished or framed by higher-ups. It may be significant that Pravda in the announcement clearing the doctors laid new stress on Article 127 of the Soviet Constitution which "guarantees Soviet citizens the inviolability of the person. No one can be detained without a court decision or an order of the prosecutor."

If this is really enforced, it will no longer be possible for persons to be seized and held by the secret police on its own responsibility. This would begin to be equivalent to *habeas corpus*. Pravda went on to say that "the defense of the rights of Soviet citizens . . . is the most important foundation for the further development and strengthening of the Soviet State."

Pravda concluded the editorial accusing the secret police of framing the doctors by saying, "No one will be allowed to violate Soviet laws. Every worker, every collective farmer, every member of the Soviet *intelligentsia* can work safely and without fear in the knowledge that his civic rights are reliably guarded under Soviet socialist watchfulness."

Is this the beginnings of a new Malenkov line in internal policy which may reduce the swollen powers of the secret police and encourage the ordinary citizen to speak more freely?

I. F. Stone's Weekly

• Editor and Publisher, I. F. STONE

Published weekly except the last two weeks of August at Room 205, 301 E. Capitol St., S.E., Washington 3, D. C. Subscription rates: Domestic, \$5 a year; Canada, Mexico and elsewhere in the Western Hemisphere, \$6; England and Continental Europe, \$10 by 1st class mail, \$15 by air; for Israel, Asia, Australia and Africa, \$10 by first class mail, \$20 by air mail. Single copy, 15 cents. Tel.: LI 4-7087. Entered as Second Class mail matter, Post Office, Washington, D. C.

April 18, 1953  Vol I, No. 14

The Vanishing Dream Of Coolie Armies

A sobering footnote to Eisenhower's happy campaign thought about letting Asians fight Asians for us (and at half the price, too!) may be found in John Foster Dulles's testimony before the House Appropriations Committee.

After another year of campaigning—and optimistic predictions—the rebel forces in Indo China hold more villages than they did a year ago. "If the native peoples," Dulles said, "are still under the impression that all they are fighting for is to keep the French there as their colonial masters, they will not put much spirit in that kind of fight." Q.E.D.

But when, as in India, Burma and Indonesia, Asians achieve freedom from their colonial masters, they show no desire to serve as cannon fodder in quarrels between the great Powers. The dream of huge coolie armies fighting at coolie wages to "liberate" China for exploitation again by Japan and the Western powers—this is what the "let Asians fight Asians" slogan means.

At one time the Republicans in Congress seemed to understand that even the most illiterate coolie would soon catch on. When the Atlantic Pact was being debated, on no point were the Republican right wingers so vociferous as on assurance that this treaty would not commit us to the support of British and French colonialism in Asia. But that was before Chiang lost power in China and gained it in Washington, and China Lobby Senators began to shop around for some cheap way to recruit the manpower needed to restore Chiang on the mainland. The Dulles report on Indo-China shows that though we have been looking around for human bargains all we have acquired are new military and political liabilities.

Shade of Goebbels At the Pentagon

A year and a half ago the American public was being fed a heavy diet of atrocity stories on mistreatment of American prisoners of war. "Reds Butchered More Americans Than Fell in '76" said

a prize headline over an Associated Press compilation purporting to show that more than 6,000 POW's had been killed by the Communists. General Ridgway, lifting his eyes heavenward, issued a statement saying that perhaps God "in his inscrutable way" had chosen this method "to bring home to our people and to the conscience of the world the moral principles of the leaders of the forces against which we fight in Korea."

Unfortunately "God" seems to be very undependable. The last time He arranged for the release of American POW's in enemy hands they came back with reports of good treatment (see the Saturday Evening Post, August 25, 1951, "They Tried to Make Our Marines Love Stalin"). This time the Pentagon is taking no chances on an inscrutable Providence. Now that sick and wounded POW's are about to be exchanged, the Pentagon has issued an 8-page "fact sheet" designed to discount in advance anything favorable which a POW may say about his captors.

It seems, according to this "fact sheet", that "by deceptively soft and ingratiating treatment" designed to make prisoners "more susceptible to indoctrination", these monsters may have led some Americans "to accept, or at least repeat, many elements of Communist propaganda". So if a prisoner comes home and says "we weren't treated too badly" or "why the heck don't we get out of Korea?", the folks will know that the poor chap's mind was poisoned by dialectical materialism.

And if the Army can't prove atrocities, it is determined at least to make good treatment of American POW's seem sinister.

The Right to Counsel— If One Can Be Found

The 4-4 decision of the U.S. Supreme Court upholding the disbarment of Abraham J. Isserman for contempt of court in the Foley Square trial is another blow at the effective exercise of the right to counsel. Justice Jackson pointed out for the four dissenting judges that they could recall no other instance where a lawyer had been disbarred "merely because he had been convicted of a contempt," except in the pre-revolutionary Peter Zenger case in 1735 when two lawyers defending that colonial editor were disbarred for having the temerity to file a document questioning the legality of the Judges' commission.

Mr. Justice Jackson pointed out, on the other hand, that in the trial of "Boss" Tweed several defense counsel were held in contempt for their attack upon the presiding judge for bias and prejudice. Yet none were subjected to disciplinary action and the incident did not interfere with careers which became eminent. One of the contemptuous counsel was Elihu Root. Another, David Dudley Field, was later elected president of the American Bar Association. A third became Chief Judge of the New York Court of Appeals. Obviously the hazards of contempt when de-

fending political corruptionists are considerably less than when defending political dissenters.

Justice Jackson said the Isserman case would have been different if there had been, as Judge Medina alleged, a deliberate conspiracy to obstruct justice. But the Court of Appeals, like the District Court in the disciplinary action, found this was not proven. The Circuit Court upheld on contempt alone. Justice Tom Clark, who urged as Attorney General that lawyers who defend radicals be disbarred, took no part in the case but his colleagues of the Truman court evidently share his views. The decision again lights up the sharp division between the Truman judges and the four, Jackson, Frankfurter, Black and Douglas, whom Roosevelt appointed.

Freedom, Like Charity . . .

The U.S. and the U.S.S.R. may not be able to get together on the subject of peace but on one point they agree. They both dislike the Declaration of Human Rights and they dislike it for the same reason. They fear "international interference" with internal affairs.

The Senate bloc behind the Bricker amendment and Eisenhower, in declaring that we will not support the UN covenant on human rights, are in an interesting position. Both the Senate right-wingers and the Administration are anxious to make the whole world "safe for democracy" by international action, the whole world that is except ourselves.

While the Bricker bloc wants to limit the treaty power lest it take away basic American liberties, the real fear is that international treaties like the proposed Covenant may help to enforce those rights. What gave the bar associations and the Southern Democrats the shivers is that a California court has already thrown out a discriminatory land law on the ground that it violated the UN Charter. And what happens to political restrictions on passports and visas if we become party to a treaty upholding the right to travel?

Hat's Off

To Francis Biddle and the ADA for their letter to Attorney General Herbert Brownell demanding action on the pigeonholed McCarthy report by the Senate privileges and elections subcommittee. McCarthy says if he weren't so busy he would bring criminal libel charges against Biddle. If McCarthy brought criminal libel charges against Biddle, he would have to discuss the charges brought against himself by the Senate committee. This is what McCarthy has steadily refused to do, as he has a right to—under the Fifth Amendment. Whether he has a right to continue in public office and refuse to answer embarrassing questions about his own financial practices is another matter. A lot of school teachers have lost their jobs for less.

JENNINGS PERRY'S PAGE

The Sweet Mysteries (If Any) of Peace

Among the fears for which I am not by nature fitted, I find, is looking peace in the teeth. I cannot keep from telling myself that there is nothing mysterious about it; that after all the race is rational, peace is desirable, and that the prospect is better than usual this spring simply because the popular will has had time again to creep up on the course of human events.

Conceivably the view is too trusting. It may be indeed that the recent *démarches* which have so lifted the hopes of the peoples are, as the experts variously contend, the result of factors more influential with governments than the mere preference of the common man in the street. For example, it may at last have sunk into those people "capable of understanding only the language of force" that the United States does have atomic artillery, and a new President who will not put up with too much foolishness. Or the new peace moves could reflect mainly the need of the new head of the Russian state to overcome the restlessness of the peoples behind the Iron Curtain, and the temperate reception of them in Washington the need of a restored Republican administration above all to make good its promise to balance the budget and cut taxes.

I am not convinced; though if the undeniably brighter outlook for peace must be attributed to the political circumstances of new national regimes cast in opposition by old national rivalry, acceptance of either of the two reasons last named—or both—would not be contrary to the concept of popular rule. Both relate to demands in the street which cannot be met save under conditions of peace. The heads of new administrations do face the problem of establishing themselves in the popular favor; and if the teachers on one side of the Curtain are preparing to tell the children that Malenkov had to taper off the Cold War to keep his people quiet, and the teachers on the other side are preparing to tell the children that Eisenhower had to do the same thing to relieve the tax burden in America, it still will be taught that *vox populi is vox dei*.

I see nothing in the other explanation of the Russian "peace blitz" (that the Kremlin now is overawed by the military might the West has put together in fact and on

paper) that satisfies ordinary common sense—or that promises any real peace. It is a theory that could be comforting only to those who have maintained there is no substitute for victory; it is a sort of left-handed claim of victory. It is, of course, unprovable. And as a belief on which the West might rest its understanding of the present peace moves, it is a formula for the perpetuation of the arms race, of "world tension" and of all the waste of human and natural resources that attends the effort of two worlds to be unendingly "ready for war."

It is a theory which conveniently forgets that the rulers of the Kremlin have been (if only in their imagination) living under the threat of atomic annihilation for the past seven years without particularly changing their ways, and which artfully supposes that the rulers of another country would be less willing to risk the destruction of their cities and populations to preserve their principles and their honor than we are ourselves. What is worse, it is a theory which overlooks our own oft-pronounced conviction that the people everywhere yearn for peace and that the people everywhere, in whom all power inheres, will exert their sovereignty despite any tyranny whatsoever.

Our armed might has done as well in Korea as anybody's armed might; it has done loyally and bravely what it was sent to do . . . and so, we must grant, has the armed might sent against it. If there is a lasting cease-fire, each side, if it chooses, can push the claim that the other was forced to come to terms. That way all national vanities would be coddled, and the myth preserved that God has served the side with the heaviest artillery.

The preservation of the self-esteem of humanity would seem however to require that a termination of the hostilities be based on mutual forbearance and the wilful transfer of all disputes from the field of battle to the arena of reason. It will not hurt humanity in its own proper estimation if this transfer is acknowledged to be upon the demand and at the direction of worldwide sentiment. It would be, obviously, the finest demonstration of the existence and usefulness of manly intelligence the rest of animate creation would ever have had an occasion to witness.

I. F. Stone's Weekly

4-18-53

Room 205

301 E. Capitol St., S.E., Washington 3, D. C.

Please enter the following subscription. \$5 for 1 year is enclosed. (See page 3 for foreign rates)

Name

Street

CityZone.....

State

I. F. Stone's Weekly

Room 205

301 E. Capitol St., S.E.,

Washington 3, D. C.

Entered as
Second Class Mail
Matter
Post Office
Washington, D. C.

NEWSPAPER

I. F. Stone's Weekly

VOL. I NUMBER 15

APRIL 25, 1953



WASHINGTON, D. C.

15 CENTS

Olive Branch—or The Same Big Stick?

The tone of the President's address to the newspaper editors was moderate and idealistic; there were passages in which one might have believed it was Henry Wallace talking. But when Eisenhower came to the terms on which he proposed to make peace, the olive branch proved a masquerade for the same big stick waved so often by Truman.

Eisenhower did not insist as a condition for peace that a new government be installed in Moscow, but that is about the only demand he did not make. There must be peace in Korea, of course on our terms; the Indo-Chinese and Malayan revolts are to be shut off, as one shuts off a spigot; an Austrian treaty is to be signed and the Red Army withdrawn from Central Europe; Germany is to be united but remain part of a Western alliance; and the Russians are to accept American disarmament and atomic control proposals "made firmly effective by stringent UN control and inspection." Eisenhower asked whether the Russians were prepared to accept these conditions and added, "If not—where then is the concrete evidence of the Soviet Union's concern for peace?" On this basis the Soviets can only demonstrate a sincere desire for peace by an unconditional surrender to American terms.

Amid the thunderous and dutiful claque (the American press has grown almost as unanimous as the Russian), few questioning voices could be heard. Senator Green of Rhode Island wondered sensibly but forlornly whether it was not "a tactical error to lay down the conditions we will agree to in seeking peace . . . The naming of conditions complicates the problem of negotiations." The Chicago Tribune and Washington Times-Herald asked, "By setting terms which to the Russians must seem not much different from the 10 points by which Secretary Hull goaded Japan into war, has he (Eisenhower) closed the door to more limited achievements, particularly to an armistice in Korea?" The follow up speech by Dulles made the program seem all the more like an ultimatum. Where Eisenhower had been tactfully silent about Formosa, Dulles made it clear that we intend to keep refueling the Chinese civil war while asking the Communists to call off the lesser civil conflicts in Korea, Indo-China and Malaya. Dulles's horticulture had produced an olive branch with thorns.

The strategy of extending a peace offer so onerous as almost certainly to be rejected was explained in the Ray Cromley dispatch published by the Wall Street Journal on April 8. This was based on that famous Dulles off-the-record talk with a few favored correspondents. Cromley reported the plan was to seize the initiative with a peace offensive in which each concession from the enemy would be followed up by a new demand and "if the Chinese or the Russians refuse any of these requests, it is contemplated that U. S. propaganda expert C. D. Jackson will organize a world-wide campaign aimed at convincing the world the Reds

don't want peace, really, despite their talk of it." Cromley said "The importance of this new policy—to American diplomats—is that heads we win and tails we win, too."

The naivete rather than the program deserves Churchill's characterization—"massive and magnificent." The Eisenhower speech followed the pattern Dulles forecast to the correspondents. Thus after enumerating his terms, Eisenhower concluded, "If we strive but fail, and the world remains armed against itself, it at least need be divided no longer in its clear knowledge of who has condemned mankind to this fate."

The real anxiety here is not to avoid the fate but to fix the blame. The basis is being laid for stepping up the emotional mobilization for war. Dulles said nervously to reporters the next day, "unless there is a prompt response from the Soviet Union . . . it will be quite apparent that it is necessary to move ahead on all fronts, East and West, with a strong position." Moscow must not only surrender, but do it quickly. The mentality is much like that of Van Fleet, who told the editors the same day the only solution in Korea was an all-out offensive.

If this were the whole story, there would be grounds for nothing but despair. A powerful group within the American military bureaucracy and governing circle is as opposed as ever to peace in Korea; the drift to war is still the line of least resistance. Dulles as always sees eye to eye with the masters of the Reich, and Adenauer wants no relaxation of tension until the U. S. has financed German rearmament and made the Ruhr the world's greatest arsenal again; then Germany can exact its own terms from the Russians. Eastern Europe is to be liberated for German exploitation; the *Drang nach Osten* requires that war, cold and hot, continue.

But Dulles and Van Fleet are not the whole story of this Administration. Other voices, equally powerful, may be heard. The Secretary of the Treasury in his speech to the Associated Press last Monday spoke a different language, the language of confidence in American business, unafraid of peace and skeptical about the endless pouring out of American wealth in a world crusade of tension and hate. Eisenhower himself, though something of a cipher, without much personal weight in the equation of forces within his Administration, yet seems to be a man of peace. There was much in his speech Dulles must have found unpalatable even as sugar-coating. If a column by the Alsops was correct, in the tug-of-war over the drafting, "White House thinking" at first "did not absolutely rule out the disarmament and unification of Germany, following free elections . . ." On such a basis agreement would be possible, with some promise of safety for Europe. I still believe there is a little more chance of peace with this Administration than there was with Truman's. The door to peace is at least ajar.

Atomic Power: Biggest Steal of the G.O.P. Era

Eisenhower in 1946 saved the atom for public ownership and civilian control. Now he is preparing to hand it over to "private enterprise."

Eisenhower swung the scales of a Republican Congress against the May-Johnson atomic energy bill favored by the military and big business. His endorsement clinched the case for the McMahon-Douglas bill, which became the Atomic Energy Act of 1946. What was done in his name then is to be undone now: the long planned campaign to hand the atom over to private exploitation has begun.

The theme of the campaign, of course, is free enterprise—"laissez faire." A better summing up for the spirit of the victorious Republicans lies in an older, franker phrase out of the years before the French Revolution—"enrichissez vous." The corporate courtiers swept into power with the Great Gopher are determined to enrich themselves at the expense of the public domain. Bigger than tidelands oil, power projects, synthetic rubber plants, grazing lands and water rights is the 10 billion dollar public investment in atomic development. This is to be the biggest steal of the new G.O.P. era.

The campaign could not begin under more favorable conditions. The spirit of the time in America is to get rid of "socialism"—creeping or otherwise. The atmosphere makes it dangerous to question the virtues of "free enterprise": the famous Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists, now planning a special symposium on the subject, is having difficulty in finding a scientist with the temerity to argue the case for continued public ownership. Such pleading is enough to create suspicion of heresy and invite loss of security clearance. The atmosphere created by "loyalty" purges pays off.

Transformation of a Hero

An unexpected asset is a New Deal hero who has become a Rotarian oracle. David E. Lilienthal, whose name is synonymous with TVA; first chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission; co-author of the Baruch-Acheson-Lilienthal plan for world public ownership (no less) of atomic energy, has since 1950 been sparking the campaign to hand the atom over to private business. In two articles that year for Collier's, Lilienthal called for revision of the law and lyrically foresaw the time when "the first breath of the tonic air of competition would blow through the atomic industry." This is not the tonic he administered to the Tennessee Valley.

This campaign, like the rest of the atomic energy story, is full of optical illusions. Not the least of them is Lilienthal himself. He illustrates the efficacy of the tactics pursued by the right wing of

American politics. The right, by taking the initiative and denouncing Lilienthal as socialistic, brought the liberals and left to his defense. In the process of proving (quite unnecessarily) that Lilienthal was no socialist, the left-of-center failed to notice how far right their hero had been pushed. They were kept busy defending as non-socialistic a program they would otherwise have criticized as much too favorable to big business. For another of the optical illusions in this story is the belief that until now the atom has been under public ownership in the full sense of the term.

The man who had administered the TVA as a "yardstick" with which to provide some public check on private power charges administered the Atomic Energy Act in such a way as to provide no "yardstick" at all for atomic costs.

The AEC's Obsession

James R. Newman, who was counsel to the Senate (McMahon) Committee on Atomic Energy which framed the present Act, cast an astringent eye on what had happened to the statute in a brilliant survey for the December, 1951, issue of the Yale Law Journal. "The Commission," he wrote, "has seemed obsessively determined to dispel the notion that the Atomic Energy Act is socialistic. It has delegated every major operating function of the production program, and most of the minor one, to private contractors . . . A small but powerful segment of American industry is today the manager of the great bulk of the atomic energy program." The Commission did not even carry on research in its own laboratories as specifically provided by the Act.

Competitive bidding, Newman wrote, has been "systematically disregarded." The administration of the cost plus fixed fee system has gone to fantastic lengths. Thus the 1949 investigation initiated by Hickenlooper disclosed that a contract which had been let for the erection of a plutonium fabrication facility at a cost of \$6,225,000 was completed at a cost of \$25,000,000 without the knowledge of the Commission; General Electric was the prime contractor. For two years the AEC thought the facility cost \$6,000,000 "when suddenly, in early 1949, the Commission, through a routine inspection by one of its members, discovered that in reality" it cost four times as much. Such contracts, Newman said, were defended by the Commission on the ground that "special concessions are necessary to induce the participation of private industry."

One of the major concessions for which private atomic contractors have long been hankering and will now campaign is the right to take out atomic patents: the Atomic Energy Act keeps these securely

under public ownership. The companies would like to obtain private patents on the work they have been doing at public expense. The other major objective is less openly proclaimed. It is hidden behind the talk of letting private industry develop the peacetime power potentialities of the atom. This is the spot at which the smooth public relations hand hopes to be swifter than the easily tired public eye.

What The Insiders Know

A public brought up on Sunday supplement science still believes that atomic pellets to operate atomic vehicles and plants are just around the corner. The insiders know that it will be a long time before atomic power can compete with oil, coal, gas or other conventional sources. They also know millions of dollars would have to be risked before ordinary use became possible. As Lilienthal told the special meeting on the subject held by the National Industrial Conference Board last October, it would be "imprudent at the present time for anyone to consider seriously putting substantial private money into this field." This is not how Lilienthal talked to the general public in Collier's.

The Congressional Joint Committee on Atomic Energy put it very softly in its report last December on "Atomic Power and Private Enterprise". It said "To date no AEC contractor has suggested that it undertake an atomic power project partly or wholly at its own expense." What has been suggested is that private contractors be allowed to take over plants producing fissionable materials, and that the government be allowed to make long term contracts to buy this material. Power could then be produced for sale as a by-product. Then, as one AEC official explained at a conference in Ann Arbor last June "The more we 'pay' for plutonium, the cheaper the power becomes . . . if some persuasive individual could talk the military into setting a really high price for plutonium, we could have power for 'nothing'".

Smart Public Relations

The real point does not lie in the domain of nucleonic engineering but in that of smart public relations. It would be too crass to suggest that a \$10 billion dollar industry be handed over to private hands. A supposed eagerness to develop atomic power is a cover-up for a desire to take over the multi-million dollar business of providing fissionable materials for the atom bomb. This is where the real money lies. As for atomic power, what with accelerated amortization, government contracts for research and other devices, this can be developed for private profit but at public risk.

The success of this campaign will in-
(Continued on Page Three)

I. F. Stone's Weekly

• Editor and Publisher, I. F. STONE

Published weekly except the last two weeks of August at Room 205, 301 E. Capitol St., S.E., Washington 3, D. C. Subscription rates: Domestic, \$5 a year; Canada, Mexico and elsewhere in the Western Hemisphere, \$6; England and Continental Europe, \$10 by 1st class mail, \$15 by air; for Israel, Asia, Australia and Africa, \$10 by first class mail, \$20 by air mail. Single copy, 15 cents. Tel.: LI 4-7087. Entered as Second Class mail matter, Post Office, Washington, D. C.

April 25, 1953  Vol. I, No. 15

One Farewell Custard

There are two voices of America. One is the Voice with a capital V, which broadcasts in so many languages so many hours a day what we would like people abroad to think about us. The other, the voice with a small v, is the inadvertent message of our own actions. This, the real voice of America, broadcast a strange message last week about Charlie Chaplin.

It told the world that the little funny man on whom we were brought up could no longer bear the spirit of contemporary America and had turned in his reentry permit. It said there must be something seriously wrong with our America if Chaplin could no longer live in it.

The "voluntary" exile of Chaplin is a measure of how America has changed since we were children. He never became an American citizen but Charlie Chaplin was and will remain more truly American than the blackguards and fanatics who hounded him, the cheap politicians who warned him not to come back.

We do not blame Charlie Chaplin for leaving us. Who could blame a comic genius—one of the greatest of all time—for being unwilling to live in a country which seems to have lost its sense of humor? But we ask him not to desert us altogether.

The man who made *The Great Dictator* owes it to us and himself to put into a new film the tragicomedy overtaking America where greasy informers are public heroes,

protectors of gambling dens set themselves up as guardians of public morality, and a Senator who is afraid to answer questions about his own financial accounts becomes the Great Investigator of others. Come to think of it, *The Great Investigator* would be a worthy successor to *The Great Dictator*.

Turn the laugh on them, Charlie, for our country's sake. This Capitol needs nothing so badly as one final well-flung custard pie.

Ghost Walks in Greece

Readers of the Daily Compass may recall a series of columns I wrote last summer attacking as whitewash the belated report turned in on the George Polk murder by the newspaperman's committee of which Walter Lippmann was chairman and for which Major General William Donovan of the OSS was chief investigator. That report took at face value the "confession" of the Greek newspaperman, Gregory Staktopoulos, who said the CBS correspondent was killed by Communists on his way to interview the rebel leader, Markos. Why Communists should have killed a reporter sympathetic to their own cause and critical of the Greek government was never explained.

It would be more logical for supporters of the Greek government to kill Polk. This is the logic the government avoided by the "confession" of Staktopoulos. That the government made a deal for that confession is indicated by new revelations from Greece. The Athens newspaper *Apoyematini* last week disclosed that Staktopoulos, sentenced to life imprisonment for complicity in the Polk murder is not in jail but held in the headquarters of the Salonika security police, given special treatment and even allowed to walk about the streets.

Two days later the Associated Press man in Athens filed a dispatch beginning, "Athens, April 15—Gregory Staktopoulos stepped into a jail last night for the first time since he was sentenced to life imprisonment in 1949 as an accomplice in the slaying of George Polk . . ." Few papers ran the dispatch. None queried Athens for more details. What's a little murder and a frame-up among friends?

Thanks

The Churchman, independent Episcopal fortnightly, in its issue of April 15 was kind enough to reprint and endorse the *Weekly's* editorial of March 21, "What Churchmen Could Do", suggesting that the churches turn the tables on Velde, Jenner and McCarthy by investigating the investigators. "We have long been convinced," the *Churchman* commented, "that the Protestant churches of America could be more effective in smashing the iniquitous witch hunt than any other group . . . the inquisitors don't relish facing an aroused Protestant church". We hope to say more in the near future on the subject of the churches and the witch hunt.

Simplification

Dr. Detlev W. Bronk, president of Johns Hopkins, has suddenly decided to "simplify the academic structure" of the University by abolishing the Walter Hines Page School of International Relations. The school has been headed since 1938—with distinction—by Owen Lattimore. Thus Dr. Bronk "simplifies" another of his problems. A great scholar crucified by the China Lobby can conveniently be dropped without the bother of waiting to see whether he is actually found guilty of perjury. It always simplifies life to abandon one's obligations of honor.

Jefferson on "FBI" Files

From the sixth volume just published of the new Princeton collection of Jefferson papers, Jefferson's message refusing Congress access to the files on Aaron Burr, accused of treason:

"The mass of what I have received in the course of these transactions is voluminous, but little has been given under the sanction of an oath, so as to constitute formal and legal evidence. It is chiefly in the form of letters, often containing such a mixture of rumors, conjectures and suspicions as render it difficult to sift out the real facts . . . In this state of the evidence, delivered sometimes, too, under the restriction of private confidence, neither safety nor justice will permit the exposing names except that of the principal actor . . ."

Atomic Power: Biggest Steal of the G.O.P. Era

(Continued from Page Two)

crease the cost of fissionable materials. It will not guarantee speedier development of atomic power; the giant electrical and chemical concerns which have the inside track on the program as AEC contractors have not been notable in the past as models of competitive enterprise.

This brings us to the question of security. A befuddled public takes it for granted that a man who once gave \$5 to Loyalist Spain may be a "security" risk.

But who dares recall that many of the big concerns working for AEC gave away vital industrial military secrets to Germany and Japan via patent-swapping and cartel agreements before the war? Who dares warn that if the atom is handed over to them they will almost certainly be swapping patent secrets again with foreign laboratories?

Finally let it be remembered that to make fissionable materials a private in-

dustry is to establish a new private interest in world tension. The atom bomb lobby would dwarf the armorplate and aircraft lobbies. The profitable operations of a huge industry would depend on a high output of atom bombs. Any attempt to outlaw this terrible weapon would threaten the industry with financial ruin. To hand the atom over would be to create a vested interest in disaster.

JENNINGS PERRY'S PAGE

A Tour Through An "Oppressed" Valley

I have just been on a long spring ramble through a region in which five million Americans are living in sin, or what Herbert Hoover considers sin. I mean the TVA country. The people, I'm afraid, are utterly unrepentant.

In the cities, on the farms and as far back up in the coves as you can go they are pushing buttons and turning on lights as happily as never before. If you try to point out to them that the lights are "creeping socialism," they look at you as if they question either your loyalty or your sanity, or both.

You can put it another way and fare no better. You say, "Don't you want to be rescued? Don't you want to be free men?" And they will call, "Come here, Mamma, and listen to what this fool fellow is saying."

All of these people have been living "under" public power for 15 years. Their children are suckled on formulas warmed with creeping socialism; they milk their cows and decorate their Christmas trees with creeping socialism. I never saw people with clearer consciences about such a thing. They simply like it. You can tell them that makes them "false liberals" if you dare. Even Mr. Hoover wouldn't dare tell them to their faces it makes them "un-American," not even with the protection of his age and name.

These people remember when the Tennessee River ran wild, and when running out of coal oil for the lamps was a calamity. Many of them voted for Eisenhower, but these to a man will remind you they voted for him on his promise "to end the war—and keep his hands off of TVA." Some of them once voted for Herbert Hoover—to keep rum and Romanism, as they thought, out of the White House; but the news that Hoover has been urging the Republicans to "rescue" them from TVA has stirred, besides guffaws, only the sharp comment that "Hoover wants to take us back—to Coolidge."

The five million Americans in this region may not stand as much in awe of TVA and its works as do the visiting nabobs from all parts of the world who come or are brought among them to be impressed by what America can do. But each and

every one of them is shamelessly aware of being "part owner" of the great system which lights his countryside. Nothing the Great Engineer can say at Case Institute can make them ashamed.

Let Herbert Hoover point out that public power is socialism—creeping or galloping—which is "the world's nightmare:" they will not stickle for that. All of them, city dwellers or countrymen, will continue to push their buttons without a twinge. Neither the former President's morality nor his reasoning reproaches them. Sell their power systems back to the corporations? But their municipalities and their cooperatives are corporations, owned by all of the people. Turn TVA over to "tax-paying private enterprise?" But in the TVA country even the children know that power companies, whose net earnings are guaranteed by rate schedules filed with the regulatory bodies, only collect taxes.

I had wondered ever since Mr. Hoover came out of his cave calling upon Mr. Eisenhower to "get the Federal Government out of the business of generating and distributing power as soon as possible" what the Tennessee Valley people would be thinking of the proposal. After all, these are the people who can speak from experience, who should be able to advise the rest of us whether or not growing up with electric power developed by the Government and distributed by 138 municipalities and consumer-owned cooperatives really threatens a "new oppression of free men greater than the old dog-eat-dog economy."

They are thinking, I find, that it is a fine American thing to have lights in the barn as well as in the house, and practically no oppression at all to be able to afford both. They appear to be conscious of no need whatever of being "rescued" from services which, by democratic choice, they have elected to render themselves. And as for Mr. Hoover's suggestion that they somehow are not the free men they were, they are free enough certainly with down-to-earth American rejoinders Mr. Hoover, at his time of life and dignity, would not care to hear.

I. F. Stone's Weekly 4-25-53
 Room 205
 301 E. Capitol St., S.E., Washington 3, D. C.

Please enter the following subscription. \$5 for 1 year is enclosed. (See page 3 for foreign rates)

Name

Street

CityZone.....

State

I. F. Stone's Weekly
Room 205
301 E. Capitol St., S.E.,
Washington 3, D. C.

Entered as
Second Class Mail
Matter
Post Office
Washington, D. C.

NEWSPAPER

I. F. Stone's Weekly

VOL. I NUMBER 16

MAY 2, 1953



WASHINGTON, D. C.

15 CENTS

Making America A Police State

The most important event of the past week at home or abroad was the issuance by the Subversive Activities Control Board of its first order. The Board was established by the Internal Security Act of 1950 which President Truman, in vetoing it, called "the greatest danger to freedom of speech, press and assembly since the Alien and Sedition Laws of 1798." The Act requires the registration of "Communist action" and "Communist front" organizations. It went into operation on April 20 when the Board issued an order requiring the Communist party to register as a "Communist action" organization. Two days later the Attorney General announced that he was petitioning the Board to order twelve other organizations to register as "Communist fronts."

Obviously these actions affected only a minority party and a dozen organizations regarded as within its political orbit. The party is relatively if not absolutely the smallest Communist party in any Western country enjoying political liberty. According to J. Edgar Hoover's latest annual official estimate (see the *Weekly* for April 11), it now has less than 25,000 members. Its top leaders are in jail. It is dwindling in size and influence; the membership, according to the FBI chief, is half what it was in 1950.

The organizations named as "Communist fronts" by the Attorney General have been so harried by Congressional investigators and miscellaneous prosecutions that only a handful of hardy folk still dare belong to them, or turn up at their meetings. That these few should be made the target of yet another proceeding does not say very much for the self-confidence of those now in power in America, nor for their faith in the capacity of their own ideas to survive under conditions of free competition.

The situation would be ludicrous were the impact of the new statute limited to the vermiform appendix of American Communism, a movement unable in its heyday—unlike the Communist parties of Britain, France or Italy—to elect a single open, real or avowed Communist to public office. But the effect of the act is not to be measured by its apparent purposes. The effect is sharply to step up the hazards of non-conformity in America. To the dangers of smear via Congressional committee and loss of employment through various forms of loyalty purge and blacklist is now added the possibility of being haled before the Subversive Activities Control Board on a charge of failing to register as a Communist. The penalty for non-registration is five years in jail, a \$10,000 fine, or both.

Once an organization is ordered to register, the path of radicals suspected of being members is lined with legal pitfalls. It becomes a felony for a member of a Communist organization to apply for a passport, to take a government job,

or to work in a defense plant without disclosing his politics. Publications and broadcasts emanating from an organization ordered to register must be labelled as "Disseminated by a Communist organization." The words are those of the Act. A series of possible prosecutions opens up in which the burden of proof—and the burden of proof to prove a negative proposition—will be on the accused in trials held in an atmosphere hardly conducive to objective judgment. In the land of the free and the home of the brave, it will be all the wiser to keep one's mouth shut and to take no chances. The rabbit will replace the eagle as our national emblem.

This Act was intended to make it unsafe to question the status quo. Its passage over President Truman's veto was the triumph of a campaign master-minded by the U. S. Chamber of Commerce to give America our own slick chrome-plated version of Fascism. The strategy of the Mundt-Nixon, Mundt-Ferguson and McCarran bills which eventuated in the Act was simple. Peaceful social reform is the product of free associations acting as pressure groups. If it could be made risky to associate, social reform could be stifled at the roots. Since there are few social reforms the Communists do not also support, there are few reform movements which cannot be attacked as vaguely "communistic" once enough suspicion and hysteria have been created. An Act requiring organizations in effect to prove that they are not subject to registration as communistic is an Act calculated to frighten away all but the most intrepid. It is also a means of giving the secret police wider authority for surveillance over the political thinking and activity of the American people. The more the Communists are driven underground the more excuse the FBI has to peer into every meeting and every mind.

The question is not whether the Communists are part of an international movement; of course they are. The question is not whether these organizations named by the Attorney General are "fronts"; let it be assumed that they are. The question is whether we are to abandon the standards and habits of a free society, fleeing the risks of freedom for the deadlier risks of repression. The question is whether we are to relinquish the standards of Jefferson for those of Torquemada.

The McCarrans and the McCarthys are the tools of big business organizations in a real conspiracy to convert America into a corporate State. The Supreme Court has yet to say the final word on the medieval monstrosity of a "Subversive Activities Control Board" in a supposedly free society. The coming appeal against this first registration order is one which every believer in fundamental American principles must support or live to regret his betrayal of all that made this country great in the past.

Military Press Agents, Peace and POW Atrocities

The American military are well staffed with advertising and publicity men in uniform. The Korean war from the start has been given Batten, Barton, Durstine & Osborne treatment. The news has been screened, molded, cut and rearranged. The purpose has been to *make* public opinion, not to inform it. The war has been handled like a soap-selling campaign. This is the background against which to examine the flare-up of atrocity stories last week in the American press.

There are two points, not one, to be noted, however. One is that the American military in the Far East by their deft handling of the POW news showed themselves as anxious as ever to poison the public mind against peace. But the other is that the Eisenhower Administration demonstrated its own desire for a settlement in Korea by putting the damper on these stories and on the attempt to amplify atrocity charges by means of Congressional "investigations".

This inconsistency of policy will puzzle those who imagine the American government is a coordinated affair. The fact is that the White House has always had difficulty in controlling Tokyo HQ. The fact also is that while the White House had favored a limited war and now wants "disengagement" from Korea, Tokyo HQ has always wanted a military victory even at the risk of a Third World War.

"If True"

Like Truman before him, Eisenhower showed no disposition to take the atrocity stories at face value. When the first big atrocity story broke in November 1951, Truman said it was terrible "if true" (See "Atrocities to the Rescue" and "Weird Statistics" in my *Hidden History of the Korean War*).

When Eisenhower was asked about the new flare-up last week, he said (direct quotation forbidden) that he still was not in a position to separate facts from, let us say, just isolated instances and was not prepared to express any sweeping conclusions. The strongest expression used by Eisenhower was that the POW's had been subjected to difficult treatment.

The day before the President's press conference, Under Secretary of State Walter Bedell Smith appeared at a closed session of the Senate Appropriations Committee. When the hearing was over, the chairman, Senator Bridges, had decided that it would be better not to upset the exchange of prisoners by investigating atrocities now. Timely intervention had prevented what might well have turned into another China Lobby field day.

Suppressing Lies

This is not a case of suppressing the truth but soft-pedaling lies. The weight of the evidence indicates that since the Chinese entered the Korean war, there has been a marked improvement in the treatment of prisoners. Earlier horrors occurred largely in connection with the headlong retreat of the North Koreans in the Fall of 1950. This is when the so-called "Death Marches" took place.

Indeed what worried the military on the eve of the prisoner exchange was that too many people might learn that the Chinese were *not* mistreating prisoners. The "Fact Sheet" issued by the Pentagon on the eve of the exchange was intended to put this in as bad a light as possible.

"While their use of brutality and physical mistreatment of peoples is well documented and widely understood," the *Fact Sheet* began, "the Communists have also attempted to use deceptively soft and ingratiating treatment if that promises to serve their purpose. These 'leniency' and 'good treatment' methods are less well known or understood."

Page George Orwell

Having prepared the mind for the revelation that the Chinese had not been torturing prisoners, this is the lush double-talk in which the news was clothed by the *Fact Sheet* (how like George Orwell's 1984 to call this a "fact sheet"!):

"When Korean, American and United Nations soldiers first set out to halt the Communist aggression in Korea," the *Fact Sheet* said, "the story of Communist treatment of prisoners was one of crude brutality. But after the Chinese Communists entered the conflict, the policy of dealing with prisoners appeared to undergo an abrupt change, although, needless to say, brutalities continued to be reported."

"Apparently the order was spread throughout the Communist armies that captured prisoners were to be treated with kindness and leniency."

How horrible!

"It Would Not Be Fair"

The military did not confine themselves to issuing this "Fact Sheet." When the exchange began, returning prisoners were "processed" and "screened". Not all were allowed to speak with the press. "The identity card of one American," the Associated Press reported (Washington Times-Herald, April 21), "was marked on the back, 'no interviews', presumably because of pro-Red leanings." It would be interesting to know what the military considered "Pro-Red leanings."

A more revealing glimpse of what was happening came from the British press where *Reuter's* reported from Panmun-

jom (*London Times*, April 21) "General Clark, who flew from Tokyo to greet the returning prisoners, said: 'Some of our chaps coming back have obviously been swayed by Communist 'brain washing.' He said these prisoners would not be available for interviews as 'it would not be fair'."

Through British Eyes

Few American readers must have realized that access to prisoners was limited and that interviews with these regarded as "pro-Red" were not allowed. The result was to high-light the atrocity stories at the expense of a more balanced view. To read the stories as they came through in the air mail edition of the *Times* of London was to get a completely different impression from that created in the American press.

April 21: "No British prisoner complained of unduly harsh treatment by the Chinese; the consensus was that they had been treated as prisoners, with occasional good will gestures by their captors. . . . Hospital treatment was generally fair, and the prisoners spoke well of their doctors and nurses."

April 22: "It seems that in some camps attempts at political education were more intense than in others . . . at first . . . attendance was virtually compulsory, but of late months such activities had largely ceased, as most of the men showed no interest in them. Food, which was bad at first . . . improved as time went on, and the prisoners were allowed to run their own kitchens and even to slaughter their own pigs, which the Communists supplied in droves."

April 23: "United Nations officials and correspondents . . . described reports that non-Koreans were sent on death marches as 'greatly exaggerated' . . . 'death marches,' occurred late in 1950 when the Communists were retreating rapidly. Their prisoners had to make forced marches, too, and those who could not keep up were abandoned in the cold. Many died."

April 24: "Certainly so far there is no definite proof of any deliberate campaign of atrocities by the Chinese and North Koreans. . . . Something like a competition in atrocity-mongering is developing between the Communists and the United Nations and there is a real danger that the bad feeling engendered by these allegations may jeopardize the success of the armistice negotiations."

Dissipating Good-Will

The propaganda purpose was plain enough in some of the worst horror stories. The campaign reached its height in the afternoon papers of Wednesday,

(Continued on Page Three)

I. F. Stone's Weekly

•Editor and Publisher, I. F. STONE

Published weekly except the last two weeks of August at Room 205, 301 E. Capitol St., S.E., Washington 3, D. C. Subscription rates: Domestic, \$5 a year; Canada, Mexico and elsewhere in the Western Hemisphere, \$6; England and Continental Europe, \$10 by 1st class mail, \$15 by air; for Israel, Asia, Australia and Africa, \$10 by first class mail, \$20 by air mail. Single copy, 15 cents. Tel.: LI 4-7087. Entered as Second Class mail matter, Post Office, Washington, D. C.

May 2, 1953



Vol. I, No. 16

McCarthy, Wechsler And A Free Press

It is ironic that the first target of McCarthy in American journalism should be an editor who advanced his own career by deft use of anti-Communism in inner newspaper politics. One editor after another made James Wechsler a protégé only to be repaid with a self-serving Red smear: Leo Huberman, whom Wechsler thus succeeded as labor editor of *PM*; Ralph Ingersoll, whom he later tried to succeed as editor of *PM*; and Ted O. Thackrey, Wechsler's predecessor as editor of the *New York Post*, who gave Wechsler a job after the latter left *PM* in a self-ignited blaze of anti-Communist glory.

It is to Wechsler's credit that as editor of the *New York Post* he has followed the liberal Democratic line rather than the *New Leader's*. Within the Americans for

Democratic Action he has fought for a more liberal position than that advocated by his columnist, the ignominious Arthur M. Schlesinger, Jr., whom Carey McWilliams in the *New Statesman and Nation* last year called "a McCarthy with a Harvard accent." Schlesinger has used his column in the *New York Post* to smear those liberals who have had the temerity to defend the rights of Communists, and thereby organize a principled opposition to McCarthyism.

Not much principle was left by the way Wechsler himself answered McCarthy. "No doubt," Wechsler wrote of his experience in the *New York Post* last Monday, "I could have found numerous legal grounds for refusing to answer many of the questions addressed to me that were clearly beyond the boundary of proper Congressional inquiry and a flagrant invasion of the area of press freedom. In an earlier American time I doubt that any editor should have responded to some of the inquiries."

Wechsler's decision to answer was understandable. "It is probably a measure of the ground we have lost," he went on, "that I knew McCarthy could successfully twist any silence to his own advantage." He felt boxed in by Pegler, Winchell and McCarthy. But there was no need to go on and hurt other people by saying, "The Communists, of course, have intensified the problem by hiding behind constitutional privileges on all occasions". This was to slur the basic constitutional privilege he compromised by acquiescing in interrogation. Many have invoked the privilege as their only way to avoid what they considered improper questions.

Wechsler is an ex-Communist and ex-Communists are only safe in America if they turn informer and run with the pack. Wechsler is a target because he has refused to follow in the footsteps of Budenz or Rushmore. But the effort at the same time to defend himself with certificates of good behavior is painful to watch.

Odd Testimonials

"For the record," Wechsler wrote of his executive session with McCarthy, "I noted that at the time I was appointed editor of the *Post* in May, 1949, I had received a letter of congratulations from Lew Nichols, then public relations man for J. Edgar Hoover and now deputy director of the FBI. McCarthy gazed out the window. I introduced a letter I received from Richard Nixon in 1950, praising an editorial I had written on the conviction of Alger Hiss. McCarthy was bored." Others may be just a little bit bored, too, by these testimonials.

The right to dissent was not established and will not be preserved by submitting certificates of conformity. McCarthy had no right to question Wechsler, but McCarthyism cannot be fought effectively until men are prepared to deny the right of Congress to interrogate any American, newspaperman or not, anti-Communist or not, on his political beliefs. Neither Wechsler's own mode of defense nor the vast indifference of the American press to this first attack on an editor is promising. As we go to press, only the *Washington Post* (McCarthy's probable next target) has had the interest or the courage to protest.

Military Press Agents, Peace and POW Atrocities

(Continued from Page Two)

April 22, in this country when the *New York Journal American* had 2,165 UN prisoners victims of atrocities and the *New York World Telegram* page one headline screamed, "PWs Bayoneted by Reds; Wounded Pushed Off Cliff."

The *World Telegram* story was a UP dispatch from Tokyo. After summarizing a series of horrors, the dispatch reported, "Allied officers refused to comment on the disclosures, nor would they say what effect they would have on the truce talks. But it was certain the stories of the returned prisoners, coupled with the violent attacks on the UN by the Red China Peiping radio, had abolished any good will which might have resulted from the sick and wounded exchange." There was satisfaction evident between the lines.

This story was a prize example of atrocity propaganda. The lead said, "Liberated American soldiers told today of seeing American war prisoners 'pushed off a cliff and left there to die' during a

horror filled Korean death march and how others were deliberately bayoneted by Chinese guards in a Red prison camp."

Typical Atrocity Tale

But the story bore out neither the head nor the lead. The lead said American "soldiers" (plural) told of "seeing" POW's pushed over a cliff. But the dispatch quoted only one soldier, a Private William Moreland of Atlanta, Georgia, and he did not say he saw this happen. What he said was, according to that same dispatch, "I just heard that there were some wounded kicked over the cliff."

As for the "bayonetting" this was its basis, "Cpl. Donald K. Legay, Leominster, Mass., said 'jumpy' Chinese Communist guards jabbed two or three American prisoners with bayonets when they refused to cooperate and walked out of a Communist movie theatre."

The Korean correspondent of the *London Daily Mirror* warned on April 24

against the horror stories being published in the American press as "greatly exaggerated versions of tales told to correspondents." He cabled his paper, "It is obvious that the South Korean government authorities will allow repatriated soldiers to talk to the press only if they talk of atrocities."

It would be an exaggeration to say that this was true of the American military. There is evidence, if our dispatches are read closely, that American prisoners testified to good treatment in the camps, especially after the Chinese took over. But it is also clear that a relatively small group was made available for interviewing, and that the public relations officers and the American press focussed largely on horror instead of seeking to provide a fair picture. This distortion hurts the chances of peace and hardly helps those Americans still left prisoner in enemy hands.

JENNINGS PERRY'S PAGE

Rehashing Atrocities May Make Hash of Peace Hopes

My grandfather, God rest him, was a P.O.W. Wounded and captured at Resaca (a minie ball in the heel), he was held for four months at a Yankee prison in Indiana. The food was pretty awful: he lost 18 pounds. Meanwhile Sherman's "horde" burned his barns, tore down his fences and made off with his corn and his cattle. . . . I was brought up on those atrocities.

My wife's grandfather, a New Yorker (God rest him, too), was wounded and taken at Bull Run and barely survived Libby Prison at Richmond. The story handed down on that side was just the other way around: the Rebels were the "beasts."

And so, a couple of lifetimes later, at Panmunjom; to say nothing of all the wars between. Each side gets back its men, that have been in the enemy's hands, and immediately begins to pry from them the proof that the enemy is as brutal as all along he has been alleged to be. The world is supposed to be shocked anew, and its hatred of "the enemy" revived.

What anybody stands to gain from this exchange of unpleasanties is hard to see, and the target world, I suspect, remembering how it has been always the same in war after war, is not really shocked. It has had no reason to expect one war to be nicer than another. In its moments of repentance and resolve it has perceived and proclaimed that war itself is in contempt of reason, a regression from civilization: it cannot be unprepared for the revelation that a part of a great barbarity is also barbarous.

We have done well to rejoice for and with our exchanged prisoners, that they have lived to return home; and we have shared to the fullest extent possible the natural delight of their next of kin—caught for us on film, on the TV screen and in the printed report.

But the exchange of the wounded and sick has grand importance only if it prefaces an armistice to halt the replenishment of the prison camp hospitals with new litter cases—and new amputees. And there is no service of this end in the labors of our propaganda, and of the other side's propaganda,

to show, by selected accounts fished for in the testimony of the RPs, that cruelty to prisoners has been the rule.

After all, if humanity hopes to succeed in its prudent attempt to bring the war to a close by an act of intelligence instead of by the attrition of artillery, there can be no question of war crimes courts to be set up afterward. There will be no victor to sit in judgment and no vanquished to be tried and punished. There will be agreement, either understood or explicit, that the war never should have begun and that by ending it the race shall have at last lived up to its proud claim of rationality. Under the circumstances the rehashing of the charges of bestiality toward prisoners is pointless.

By no means all of our RPs have brought back stories of ill-treatment and we must assume that not all of the prisoners our side has held have gone back across the Parallel to cry witness to our "inhumanity." It is regrettable that the experiences related by these more fortunate P.O.W.s have not been given at least equal circulation with the reports of "death marches," starvation and "medical murder." For our part, it is no disparagement of the hardships our captured soldiers have undergone to recall that their removal to the enemy's rear over roads under constant attack by our own air force could not but have been hazardous; and the other side has plenty of evidence in the condition of its men turned over at Panmunjom that neither our doctors nor our mess sergeants have tried to exterminate them.

I hope excitable people like Sen. Stiles Bridges will keep their shirts on—or put them back on. It would help for reasonable people like Sen. Sherman Cooper to take them aside and accustom them to the fact that the facts of war are ugly. My P.O.W. grandfather lived long enough after his war to concede that Yankees were fairly representative human beings, and his opposite number, though he may never have shaken off the horrors of Libby, did pass on life to descendants who could marry South without too grave a sense of degradation. By blaming war instead of each other it will be easier one day for Americans and Chinese to be friends again.

I. F. Stone's Weekly 5-2-53

Room 205
301 E. Capitol St., S.E., Washington 3, D. C.

Please enter the following subscription. \$5 for 1 year is enclosed. (See page 3 for foreign rates)

Name

Street

CityZone.....

State

I. F. Stone's Weekly
Room 205
301 E. Capitol St., S.E.,
Washington 3, D. C.

Entered as
Second Class Mail
Matter
Post Office
Washington, D. C.

NEWSPAPER

I. F. Stone's Weekly

VOL. I NUMBER 17

MAY 9, 1953



WASHINGTON, D. C.

15 CENTS

An End of Government by Alarum

Momentous conclusions hopeful for world peace flow from the budget statement made by the President at his press conference last week. He announced a new approach to the problem of defense. He said, "We reject the idea that we must build up to a maximum attainable strength for some specific date theoretically fixed for a specified time in the future". The tempo of rearmament was no longer to be "tied to any magic critical year." This means an end of government by annual alarum, and an end of government by alarum in America must contribute materially to an easing of world tension. Under Mr. Truman, the Pentagon threw Congress and the country into a dither annually. Military appropriations were enacted by stampede.

A correspondent reminded Eisenhower that the maximum target date of 1954 was supposed to mark the time when (in the opinion of the Joint Chiefs of Staff) the U.S.S.R. would be ready to launch an atomic attack on the United States. Eisenhower's answer was refreshingly calm. He said he was not going to quarrel with the estimate of when the Russians would have the atom bomb because he does not admit that anyone can predict when, if ever, another government would want to launch into global war. He added that he just did not believe there was a necessary relationship between the two. The quiet reply deviated strikingly from the demonology of the cold war.

The concept of a target date for an arms buildup made sense only if over-all policy was pointed toward a showdown. This was in fact the basic premise of Truman-Acheson "total diplomacy." All negotiations were to be avoided until we had built up such overwhelming power that the Russians would have to choose between surrender or destruction. To abandon the target date is not only to relax the public mind from artificial frenzies but to establish conditions from which a different foreign policy must flow.

The dominant drift of Eisenhower policy is making Dulles an anachronism. "Liberation" is no longer a conceivable goal if we are not to create a destructive power so overwhelming as to force Russian withdrawal. The stretch-out of rearmament is defensive; it will not support an aggressive diplomacy. The new policy presupposes co-existence for a long time to come. The co-existence need not be friendly but co-existence of any kind demands some mutual adjustment. If "a healthy American economy" and "a functioning economy" in other countries are, as the President said, "inseparable from true defense", then there are circumstances under which successful negotiation for relaxed tension and reduced armament may increase real security. The implications are not those to which we have become accustomed in the last few years when the bugaboo was any relaxation of tension!

It is not that the Republicans hate the Communists less. It is merely that they love a balanced budget more. Taft

said it in Chicago on February 21 when he warned that "we could destroy our liberty by a military and foreign expenditure in time of peace so great that a free economic system cannot survive". There is no such thing as building up to a final situation of strength between two great Powers. An increase on one side is matched by an increase on the other; new weapons of offense call forth new means of defense. Tension and hostility must be stimulated to maintain the competitive pace and no country is too rich to avoid impoverishment if the process is unchecked.

General Eisenhower is proving much less bellicose than Captain Truman. "Disengagement" rather than "liberation" seems to be his principal objective, and one of the things he wishes to disengage is the public purse from the grip of the military. His new reorganization plan strengthens civilian control. David Lawrence in alarm called it downright unconstitutional. Senator Symington, through whom the Air Force and the air lobby speak, insisted that the Joint Chiefs of Staff should have the right to state their views "without pressure from anyone to alter those views on economic grounds." The President was alarmingly non-committal when asked about the 143-group air force goal and Symington was almost shrill when he protested in his speech at Charlottesville last week, "no one at any level has the right to place solvency above security." The Democrats now seem to be the war party. The Republicans are not sure the 8 and a half billion reduction promised by Eisenhower will be enough; they still want a tax reduction. The Democrats grumble that he may be endangering security by too sharp cuts.

How understand what is happening? The Democrats, the popular party, have always been a cheap money party. The Republicans came back to power where they went out—in anxiety over the budget. The dollar cannot be "strengthened" without sharp cuts in expenditure; the only place where sizeable cuts can be made is in military spending. The Democrats, under Red smear attack since 1936, did not dare suggest we could cut down arms in face of The Menace. The Republicans are under no such compulsion. They speak for and through big business men who want an end to spending.

The key word of the Administration seems to be deflation. No Democrat would dare handle the military as Charles Wilson of GM is doing, or to talk of the military the way his deputy, Kyes, also from General Motors, did last week before the annual meeting of the U. S. Chamber of Commerce, lashing out at the incompetence and extravagance in the Pentagon. How the military must miss those docile Democrats! I, though never a card-carrying Republican, am beginning to like Eisenhower. If Moscow and Peiping are wise they will come to terms with him before the desperate stage some new provocation to keep peace from breaking out.

Is Freedom of The Press Under Attack?

This appeared last week-end on the bulletin board of the press gallery in the House of Representatives, "Chairman Harold H. Velde (R. Ill.) of the House Committee on Un-American Activities, today announced in connection with the forthcoming hearings in New York City May 4, that Cedric Belfrage, editor of the publication called the 'Guardian' is apparently operating under the delusion that his association with that publication places him in the category of being a member of the press and is making charges that his scheduled appearance before the committee is an attack on freedom of the press."

The announcement continued, "I doubt very much if the members of the nation's press consider him worthy of being classed as a colleague of that great institution of the Fourth Estate," the Chairman said." The press release went on to explain that testimony before the Committee showed that Belfrage "has been, and may now be, a member of the Communist Party." If this is the kind of stupendous discovery Velde made when he was an FBI man, his election to Congress was no loss to J. Edgar Hoover. The revelation, if true, is about on a par with the disclosure that the editor of the Chicago Tribune, the redoubtable Colonel McC., "has been, and may be now, a member of the Republican party."

Hardly A Scoop

Velde must be running short of sensations, may soon be exposing the Daily Worker as a Communist organ. His snide little dribble of a press release was chiefly interesting for the simple-minded FBI-man's notions it reflects of what constitutes freedom of the press. This would seem to be the prerogative only of politically pasteurized organs. But the heroes of the fight for a free press, and its martyrs, were no more respectable in their time than Belfrage. Zenger, Wilkes, Paine, Lovejoy and Garrison were as much looked down upon in their time by "right thinking" people.

Freedom of the press was under attack last week from three separate groups of Congressional snoopers. Velde's subpoena for Belfrage followed on the heels of the session to which the McCarthy committee subjected James Wechsler, editor of the New York Post.

The Senate Internal Security subcommittee announced that a witness who had pleaded the Fifth amendment on spy ring questions had reviewed 53 books for the Saturday Review of Literature and "about 38 books" for the New York Herald-Tribune.

This was no mere search for febrile sensations. The pattern, like so much in the current Red hunt, was outlined in

the annual U. S. Chamber of Commerce reports since 1945 on "community action" to deal with the menace of Communism. The "infiltration" of the press by radicals was stressed, the liberal press was a special target, and much was made of the fact that rightist literature was being given unfavorable book reviews. The press was not to be immune from the drive to purge non-conformists from all professions which had to do with ideas. Newspapermen were not to be exempt from the purge of teachers, librarians, radio broadcasters, writers and artists of all kinds. The turn of the press had come at last.

Whether the press knew it or not was a different matter. The Wall Street Journal last week had a piece strongly defending — Zenger. The New York Times and the New York Herald-Tribune both had strong editorials protesting infractions of freedom of the press—in Ecuador. The New York Post was manfully defending the New York Post—but as we went to press had yet to say a word in defense of the Guardian. Times had changed a great deal since the days when the conservative Republican Herald-Tribune in 1934 defended the Daily Worker against criminal libel charges brought by District Attorney Dodge.

Panic Among The Liberals

The climate of opinion has changed for the worse. Principles have been abandoned in panic. The notion that the right of Congress to investigate is unlimited has been accepted. The pro cold war liberals, anxious to shield their own respectability, have begun to accept the idea that Congress has a right to stage ideological inquisitions. Thus the New Republic in its April 20 issue cut the ground out from under itself by saying "Congress has the right to investigate subversion in the churches in its general inquiry into the activities of the Communist party." If it has a right to investigate "subversion" (nobody asks any longer just what that means—this bogeyman word for nonconformity has also been accepted by the housebroken liberals) in the churches, then it has a right to investigate "subversion" in the press.

The logical consequences were those drawn by the conservative Washington Star which said of the McCarthy-Wechsler affair, "The first amendment forbids Congress to make any law abridging the freedom of the press. It hardly follows, however, that this guarantee of a free press confers immunity from investigation on an editor. If a Congressional committee has a right to expose the fact that a union official or a teacher, for in-

stance, is a Communist or a former Communist, it certainly has the same right with respect to an editor." Once the premise is accepted, the gate is wide-open to the witch hunt.

What About The First Amendment?

But is the premise correct? Does the First Amendment provide no bar against indirect attacks from government? The Supreme Court not so many years ago invalidated a Huey Long tax on newspaper advertising on the ground that such taxes could be turned into an indirect restriction upon freedom of the press. How much more repressive is the fear of Congressional smearing! The First Amendment says Congress shall make no law setting up an Established Church. Could Congress under the guise of investigating Communism harass ministers who believe in certain theological doctrines which other ministers think conducive to Communism? Could an investigating committee apply the standards of Catholicism, or fundamental Protestantism, as a means of rooting out "crypto-Communism"?

The power of investigation is an auxiliary to the power of legislation. Congress has a right to inform itself about matters on which it may legislate. But can it under the First Amendment legislate control over ideas, whether political or theological? This is the basic question. It is only by asserting that the sphere of ideas is beyond the power of the State, it is only by reaffirming this traditional conception of the First Amendment, that the witch hunt may be fought. But this requires the courage to say that Communists have the same political rights as anyone else. Not to say it is to endanger everyone's rights.

The Fatal Consequences

For if Congress may treat certain ideas as criminal, if it may set up a Committee to act as a grand jury operating in public without the safeguards of secrecy, then it may not only ask questions about political affiliation but about a man's writing and preaching. What if he never was a Communist, or is now an anti-Communist? If Congress and the government have a right to put ideas under surveillance, they have a right to examine writings or sermons which propagate ideas that may conduce to Communism or shield Communism. Wechsler says he is not longer a Communist. He claims to be an anti-Communist. But he has criticized the FBI as a thought police. He has defended Communists against Smith Act prosecution. So he is attacked as crypto-Communist. This is where acceptance of that fatal first premise leads.

I. F. Stone's Weekly

• Editor and Publisher, I. F. STONE

Published weekly except the last two weeks of August at Room 205, 301 E. Capitol St., S.E., Washington 3, D. C. Subscription rates: Domestic, \$5 a year; Canada, Mexico and elsewhere in the Western Hemisphere, \$6; England and Continental Europe, \$10 by 1st class mail, \$15 by air; for Israel, Asia, Australia and Africa, \$10 by first class mail, \$20 by air mail. Single copy, 15 cents. Tel.: LI 4-7087. Entered as Second Class mail matter, Post Office, Washington, D. C.

May 9, 1953



Vol. I, No. 17

CIVIL LIBERTIES FRONT: A CROWDED WEEK

Hat's Off

To Judge Luther W. Youngdahl for an eloquent decision in the old-fashioned libertarian tradition knocking out four of the seven counts in the indictment of Owen Lattimore for perjury and casting doubt on the remaining three.

The Lattimore case can be won when it comes to trial next Fall and a victory in it would be a terrific blow at McCarran, who forced this spurious indictment, and McCarthy, who first made the fake charges. Lattimore needs help and can be reached care of Johns Hopkins in Baltimore. Those readers who would like to rally support among their friends may have free copies for distribution of our issue No. 5, with its "The Truth About The Lattimore Case", the full behind-the-scenes story.

We refer to McCarthy's as "fake charges" on the authority of Judge Youngdahl himself. For after surveying the vague allegations of the indictment, the Judge commented drily in his decision, "Apparently the Committee [i.e. the McCarran Committee] could discover no evidence from its investigation or the testimony of various witnesses that defendant lied in denying that he was a Communist, a member of the Communist party, a Soviet spy or a fellow traveller." McCarthy called Lattimore the No. 1 Soviet spy in this country. Budenz called him a Communist. Lattimore was not indicted for denying either charge. Apparently even the McCarran committee didn't believe them.

Last Chance

In the high vaulted marble chamber where the U.S. Supreme Court last Monday heard the final argument in the Bridges case, there was little echo of the tumultuous 20 years in which the San Francisco waterfront interests, the government and latterly his own enemies in the CIO have tried to "get" Bridges.

The argument went round and round the legal metaphysics of what precisely constitutes fraud, and whether the repeated hearings and trials to which

Bridges has been subjected brought the matter under *res adjudicata* or *collateral estoppel*.

A diminutive counsel for the government, dapper in a frock coat, put the matter more succinctly than he himself perhaps intended. "It seems to me," he said at the end of his argument, "you get nowhere if you take a broad view of this case."

From the standpoint of the government, this is all too true. For on a broad view, it would be asked how often a man could be put through the wringer of trial on the same political charges in a country that constantly advertises itself as free and has a constitution which forbids double jeopardy.

On a broad view, one would see in all its embarrassing clarity the contrast between the treatment accorded Joe Ryan on the corrupt East coast and the treatment accorded Harry Bridges on the West coast. On a broad view, it would be seen how the government has favored the gangster type of labor leadership and pursued with implacable hostility a man who neither betrayed his workers nor dealt dishonorably with their employers. From the government's point of view you do indeed "get nowhere" by taking a broad view.

All the blood and agony of those 20 years had been sifted out of the argument by certiorari. The urbane Chief Justice enlivened the proceedings with an occasional joke. Mr. Justice Frankfurter was as sharp and witty in his questions as if examining students at Harvard Law. The tenor of his questions, like those of Mr. Justice Black, seemed to favor Bridges. Douglas was silent. Jackson and Clark absented themselves as former Attorneys General who had engaged in the Bridges hunt. The others, including the Chief Justice, seemed to have their minds firmly made up. It looked as if Bridges this time faces jail, 4-3 or even perhaps 5-2.

This conviction of fraud was brought about by circumventing the double jeopardy clause and getting around the statute of limitations, but law counts for less and less these days. Bridges can only be saved from jail and the U.S. from the disgrace of this whole affair if the leaders of the labor movement can be prevailed on to join in a campaign for pardon.

This time Bridges was the victim not of the waterfront interests, which have grown to tolerate and like him, but of the cold war split in the labor movement. He was warned to line up for the cold war—or else. Now that the cold war may be abating, perhaps his old colleagues of the CIO will make amends. Perhaps.

Antiquated Notions

The Congressional witch hunt is now to be a four instead of a three ring circus. To the Velde, Jenner and McCarthy committees is now added a special Subcommittee on Security Affairs established by the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, with Wiley of Wisconsin as chairman;

the other two members are Ferguson of Michigan and Gillette of Iowa.

The subcommittee made its debut last week-end with the release of a report on "Adequacy of U.S. Laws With Respect to Offenses Against National Security." Of course it found these laws inadequate.

The report complains that the constitutional provisions on treason make conviction difficult and that "Constitutional guaranties of a public trial and due process of law make it difficult to prove certain offenses, particularly espionage, without endangering national security." It is a good thing the Founding Fathers are dead or they'd be subpoenaed for some pretty stiff questioning.

The subcommittee complains about our allies as well as our Constitution. "In many allied countries," says Senator Wiley's preface to the report, "the security problem has been aggravated by the fact that their governments and their peoples have traditionally taken a far more tolerant view of Communism and Communists than we as a people feel the present situation and the past record justifies. Some of these countries have systems of law which are even more antiquated in this respect than our own . . ." The British, for example, notoriously backward, are said still to have something called *habeas corpus*.

Senator Wiley generously recognizes that "each nation must of course remain sovereign in its own internal affairs" but "the internal security of many countries has become inextricably intertwined with the very lives of our own American sons who are stationed in those lands . . ." The Senator feels therefore that it is not "presumptuous" of the subcommittee "to call the attention of our friends overseas to facts of this nature." Those allies who show no disposition to adopt more up-to-date legal systems will have only themselves to blame if some day they find their mutual security allowances cut. The free world cannot afford to subsidize legal backwardness.

The subcommittee endorses the move underway this week to legalize wire-tapping but judging by its first report will not rest content until we have gone further and at least restored secret trial in star chamber. To read its report is to realize how immeasurably the security problem would be eased simply by repealing the Constitution. Senator Wiley hesitates to say so publicly but obviously it's antiquated, too.

Good News

Attorney General Brownell has agreed to reopen the case of Ignatz Mazei, see the *Weekly*, No. 11, "Detention for Life—On Undisclosed Charges," where we told the story of this long time alien resident of Buffalo who faced life imprisonment on Ellis Island on secret charges. We are happy to report that copies of that issue, circulated last March by Mazei's counsel among friendly members of Congress, helped.

JENNINGS PERRY'S PAGE

Freedom and Fortune Bid for Treason and Theft

At this writing, our reception committee at Kimpo airport still is scanning the skies for the first enemy pilot to accept Gen. Mark Clark's generous invitation to bring in his jet and receive 100,000 pieces of silver, and the keys to the Free World. The delay, one can imagine, has been as gratifying to one side as to the other. For though there hardly can be any question of the firmness of the offer, with the Supreme Commander's name behind it, nor of the Free World's ability to pay, certain aspects of the project appear to need further study and clarification.

For instance, the air and odor of the reception itself, when the respondent pilot, having carefully followed the instructions given to assure him safe conduct through our defenses, sets down his MiG-15 or "other Russian-built jet combat type" at Kimpo. Should the occasion be festive or solemn, open to the press or discreetly screened?

The role of the enemy pilot has been, to be sure, elaborately cued for him. He has been addressed in the leaflet as "courageous." His desire to liberate himself from the "vicious whip" of his Red masters has been sympathetically suggested to him. He has only to step out of his plane hailing Freedom—and pick up his check.

He will have hit the jackpot; with his fortune (which itself would not connote freedom to many a man not now, or ever, behind the Iron Curtain) he can proceed, the Free World promises him, to any corner of the Free World his heart fancies: to New Jersey or Long Island, perhaps, with winters at Miami Beach. (Nice little places at Miami Beach for much less than \$100,000.) For the rest of his years, he can have comfort and respectability . . .

It is when one considers this item of prospective comfort and respectability that reasonable doubts must arise both as to the ability of the Free World to guarantee it and the ability of the freedom-seeking pilot to experience, within himself, the said blessings. Indeed, it must be perceived that even the reception at Kimpo can be brought off handsomely only if none says aloud what all will be aware of—that a single breath of candor at the moment of liberation would name the coura-

geous pilot traitor, and thief as well as traitor, and his Free World receivers as suborners of his treason and his larceny.

It is the extra added attraction, the \$100,000, of course, which makes the situation delicate. Elsewhere, as at Bornholm, a pilot from behind the Curtain can land his plane in the Free World and claim asylum—and respect—on no other showing than his love of liberty. Theoretically he has only borrowed the plane; it will be returned to its owners. But the operation General Clark's proposals have set us up for in the Far East is a horse of a different shade and breed.

We are dangling a straight cash bribe before enemy soldiers under oath—the universal soldier's oath—to serve their homelands. We are tempting them to desert on the battlefield for pay—for very high pay. From the beginning, we have offered them freedom: now, we are telling them to steal and bring over to us their side's military secrets and we will make them rich. I submit that it will be next to impossible for us ever to feel real neighborly esteem for any enemy pilots in Korea who may liberate themselves to us on those terms no matter what pleasantries we organize for their reception at Kimpo airfield near Seoul.

We may be able to bring ourselves to welcome them as freedom-loving brothers, while slipping them their \$50,000 and \$100,000 checks under the table, but we will have to hold our noses on the side.

I should not be surprised if one day before long, perhaps before this is in print, some Red pilot sneaks off to Kimpo with a copy of the General's glittering IOU in his padded sleeve. In all lands some men have a price, and we are bidding high. Then we should have our MiG-15 to tear apart to our complete satisfaction, since we got only photographs and measurements of the one at Bornholm. And the Russians would have to develop another secret to hide from us as long as they could.

In that case, General Clark's psychological warfare experts will have proved a point: that when all else fails the Free World can go out and buy what it wants . . . in the black market.

I. F. Stone's Weekly

5-9-53

Room 205

301 E. Capitol St., S.E., Washington 3, D. C.

Please enter the following subscription. \$5 for 1 year is enclosed. (See page 3 for foreign rates)

Name

Street

CityZone.....

State

I. F. Stone's Weekly

Room 205

301 E. Capitol St., S.E.,

Washington 3, D. C.

NEWSPAPER

Entered as
Second Class Mail
Matter
Post Office
Washington, D. C.

I. F. Stone's Weekly

VOL. I NUMBER 18

MAY 16, 1953



WASHINGTON, D. C.

15 CENTS

Van Fleet's Pipe-Dream in *Life*

In *Life* last week General James A. Van Fleet told a dramatic story. In April, 1951, he was ordered to take over command of the Eighth Army in Korea. He arrived on April 14. "The atmosphere at Taegu was tense. The Eighth Army had taken some bad beatings. We had managed to fight back, but now it appeared that the enemy was about to attack with tremendous forces and try to drive us into the sea."

"And then," Van Fleet went on, "came the sudden and dramatic shift in the tides of war that every American must surely remember from the spring of 1951. The next six weeks were among the greatest in the history of the U. S. Army. We met the attack and routed the enemy. We had him beaten and could have destroyed his armies . . . Then our government's high policy intervened, and we were ordered not to advance any farther. The stalemate began, and then the long and futile armistice talks . . ."

The implication of the *Life* article is that the truce talks saved the enemy from defeat, that the stalemate was the result rather than the cause of a decision to negotiate, and that a decisive victory can be won in Korea if only we stop talking and get down to "business." Van Fleet told much the same story to the Senate Armed Services Committee in March. But when Van Fleet's superior, U. S. Army Chief of Staff, J. Lawton Collins, appeared before the committee, he cut the ground from under this dramatic story. "When the negotiations began," General Collins said in answer to a question by Senator Case, "there was no fighting of any consequence by either side . . ."

When Senator Byrd asked General Collins, "Didn't General Van Fleet have an offensive in June, 1951?", Collins could recall no major military operation at the time. "Well, if it was," Collins told Senator Byrd, "it was a local offensive, if I recall rightly." Van Fleet was present. Collins turned to him and said, "Maybe General Van Fleet can answer that directly." The colloquy which followed deflated Van Fleet's story of a great offensive tragically shut off at the moment of victory:

General VAN FLEET. The operations going on in the early part of 1951 were limited offensives.

Senator BYRD. What was the date, General, that you told the committee that you thought you could have gotten a very great victory had you been permitted to go ahead? Wasn't that June 1951?

General VAN FLEET. Early June of 1951.

Senator BYRD. That is the offensive I was talking about was the one in June 1951.

General VAN FLEET. That was the counter-offensive, limited in nature.

The proof that Van Fleet's story in *Life* is a pipe-dream may be found on pages 108 and 132 of the hearings on

"Ammunition Supplies in the Far East" as published by the Senate Committee on Armed Services. The testimony debunks Van Fleet's glamorous account of the greatest six weeks "in the history of the U. S. Army" in which we had the enemy beaten "and could have destroyed his armies." The Army's Chief of Staff never heard of those greatest six weeks in the history of the U. S. Army and Van Fleet had to knock down his own story when asked about it by Senator Byrd the day Collins was present.

But for every reader reached by this Weekly with the truth about Van Fleet's story, a half million or more will swallow unawares the pernicious poppycock dished out by the series in *Life*. The important point is not that Van Fleet is a romantic liar. The important point is that at the moment when the Chinese have made dramatic new concessions in the peace talks, vast engines of propaganda are set in motion to poison the American mind against peace. *Life* took full pages in newspapers all over the country to advertise the Van Fleet series in advance, "The Truth About Korea: From a Man Now Free to Speak" in which "Our Combat General . . . Warns Us Not to Overestimate Our Enemy in The Future."

Van Fleet picks up where MacArthur left off in the battle of the fire-eaters against the more sober American military. Van Fleet aims directly at the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, Omar Bradley, when he promises in his next installment to prove that "Korea is for us the right war in the right place at the right time and . . . with the right allies", by which Van Fleet means principally Syngman Rhee's South Koreans. Van Fleet does not explain in *Life* why he told a visiting Filipino delegation two winters ago that Korea was "a blessing" but he speaks for powerful forces in the American military bureaucracy who want the "blessing" to continue. The ultimate aim was indicated in a remark Van Fleet made to the committee but was too circumspect to repeat in *Life*. "You will never get a political solution," Van Fleet said of the Korean situation, "there will always be an Iron Curtain until you have it out with Russia."

This is the language of those who think a new world war inevitable and desirable, who see the Korean conflict as a useful means of maintaining tension and the pace of mobilization. While the peace movement in this country has been silenced by intimidation, the voice of the warmongers is amplified. A deaf ear is turned to India's new warning that the Chinese may compromise no further. A cold shoulder greets Churchill's call—and the Pope's—for top level talks. As we go to press Premier Chou En-lai protests that U. S. planes killed or wounded more than 250 Chinese last Sunday and Monday in raids on two Manchurian cities. Van Fleet's pipe-dream is part of a larger pattern.

An Editor Who Informs On His Own Staff

In the Inquisition, the victim was required to confess, to abjure heresy, to denounce others and to refrain from any criticism of the Holy Office. The transcript of the Wechsler hearings before the McCarthy committee shows that the editor of the New York Post met all but one of the medieval standards. He confessed his youthful errors. He submitted proofs of orthodoxy. He "named names". He failed on only one count to qualify for reconciliation. He had criticized the Inquisitors—the FBI, the House Un-American Activities Committee and, of course, McCarthy.

Lea's monumental history of the Inquisition in Spain, which begins to read more and more like a contemporary document, tells us that "criticism" of the Inquisition "was held to be impeding its action and was a crime subject to condign punishment." The logic was twofold. Criticism, even when justified, was wrong because it brought scandal on an institution doing a sacred task: "I don't like McCarthy either, but this is a job that had to be done." Then, also, to attack those rooting out heresy was to cast suspicion on the fervency of one's own opposition to heretics.

The Madness in His Method

Once the Inquisition is accepted, it is futile to protest that its victims should be chosen and broiled more carefully. This is the vice in *Time's* alarm last week over "McCarthy's methods: he seemed even less interested in systematically investigating subversives on U. S. newspapers than in carrying on a personal vendetta against a persistent critic." There is—to reverse the chestnut—a madness behind McCarthy's methods. One cannot acquiesce in the madness and effectively fight the methods it produces.

To talk as if Congress has a right or duty "systematically", as *Time* says, to ferret out "subversives" on U. S. newspapers is to accept the premises of McCarthyism and undercut any successful fight against it. If we are to replace free discussion with a system of debate limited and policed against the "subversive", we must expect the wielders of such power to abuse it and we must expect the orbit of suspicion to widen to the point of paranoia—real or simulated—in Wechsler's case.

Heresy to Doubt The Devil

The weakness evident in those few publications supporting Wechsler springs from this unwillingness to combat the notions from which McCarthyism springs and to counter them with the courageous risk-taking affirmations of a free society. For if Communists are such cunning devils—to doubt the consummate cunning of Satan was a particularly insidious form of heresy—then it is not possible that Wechsler as a promising young Communist was ordered many years ago in Moscow to pretend anti-Communism in order all the more effectively as McCarthy said "to attack and destroy any man who tries to hurt and dig out the specific traitors who are hurting our country?"

To develop an atmosphere in which such hobgoblin fantasies are eagerly believed by a substantial portion of the population is a necessary preliminary to the establishment of Fascism. And there is reason to believe that McCarthy consciously and skillfully is working toward just that goal. It is easy to see what he has gained and it is difficult to see what he can lose in the battle as waged by Wechsler. For the fight as waged by Wechsler concedes that McCarthy has a right to subject newspapermen to ideological interrogation, that they have a

duty to testify and that they must not falter even when asked to act as informers.

An editor who will inform on his own staff members "to keep the record straight" is an editor who has allowed himself to be degraded. To break the intellectuals morally is part of the strategy of the witch hunt. The exaction of the informer's role helps to spread panic and distrust; this is as important a function as learning who else may be dragged into the pillory.

Edgerton's Barsky Dissent

It is only by denying the right of Congress to investigate political opinions that the basic freedoms may be preserved. The lines of effective and principled battle were laid down by U. S. Circuit Judge Edgerton in his great dissenting opinion (167 F 2nd 254) in the Barsky case, an opinion which will some day be regarded as we today regard the similar dissents in a similar period by Holmes and Brandeis.

"The investigation," Judge Edgerton said of the House Un-American Activities Committee "restricts the freedom of speech by uncovering and stigmatizing expressions of unpopular views. The Committee gives wide publicity to its proceedings. This exposes the men and women whose views are advertised to risks of insult, ostracism and lasting loss of employment . . . The effect is not limited to the people whom the Committee stigmatizes or calls before it, but extends to others who hold similar views and to still others who might be disposed to adopt them . . . People have grown wary of expressing any unorthodox opinions . . . it affects in one degree or another all but the very courageous, the very orthodox and the very secure . . . What Congress may not restrain, Congress may not restrain by exposure and obloquy."

Must All Americans Become Informers?

The question of the proper attitude toward Congressional Inquisition is made urgent by the prospect that before this issue is in the mails the Senate will have passed the McCarran bill to destroy the protection afforded by the self-incrimination provisions of the Fifth Amendment.

A similar bill was introduced by the Nevadan last year and the year before but failed to come up for a vote. This year the bill, S-16, was reported by the Senate Judiciary Committee without hearings and would have passed on the consent calendar Wednesday of last week but for the objections of Senator Taft.

The original McCarran bill would have compelled a witness to testify if a majority of the investigating committee voted to give the witness immunity. This was

amended last year on motion of Senator Ferguson, R., of Michigan to provide for a two-thirds vote, including at least one member of the minority party. This is the form of the present bill.

Only The Fifth

The only ground on which the Supreme Court has so far upheld the right of a witness to refuse an answer is that provision of the Fifth Amendment which says no man shall be compelled to be a witness against himself. Theoretically the provision can only be invoked if the answer might provide some link in a chain which would justly or unjustly incriminate the witness.

But in practice the provision can and has been used for other and broader pur-

poses. The rule laid down by Chief Justice Marshall in Aaron Burr's trial for treason makes the witness the sole judge of whether the testimony might be incriminating and says that if the witness so declares under oath "the court can demand no other testimony of the fact."

Safeguard Against Frame-Up

As a result the provision has been invoked by non-Communist liberals or Leftists fearful of being framed for perjury by some professional informer if they denied Communist membership or connections. It has also been invoked to avoid being forced into informing on others. Once a man testifies as to his own politics he may not, on pain of contempt, refuse to answer questions about others.

A New Era Opens In The Witch Hunt

The Fifth Amendment has also been the sole refuge from the arbitrary procedures of Congressional committees and the one way to avoid political interrogation on principle without risking jail for contempt.

The Pilgrims Understood

Of all the provisions in our Constitution, none other—except that which forbids an establishment of religion—would have had more meaning for the Pilgrim Fathers than this. Their flight to Holland and later the New World was bound up with struggle against similar Inquisition whose most potent weapon was to put religious dissenters under oath and force them to testify against themselves, their families and their friends. Elizabeth's Court of High Commission and its older lay twin, the Court of Star Chamber, both used compulsory testimony to enforce doctrinal conformity.

The firm establishment of the privilege against compulsory testimony goes back to the case of John Lilburne, a contentious character who lived to become known as "Freeborn John". He was arrested in 1637 on his return to England from the freer atmosphere of Holland and accused of having printed certain heretical and seditious books for distribution in England. Lilburne was then a youth of 20. When brought before the Court of Star Chamber, he refused to take the oath and asserted that no one had a right to compel him to incriminate himself and his friends. He was publicly whipped, pilloried and imprisoned. In 1641 the revolutionary Long Parliament set him free and abolished the courts of High Commission and Star Chamber. One of the successful demands of Cromwell's New Army was that no man be required to testify against himself.

A Spurious Immunity

This is the ancient privilege which may

soon be overturned by the McCarran bill. On its face, as required by the Constitution, it offers immunity from prosecution in return for the loss of the privilege. But this immunity, which may prove a Godsend for gangsters, is spurious when applied to political cases.

Federal law cannot grant immunity from prosecution under State legislation against sedition and "criminal anarchy". Dragnet conspiracy prosecutions are being utilized under the Smith Alien and Sedition Act, and it is doubtful that there can be complete immunity against them. Witnesses are still liable to prosecution for perjury and contempt; the former exposes them to the danger of frame-up by political informers, the latter hangs over their heads if they refuse to betray their friends. The immunity is conferred only as to such portion of the testimony on which the Fifth Amendment privilege has been invoked.

Pitfalls of Conspiracy

As I explained in an article for the *Daily Compass* two years ago when this legislation first came up, "A man might testify to activities which he considered innocent and then wake up to find that these activities have been spun by the government into some weird fabric of 'conspiracy' . . . If he invokes his privilege before telling of things he considers innocent, he may be accused of abusing the privilege. If he fails to invoke his privilege, he may one day find the testimony used against him."

The McCarran bill is calculated and intended to turn the American people into a race of stoolpigeons. As in the days of the Spanish Inquisition, people will be required to trample on all considerations of kinship and honor to inform. In those days men could not trust their wives or children, and none knew whether those they sought to shield might not already

have betrayed them. Yet there seems to be no opposition of principle to this revolutionary measure.

Kefauver's Only Objection

The only minority view which emerged from the Senate Judiciary Committee was Senator Kefauver's and his objection was a limited one. He thought "the dangers of interfering with necessary Federal law prosecution and innocently granting immunity to dangerous and heinous criminals is too great under this bill." He cited the Rosenberg case and said that David Greenglass, had he been summoned as a witness before a Congressional committee, might have won immunity from prosecution by testifying. He wanted the bill amended to require the Attorney General and the FBI to be informed in advance by any committee considering a grant of immunity to compel testimony.

It is a bad sign that the *Washington Post* on the eve of the vote declared, "We think the general principle behind this measure is sound" but urged that grant of immunity be more carefully safeguarded. From the standpoint of real crime enforcement, such general immunity statutes open the way to grave abuses. These arise naturally from the dangerous fallacy that Congressional committees may act as roving public grand juries. From the standpoint of political persecution, the effects are appalling.

Since the intention is to punish by exposure and blacklist for political affiliations past or present, the "immunity" means little. The purpose is to widen and intensify terror-by-investigation. Should the bill become law, we will enter a new stage in the American Inquisition.

Only by invoking the First Amendment and risking imprisonment for contempt will it then be possible to evade the role of informer.

I. F. Stone's Weekly

• Editor and Publisher, I. F. STONE

Published weekly except the last two weeks of August at Room 205, 301 E. Capitol St., S.E., Washington 3, D. C. Subscription rates: Domestic, \$5 a year; Canada, Mexico and elsewhere in the Western Hemisphere, \$6; England and Continental Europe, \$10 by 1st class mail, \$15 by air; for Israel, Asia, Australia and Africa, \$10 by first class mail, \$20 by air mail. Single copy, 15 cents. Tel.: LI 4-7087. Entered as Second Class mail matter, Post Office, Washington, D. C.

"The Truman Era" Published

"The Truman Era", a collection of my best pieces from 1945 to 1952, has just been published and will probably meet the same boycott from reviewers as my "Hidden History of the Korean War." Advance response, however, indicates that this new book like its predecessor will have a substantial sale at home and abroad. I am proud of "The Truman Era" and believe you will like it. The book sums up my political philosophy and preserves the best of my newspaper work in more permanent form. I believe it will some day have an honored place in the annals of American journalism. The book can be ordered from the Weekly at the bookstore price, \$3, and there are still some copies of "The Hidden History" available at \$5. Much that is now happening at Panmunjom becomes clearer in the light of that book.

—I. F. Stone

JENNINGS PERRY'S PAGE

Courts Must Say What Congress Can't Give Away

Before we go on, I would like to contribute one citizen's earnest mite to the commendation the American people owe Wayne Morse, Paul Douglas, John Sparkman, Estes Kefauver, Clinton Anderson and the 30 other senators who tried to hold the door against the tidelands oil bill. Unfortunately the horse was stolen last Nov. 4, when everyone was looking the other way. What might happen to a fabulous national treasure offshore, under water and out of sight, seemed inconsequential beside Candidate Eisenhower's undertaking, as it was hopefully received, to go to Korea personally and get the war over with. The issue is not yet well understood, and then was seen dimly. Had it been clear in the view of all, however, it hardly would have had decisive weight with even one American voter who believed the election of the General would do most for the chances of peace.

This does not mean that the nation by elective choice has given or signified its willingness to give the submerged riches to the coastal states. Nor has it been established by passage of the bill that Congress, or any representative body, has the right to make such a gift.

What has been established, by the Supreme Court's 1947 ruling, is that the lands in question are the property of the United States, of all of the people thereof. From this ruling it now is contended, even by "leading" legal minds among the opponents of the give-away bill, that the legislation passing title to the states, though profligate and probably unpopular, is competent, that precisely because the federal right is paramount the act of Congress disposing of the property is valid and conclusive. The contention itself is plausible of course only to the extent that it is taken for granted that the affairs of the nation, in all things, are at the mercy of its governmental creature.

There still is room to swing a healthy doubt that Congress has full authority as a real estate agent for the public domain, that it can sell, bargain, devise or give away to individual states of the Union, or to any foreign state, the most valuable

tracts of the commonwealth. Already on the initiative of West Virginia the tidelands case is pointed again towards the courts and it is not unlikely that other states, troubled for the equity of their citizens in the natural resources of the country's territorial possessions, will join in the proceedings.

We may confidently expect many pithy questions of congressional authority in the premises to be raised, many possible parallels to be probed. For it is unreasonable to suppose that the people as a whole are so indifferent to their interests that they will permit to pass unchallenged a precedent by which, another time, a headstrong Congress could justify "giving back" all that remains in the nation's sole name of the Louisiana Purchase—the Mississippi river—to Louisiana, or ceding the Gadsden Purchase to Mexico, or (for an extreme example) selling Alaska back to the expansive state within whose historical boundaries Alaska—indisputably—once lay.

These absurd suppositions will have to be exercised, I think, not only to set off the absurdity of the tidelands deal but to locate, by adjudication, the limits restraining even Congress in the alienation of parcels and tracts of the national holdings. There must be such limits. There always will be ready "takers" for any part of the land by which the United States allows its patrimony to be diminished. This time it was the great oil statesmen of Texas, California and Louisiana who slipped up on our blind side during an election, planting an "issue" (while our chief concern was claimed by a distant battlefield) that would enable them to demand of a new and unwary administration the transfer of the oil-rich sea-bottom from federal ownership to more amenable jurisdictions. Tomorrow, we may be beset by similar machinations looking to congressional cession of other public properties loaded with natural prizes whose existence is yet unsuspected.

Sen. Morse and his fellow conservationists have done us this service, for which we ought additionally to esteem them, that their deliberately prolonged debate has alerted us to a nicer regard for the commonwealth and the need of a sharper watch upon what appear to be side issues in presidential campaigns.

I. F. Stone's Weekly 5-16-58
Room 205
301 E. Capitol St., S.E., Washington 3, D. C.
Please enter the following subscription. \$5 for 1 year is enclosed. (See page 3 for foreign rates)
Name
Street
City Zone
State

I. F. Stone's Weekly
Room 205
301 E. Capitol St., S.E.,
Washington 3, D. C.

Entered as
Second Class Mail
Matter
Post Office
Washington, D. C.

NEWSPAPER

I. F. Stone's Weekly

VOL. I, NUMBER 19

MAY 30, 1953



WASHINGTON, D. C.

15 CENTS

The Bombshell That Led to Bermuda

When the chief architect of the cold war begins to dismantle his own handiwork, that is—or should be—news. But most American newspaper readers still do not realize the significance of Sir Winston Churchill's "new Locarno" speech last week. The bombshell that led to the hasty calling of the Bermuda conference was the most momentous—and the most poorly covered—story in many months. The *New York Times* did not give the Churchill speech in full text. Commentators shied away from a declaration which carried so many unpalatable implications for American foreign policy. The man who wanted to strangle Bolshevism in its cradle had suddenly announced that he was prepared to live with it in its prime.

Since Roosevelt's death, Churchill has been the Toscanini of Western foreign policy. The U.S. has footed the bills, but he has set the themes. It was Churchill who launched the Anglo-American alliance at Fulton in 1945, with that deadly phrase about an Iron Curtain rung down on Europe. It was Churchill who later the same year in Zurich proposed a Franco-German entente and a United States of Europe as a counterpoise against the East. It was Churchill who at Llandudno in October, 1948, struck the opening note of the "liberation" chorus. He wanted to push the Russians back to their old borders. He called for a showdown while the U.S. still had a monopoly of the atom bomb.

Now, five years later, Churchill has changed his tune. He no longer speaks as if the problem were simply one of dealing with a Russian menace. It is worth listening closely. "We all desire," he told the Commons, "that the Russian people should take their high place in world affairs, which is their due, *without feeling unsettled about their own security.*" The emphasis is new. The problem is no longer to deal with the diabolic, but with understandable mutual fears. The Russians are also people, and fear us as we fear them. Discourse has shifted from the cold war hallucinations still dominant here to the realm of the real world. And Churchill said he did not believe "the immense problem of reconciling the security of Russia with the freedom and safety of Western Europe is insoluble." This is a new language. It is not difficult to understand why the American press preferred to leave it untranslated.

What is Churchill's solution for reconciling the security of Russia with the security of Western Europe? A new Locarno. The Locarno Pact of 1925 gave France a British guarantee against a German attack and Germany a British guarantee against a French attack. Churchill as Chancellor of the Exchequer had a part in the framing of that treaty. But—and here we come to the crucial point—Locarno was not intended simply to make possible a Franco-German reconciliation. It was intended to free Germany from anxiety about her Western frontier so she would be free to strike toward the East.

A Locarno which would also safeguard Russia against attack from the West is a new kind of Locarno. The formula is the same. The effect is the reverse. The old Locarno was intended to facilitate a crusade against Communism. This new Locarno would formalize co-existence. Churchill's words, as they came in over the State Department ticker, must have seemed downright treasonable. "Russia has the right," Churchill said (to speak of Russia as having rights is itself an innovation), "to feel assured that, so far as human arrangements can run, the terrible events of the Hitler invasion will never be repeated. . . ."

The main objective of American foreign policy for several years has been to rearm Germany in order to repeat that invasion, this time more terribly than before because supplemented by American atomic bombing. And now let us pick up Churchill's words where we broke off and see the very climax of Albion's new perfidy. Russia also had a right, the sentence ended, to be assured ". . . that Poland will remain a friendly Power and a buffer, though not, I trust, a puppet, State." This says good-bye to "liberation." To make a new Locarno is to give up the "liberation" of Eastern Europe. A "free" Poland was the main concern of the liberationists, for the road to Moscow lies across Poland.

Our Richard has deserted to the Saracens. The vision dreamed up for the State Department by the Jesuits of Georgetown was a vision of a U.S. of Western Europe cemented by the confessional ties of the American supported Catholic Centre parties of Italy, France and Western Germany. The resurrection of a Roman Catholic Poland was to be a prime object of the new Crusade. Poland was to resume its role as a buffer against the East, against Bolshevism and beyond Bolshevism against the Orthodox heresy. Now this spokesman for Henry VIII's treacherous realm speaks of Muscovy's right to have Poland as "a friendly power and a buffer," adding—and here we see Churchill's genius for diplomacy—"though not, I trust, a puppet State." With that deft touch, Churchill opened the door to an area of negotiation in which Russian security, Polish national pride and American liberationist slogans could be reconciled. To make such a solution seem possible must appear dangerously subversive in State Department eyes.

This is not the full measure of the havoc threatened by Churchill's bombshell. "To consolidate the peace of Europe" by such arrangements "as the key to the peace of mankind" is also to give up the complementary dream of "liberating" China. A new Locarno guaranteeing the new Poland and Russia against German and Western aggression presupposes also co-existence in the East, recognition of the new China. Otherwise the effect would be to free Moscow from European anxiety and enable her all the more effectively to support

colonial uprisings against the remains of the Western empires in the Far East. Churchill is not proposing to preside over a new Locarno in order to liquidate Britain's holdings of tin and rubber in Malaya. But the Far Eastern corollaries require the abandonment of Chiang Kai-shek and resumption of normal relations with Communist China. To see this is to see why Eisenhower is packing his bags so hastily for a week-end in Bermuda.

Churchill's initiative is initiative in calling off the cold war. When he told the Commons "It would, I think, be a mistake to assume that nothing can be settled with Soviet Russia unless or until everything is settled" the words were deceptively offhand. One of the basic axioms of American "total diplomacy" as launched by Acheson and carried on by Dulles has been to avoid piecemeal and peripheral settlements because these would relax tension and slow up the pace of rearmament. The idea was to build up such overwhelming power as to make possible peace by dictation or swift victory by atomic blitzkrieg. Here again the new Churchill line undercuts American strategy.

The Issues in the Arrest of Cedric Belfrage

Crucial issues are raised by the arrest of Cedric Belfrage, editor of the *National Guardian*. His interrogation by the McCarthy and Velde committees illustrates again the way in which these Congressional Inquisitions usurp the functions of a grand jury. Belfrage was questioned about Elizabeth Bentley's story that Belfrage as a member of British Intelligence during the last war had given information to Soviet Intelligence. A Federal grand jury heard this story in 1947 and questioned Belfrage about it at length. No indictment was returned. Now the old charges were rehashed in public session under circumstances which permit no fair and orderly rejoinder.

The country has grown so accustomed to this abuse that few any longer question it. Martin Dies said fifteen years ago that he proposed to use the House Un-American Activities Committee as a grand jury. The procedure combines the worst features of the public pillory with none of the good features of the grand jury. The grand jury safeguards the reputation of the accused by hearing him and his accusers in secret. Nothing is made public unless the grand jury is sufficiently impressed to return an indictment. The indictment must still be tried. But these Inquisitorial committees may destroy a man's reputation in a single sitting by the device of asking dirty questions.

A related issue has to do with the breakdown in the separation of power within the government. McCarthy asked that a representative of the Immigration Service be present at the hearing. It was made plain that Belfrage was to be arrested for deportation as soon as he pleaded his privilege. The Immigration Service was to act—or else. The Immigration Service is responsible to the Attorney General. In the Belfrage case, McCarthy was acting as a super Attorney General, just as in the case of the Greek shipowners he acted as a super Secretary of State. Must Americans be reminded, two centuries after Montesquieu, that the whole theory of the separation of powers on which our government rests was intended to prevent just such concentration of legislative, judicial and execu-

Churchill's view of internal developments in Russia since Stalin's death also diverges strikingly from the official American line. The State Department, its eyes shut tightly, insists that nothing has happened. It is essential to cold war policy to allow nothing to disturb the endlessly inculcated view that the Kremlin always has and always will be occupied by monsters until the evil is finally exorcised by nuclear fission and holy water. But here is Churchill saying unexpectedly and exasperatingly that he regards "some of the internal manifestations and the apparent change of mood" since Stalin's death "as far more important than what is happening outside." He is anxious that "the NATO Powers" do nothing which might "supersede or take the emphasis out of what may be a profound movement of Russian feeling." To imply that reform in the direction of a less draconian Russian regime is possible without crack-up, war or counter revolution; to speak as Churchill does of a "spontaneous and healthy evolution which may take place in Russia" is his ultimate apostasy.

(Next Week: Why Churchill Shifted)

tive functions in one man's hands? McCarthyism is not a new phenomenon.

The most important issue of all revolves around the freedom of the press and its role in the fight for peace. The *National Guardian* is the unofficial organ of the Progressive Party. It is one of the few voices left which disagree with the official cold war line. Mr. Attlee was telling the literal truth when he said there were some Americans who don't want peace; they may be few, but they are powerful. He might have added that there are few Americans left who dare speak up openly for peace. The attack on Belfrage and the *Guardian* is an attempt to intimidate and silence those few.

McCarthy is hunting for bigger game. James Aronson, managing editor of the *Guardian*, was asked at the hearing in Washington whether he had ever taken instructions on the handling of the news from the Communist Party while employed by the *New York Post* and the *New York Times*. Aronson denied this. The groundwork is being laid for "expert" testimony by Matusow and Budenz with which McCarthy, Velde and Jenner may harass what little remains of independence and liberalism in the American press.

The respectables look the other way. The *New York Times* spoke up for James Wechsler of the *New York Post* but the *Post* did not speak up for the *Guardian*. True, Belfrage's case is more difficult: he neither confessed, recanted nor informed. But the difference clarifies the real issue which must be faced if freedom of the press is to be preserved.

Congress, under the First Amendment, may make no law abridging freedom of the press. A law imposing some kind of "loyalty" standard on the personnel and policies of the press would be patently unconstitutional. The crucial question is whether a Congressional committee can do by indirection under the guise of investigation what it clearly could not do directly. To permit Congress to investigate the ideas of newspapers and newspapermen is to permit the enforcement of conformity by harrassment. Unless such right is denied the door is wide open for any adventurer like McCarthy.

I. F. Stone's Weekly

• Editor and Publisher, I. F. STONE

Published weekly except the last two weeks of August at Room 205, 301 E. Capitol St., S.E., Washington 3, D. C. Subscription rates: Domestic, \$5 a year; Canada, Mexico and elsewhere in the Western Hemisphere, \$6; England and Continental Europe, \$10 by 1st class mail, \$15 by air; for Israel, Asia, Australia and Africa, \$10 by 1st class mail, \$20 by air mail. Single copy, 15 cents. Tel.: LI 4-7087. Entered as Second Class mail matter, Post Office, Washington, D. C.

May 30, 1953

Vol. I, No. 19

COMMENT

Last Week's Issue

There is *nothing* like a short stretch as a small capitalist to make one look forward to the Socialist revolution, if Messrs. McCarthy, Jenner and Velde will excuse the expression. Our latest trouble as an entrepreneur: last Monday a week the printers and mailers in all of Washington's commercial printing establishments went out on strike. The *Weekly*, which goes to press on Tuesdays, had to suspend publication. This, and not a plot by the Postoffice, explains why you did not get an issue last week. This week's was printed and mailed in New York.

Morale Builders

Early Soviet novels used a vivid phrase, "former people," about the remnants of the dispossessed ruling class. On the inhospitable sidewalks of Washington these days, the editor often feels like one of the "former people," a phantom out of the New Deal past. A few more years of the current trend and we may furtively be hawking forbidden books by Jefferson and bootlegging copies of the *Federalist Papers* to passersby who can't resist the temptation of having a peek at subversive literature, despite the danger of being picked up by thought police patrols.

Every once in a while, however, something happens which is a morale builder. I went to a hearing on "front" organizations before the Subversive Activities Control Board and several days later my secretary told me someone had phoned from the Board to ask whether I would be sure and send a copy of anything I wrote about the hearing. The thought of the Board waiting feverishly to see what I was going to say about it perked me up on end.

Victor Lasky has also been a help. He runs something called the Spadea Syndicate. Last week he kindly sent me advance copies of a four page article by my old friend, John Chamberlain, called

"Clap-Trap and The Atom." The editor's note with the article said Chamberlain had just completed a two-month tour of atomic installations but devoted most of the piece to an attack on the article in our issue of April 25, "Atomic Power: Biggest Steal of the G.O.P. Era."

On the basis of this article, Chamberlain predicted that before there is any alteration in the atomic energy law "the air of Congressional Committee rooms will undoubtedly ring with charges that the wicked capitalists are out to 'steal' the atom from the 'people.'" I sadly suspect that Chamberlain is overly optimistic, but I carried his article around with me for several days. It made me feel like Quite A Molder of Public Opinion.

Footnote on POW's

I called the Pentagon last week to get some figures on prisoners of war. I had read, as no doubt you have, half a dozen articles, editorials and speeches explaining that the U.S. was so adamant about voluntary repatriation because it wanted to encourage mass desertions from the enemy side in the event of World War III. One writer, the respected and scholarly William Henry Chamberlain, even went so far as to suggest that "The fear of such defection has been a factor restraining the Kremlin from other military adventures."

The figures do not give much support to these views. The Chinese have been in the Korean war two and a half years. If their armies were, as so often pictured to the American public, masses of unwillingly impressed men sent into battle by a regime they hate, one would expect them to surrender easily. The number of Chinese poured into the Korean war has been estimated by our own military as high as a million men. Certainly they number several hundred thousand. Yet the latest figure on Chinese prisoners held is only 21,000.

If the line being handed out to explain our position on POW's at Panmunjom is true one would expect the figures to show a sharp increase in surrenders during the months in which we have insisted that enemy prisoners shall not be forced to return against their will. Truce talks began in July, 1951. The voluntary repatriation issue was first raised in December, 1951, and has been the main topic of disagreement and propaganda since that time. Yet it does not appear to have had much influence.

The Pentagon's figures showed that we held 17,382 Chinese prisoners of war when the truce talks began. This had risen to 20,678 by the end of the year 1951 when the voluntary repatriation issue was raised. The current figure (available only in the round number) is 21,000. This does not support the picture of mass defections encouraged by the offer of asylum.

Right of Asylum

I believe in the right of asylum and do not think any man should be forced to go back to his own country if he does not want to. But the affirmation of this moral principle at Panmunjom does not prevent our own government from picking up hundreds of long term residents of this country, many with American children, and ordering them deported. We practice "involuntary repatriation" at home while preaching against it abroad.

New Obstacles to Peace

The real moral issue at Panmunjom is to ensure freedom of choice to prisoners. POW's ought not to be polled on their political views while held captive; the conditions are those of duress. But a soldier who tells a neutral commission that he does not want to be repatriated should have the right to go free.

The real difficulty is the question of face. The American military negotiators have sought to force concessions on the issue under conditions which would cause the most loss of face to the Chinese.

If the Chinese, after the new recess, should accept the terms offered on POW's, watch for new obstacles to an armistice. The so-called armistice agreement carries a notation saying that it is all tentative. There is already talk in Washington of reviving older issues thought to be settled. One is whether the North Koreans may build air fields during an armistice. Another is the exact location of the cease-fire line.

Condolences

To the Senate Internal Security subcommittee on the unfortunate demise of one of its more sensational recent revelations. A certain Thad Mason claimed to have been a Soviet spy and stolen 100 blueprints from a General Motors plant in Cleveland. He testified that he passed the blueprints on to a confederate who worked as a counterman in the plant cafeteria who passed them on in turn to another confederate who was a dishwasher "in the basement." There the dishwasher would film the prints in between washing dishes, and pass the originals back up again. A spokesman for the General Motors plant now explains that it has no basement and the Department of Justice is investigating Mason.

Hat's Off

To Senator Taft, for blocking passage on the consent calendar last week of the McCarran bill to deprive witnesses before Congressional committees of their privilege under the Fifth Amendment; to Senator Kilgore, for mustering opinions against the bill from Governor Dewey, Dean Griswold of Harvard Law School and Donald Richberg; and to the Wall Street Journal, for an editorial against the bill which has had great weight in the Senate.

Any day now we expect McCarran to open an attack on "crypto-liberalism."

JENNINGS PERRY'S PAGE

Cohn Takes to Phone and Saves the Public Pence

I think Mr. Roy Cohn and I have just about worked out a way to help Congress save the Republic some money. The high points of our collaboration thus far are as follows:

Shortly after noon on Feb. 23, I was handed a paper commanding me to appear the next morning at 9:30 in Washington to testify what I might know relative to subject matters under consideration by the Senate Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations of the Committee on Government Operations. The paper was water marked with the Great Seal of our nation and signed Joe McCarthy, with flourishes.

I had been washing the boat under the palm tree. I dried my hands on a sponge and looked in the morning paper to see what wind the subcommittee had up: apparently it was the Voice of America. I sat down and wrote a nice note explaining why it was impossible to reach Washington from Key West by 9:30 the next day.

"I'll gladly come up," I said, "if that is the wish of Congress, though I fear it will be a waste of the taxpayers' money, since I have little but opinion to give that would be of the slightest use to your subcommittee." I pointed out that as an editor and columnist my opinions of practically everything had been in print for many years. I gave the phone at which I would be available on any day on which the weather was not good. "Other days," I concluded, "I probably will be fishing."

Two days later, a Mr. Hawkins phoned for the subcommittee, inquired of the fishing and told me that another time the subcommittee would let me know beforehand. I repeated my view that the whole thing was a waste of money—my money as a taxpayer, too. It was a pleasant and uneventful chat.

At 6 p.m. on March 5, I had just come in from talking sailfishing with Capt. Jakie Key, who used to fish Zane Grey, when Washington opened the wire again. The voice said it was Roy Cohn, chief counsel for the subcommittee—and, "We'd like to have you tomorrow morning."

I vaguely recalled having heard the name, though at the time I would have settled for Cowan or Kahn. I didn't ask Mr. Cohn how he spelled it. I told him the facts of time and

space, that the last plane from Key West for the day had gone, and that I couldn't at the fastest be in Washington before the next afternoon. Whereat my caller, some little put out, asked if I would hold the wire.

After several minutes, during which I worried at the cost of the tolls, Mr. Cohn came back on and, asking and obtaining my permission to put a few questions "which might help this situation," informed me that his matter related to an article I'd written for the Daily Compass. I assured him I had written a great many articles for the Compass. He did not say which article. Instead he asked me if I was now or ever had been a member of the Communist party. I told him, "Never in my life."

"Were you," he said, "when you wrote for the Compass?" "I said never in my life."

"But you were a member of some Communist front organizations?"

"Not to my knowledge."

"Not to your knowledge . . . And that is how you would reply before the committee?"

"That is right," I said, watching the sunset redden the waters of the Bight. And Mr. Cohn said, "Well, we will let you know." I reminded him that he had my phone, and he thanked me. And that is all I ever expect to hear from Mr. Cohn and the Subcommittee on Investigations of the Senate Committee on Government Operations.

It all was rather silly and expensive. Just having Joe McCarthy's autograph certainly is not worth the part of my tax that has to go to pay for these calls. And yet, I have thought since, how much more expensive it would have been had I, as commanded out of hand, rushed off to Washington from the fishing grounds 1200 miles away. There would have been the planes, hotels, cabs, meals, tips and, for the sake of civilization, perhaps a martini or two.

Mr. Cohn got his little query off of his mind, and packed himself away to Europe to get a man fired for calling him a gumshoe. A phone call sufficed (a postcard would have done as well), and I gladly contribute the difference toward retirement of the national debt.

I. F. Stone's Weekly 5-30-53
 Room 205
 301 E. Capitol St., S.E., Washington 3, D. C.

Please enter the following subscription. \$5 for 1 year is enclosed. (See page 3 for foreign rates.)

Name

Street

City Zone

State

I. F. Stone's Weekly
 Room 205
 301 E. Capitol St., S.E.,
 Washington 3, D. C.

Entered as
 Second Class Mail
 Matter
 Post Office
 Washington, D. C.

NEWSPAPER

I. F. Stone's Weekly

VOL. I, NUMBER 20

JUNE 6, 1953



WASHINGTON, D. C.

15 CENTS

That Wild Uproar May Herald Peace

Washington this past week has been the center of a tempest. But the howling gales, the deafening tumult and the tension have been good signs, not bad. It is the approach of peace which has aroused to furious protest every pro-war element in the Western coalition from Seoul to Bonn, and within both parties at home. The balance of forces making for peace is precarious. Some new provocation may easily upset it, and plunge us suddenly into wider conflict abroad and intensified repression at home. The screaming will grow louder, the danger greater, as peace draws nearer, but the direction of events is hopeful and President Eisenhower himself is a positive factor in this situation, a factor on the side of peace and world sanity.

This becomes clearer if one looks carefully and as objectively as possible at the Taft speech in Cincinnati and the President's reactions to it. Taft is not a demagogue. He is an able and well-informed conservative. The speech was painfully honest in its survey of American foreign policy and its search for a way out. After six years of cold war cant, it is refreshing to hear Taft say again as he did in the original Senate debate on the Atlantic Pact, that the Truman doctrine and NATO could not easily be reconciled with the United Nations Charter, that we had abandoned the UN for a system of military alliances. Though Taft's is the voice of Midwestern isolationism, there were passages in the speech which will be read gratefully in Western Europe. "It is pretty hard," Taft said of our restrictions on East-West trade, "for the United States to claim the right to cut off trade channels which have existed for centuries." He urged that we try to understand the problems of other countries "and not force upon them a policy they do not approve, either by the pressure of grants of money or grants of soldiers." No one of any importance in Washington has spoken that way in a long time.

But the context of the speech is bad, and its confusions are endless. The same man who objects to any undertaking to defend Norway and Denmark against Russia would have us persevere in holding out the hope of American "liberation" for Poland, Czechoslovakia, Hungary and Rumania. This certainly is not cutting the cloth of national policy to the fit of military realities. Taft says that he has felt from the beginning that "we should have insisted on a general peace negotiation with China, including a unification of Korea under free Koreans, and a pledge against further expansion in Southeast Asia." But such an over-all settlement would require the recognition of Communist China and the liquidation of the Chiang Kai-shek regime. There is no indication whatsoever that Taft is prepared to support such a settlement. Indeed the context of his demand that we "go it alone" if truce talks break down in Korea is resentment against the much smaller concessions forced from American policy by British, French and Indian pressure.

Taft's honesty leads him to hopelessness but this hopelessness may swiftly turn to desperation. This is why the Taft speech has been welcomed in those circles which are fighting peace. This is why it is hailed by Father Curran and David Lawrence. Taft sees the disintegration of the Western alliance. He is doubtful that we can go on buying firm allies. He thinks we may have to "go it alone" but he doesn't say where. He says he has "always felt that we should not attempt to fight Russia on the ground on the Continent of Europe any more than we should attempt to fight China on the Continent of Asia." But to raise the cry "go it alone" at this moment is to suggest throwing off the restraints imposed by our allies and embarking on a course which must lead to war with China and may lead to war with Russia. And every sober military man agrees that such wars must ultimately be fought out on the ground, which in this case means thousands of miles from home and against an enormous superiority of manpower. It is this huge and terrifying blind spot which makes the isolationism of Taft the avenue to a wider adventurism. It is this which makes the sober and decent Cincinnati corporation lawyer the leader of those forces in the Republican party on which the China Lobby sets its hopes. It is this which makes him the bedfellow of Bridges and McCarthy.

It is a mistake to believe that the breakup of the Western coalition is necessarily a factor for peace. If it breaks up just when Churchill and our Western allies are beginning to restrain American policy and to move toward negotiation, then the result may be calamitous. In this perspective, Eisenhower's comment on the Taft speech reflects not only an understanding of the need for compromise in any coalition policy but a willingness to compromise. And compromise in this situation means compromise for peace. This is why Adenauer and Rhee both are appealing frantically to Washington against further talks. This is why the China Lobby is pushing hard for Congressional action to take the U.S. out of the UN and to shut off American appropriations for the UN if there is a vote to seat Communist China. This is why the split grows inside the Republican party and the Eisenhower Administration itself. This is why McCarthy is driving hard for bad relations with Britain.

The coalition which was acceptable when it meant air bases for attack on Russia begins to seem an urgent menace when it becomes a force to draw an unwilling America toward peace talks. Eisenhower's leadership may be weak, but its direction is good. He is the center around which rally those elements in the business community which want a more moderate policy and negotiations. Moscow and Peking may make fearful errors if they fail to see the real balance of forces here, and if the Chinese Communists let stubborn considerations of pride and prestige stand in the way of making a settlement in Korea now.

That "Ammunition Shortage" and a New Stab-in-the-Back Myth

The German military after World War I came up with the myth of a "stab in the back" on the home front to explain away their defeat in the field. A comparable myth is being fabricated by some of our military and exploited by Republicans and right wing Democrats to alibi the failure to win a decisive victory in Korea over much more poorly equipped enemy forces.

Hitler utilized the "stab in the back" myth to gain popular support. The myth implied that the Social Democrats were traitors to the Fatherland. It also spread the notion that German military power, if free from treachery at home, could dominate the world. A similar myth may play a similar role in this country.

The newly developing "stab in the back" theory of the Korean war falls into two related parts: (1) victory was in our grasp when the Truman Administration agreed to a truce; (2) the truce and the failure to win the Korean war were the result of an ammunition shortage. In both cases the charge of Democratic error on the home front passes over easily into the imputation of Democratic treason. Such ideas may help pave the way to Fascism at home and war abroad.

The New Senate Report

These ideas have been advanced by General Van Fleet since his return from Korea and given a sounding board in *Life Magazine* and a series of Congressional hearings. This is the context in which one must read the new "ammunition shortage" report turned in by a Senate Armed Services subcommittee early last week. The report made sensational headlines at the expense of anxiety in thousands of American homes. The charge that an ammunition shortage had caused "a needless loss of American lives" conjured up a picture of American boys killed because they had run out of ammunition.

But neither in the extended hearings nor in the report itself was there any evidence that a single American boy was killed because he lacked ammunition. The one dissenting Senator on the subcommittee, Kefauver, Democrat, of Tennessee, protested that "the statement is based, as the committee acknowledges, on conflicting testimony between various army generals."

The fact is that on the one crucial point there was no conflict. The Generals agreed that there was no shortage at the front itself. The report says U.S. Army Chief of Staff General J. Lawton Collins "stated that the man at the front was never out of ammunition." The report admits, "In a sense General Van Fleet agreed with General Collins' statement. He stated that the man at the gun always had in his possession what is known as a basic load. This is the amount of ammunition which can be carried with the weapon to its position."

No one would guess from the report that testimony showed our forces were firing ten times as much ammunition as the enemy and that authorized rates of fire were far higher than in the last war.

A Matter of Definition

At these levels of consumption, shortages did develop in certain items at supply points behind the lines. Here part of the dispute between Van Fleet and Collins was a matter of definition. According to the report itself, Army officials regarded a 60-day ammunition supply as the safety level. On the other hand, the report says, "General Van Fleet describes a critical short supply as existing when the ammunition on hand and in reserve is less than a 65-day supply."

These are technical matters which must be left to military men. The only point made here is that it was wrong to make a report implying that American lives were lost because American soldiers ran out of ammunition when in fact the subcommittee had no such evidence.

A careful examination of the report and the testimony shows that Van Fleet in alleging shortages was talking (1) of certain specific items: mortar and howitzer shells of specified calibres and hand grenades and (2) of shortages behind the lines. Even so his testimony is full of discrepancies. At one point he said that ammunition was in short supply "during the entire 22 months" he was in Korea. But a little later he denied that a shortage of ammunition explained the refusal to allow him to continue that supposed victory offensive in June 1951:

Senator BYRD. Was the ammunition an adverse factor at the time?

General VAN FLEET. No, sir; we had enough ammunition then.

On the other hand the Armed Services subcommittee report says, "There is evidence to indicate that a part of the decision in the summer of 1951, to conduct a sidown war in Korea, was influenced by the fact that our military planners knew our ammunition supplies were in such bad shape and instituted this new policy to conserve ammunition." If there is such evidence, it was not produced either in the report or the lengthy hearings which preceded it. The testimony of General Collins, as we shall see, showed on the contrary that offensive plans were vetoed not to save ammunition but to conserve lives.

Van Fleet's Contradictions

Van Fleet's testimony that the truce talks deprived him of victories is worth careful examination. He never told the same story twice. On March 4 before the House Armed Services Committee, he was asked about an interview he had given in Korea saying that the war might have been ended with victory in 1951 had it not been for the truce talks.

"In other words," Congressman Arends

asked him, "had we followed up at that particular moment in place of going into these interminable talks, why, we might have brought about the successful conclusion of that war, in your opinion?"

"I would like to think so," was Van Fleet's answer, "as being the man on the spot at the time."

"A Little Overstated"

But the very next day in executive session before the Senate Armed Services Committee, Van Fleet answered the same question differently. Here is the colloquy as it appears on page 31 of the printed record:

Senator BYRD. You were quoted, I think, General, in the newspapers, as I recall it, as saying on two occasions that you could have gotten the military victory in Korea, is that correct?

General VAN FLEET. I think that was a little overstated in the paper, or we might define what you mean by a military victory.

I would not say a complete victory, but in June of 1951 we had the Communist armies on the run; they were hurting badly, out of supplies, completely out of hand or control; they were in a panic. . . .

Still another version was given by Van Fleet when he was questioned again by the Senate committee, this time on April 1. Senator Byrd recalled that in his previous testimony he had said that "you had the Communist armies on the run and felt convinced then that you could win a military victory but that you were stopped by orders not to pursue and finish the enemy." It then appeared for the first time that it was not a case of simple pursuit.

"Early in June," Van Fleet replied, "I recommended to General Ridgway, who was then the Far Eastern commander, that we follow that up with an amphibious landing on the east coast . . . and that operation was stopped."

On this day of testimony Van Fleet did not claim that this operation would have led to a final military victory. The best claim which now appeared in the Van Fleet-Byrd colloquy is that we "could have captured a great many of the enemy and destroyed their supplies."

Collins Saw No Panic

Quite a different picture was presented by General Collins when he was before the same subcommittee on April 20. He flatly denied Van Fleet's testimony that the enemy was fleeing in panic.

"I assure you, Senator," General Collins said to Byrd, "that I was over there shortly after that time, and neither I nor anybody else that I know saw any signs of panic. We were getting pretty severe casualties at that time."

As for the "victory offensive" which was countermanded in June, 1951, General Collins put two official documents

(Continued on page 3)

I. F. Stone's Weekly

• Editor and Publisher, I. F. STONE

Published weekly except the last two weeks of August at Room 205, 301 E. Capitol St., S.E., Washington 3, D. C. Subscription rates: Domestic, \$5 a year; Canada, Mexico and elsewhere in the Western Hemisphere, \$6; England and Continental Europe, \$10 by 1st class mail, \$15 by air; for Israel, Asia, Australia and Africa, \$10 by 1st class mail, \$20 by air mail. Single copy, 15 cents. Tel.: LI 4-7087. Entered as Second Class mail matter, Post Office, Washington, D. C.

June 6, 1953

Vol. I, No. 20

COMMENT

The Rosenberg Case

The Supreme Court last week for the third time refused to grant a hearing in the Rosenberg case but on this occasion Mr. Justice Douglas joined Mr. Justice Black in favor of a review. A new execution date has now been set for June 15.

There is no doubt that the death sentence is shockingly out of line with the offense. The case for clemency is strengthened by the appearance of new evidence and new expert affidavits which call for examination in a court of law. A decent respect for the opinion of mankind calls for clemency and a new trial.

The case for a new trial is, if anything, strengthened by the peculiar circumstances under which the physicist William Perl was finally brought to trial and convicted of perjury in denying that he knew Julius Rosenberg and Morton Sobell.

The indictment of Perl came in the midst of the Rosenberg trial, creating another sensation unfavorable to the defendants. The chief prosecuting attorney said Perl was to be a corroborating witness for the State but he was neither produced nor brought to trial. The government now says that it is in a position to link Perl "directly" to the Rosenberg "espionage ring." If it has, it should join the defense in application for a new trial

and accept the challenge of erasing doubt about the Rosenberg verdict.

On Arming the Germans

Some indication of the growing strength of the Germans—and of the thinking of General Alfred M. Gruenther, newly appointed to succeed Ridgway as the head of NATO—may be seen in this unnoticed passage of his testimony recently before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee.

General Gruenther was discussing the treaty for a European Defense Community. "We no longer have the alternative of not arming the Germans," Gruenther told the committee, "the question is: What is the best way for the Germans to participate? Too much water has gone over the dam now to be able to assume that it is realistic to keep the Germans under an occupation status much longer. The future of Europe depends in large measure on the solution of the German problem.

"As I see the problem," Gruenther went on, "it is not the alternatives of arm or not arm. It is a question of making the best of a risky situation, evaluating whether there is more to fear from the Russian or from the German." (Italics added.)

I have had to postpone my promised piece on why Churchill shifted his position. But when a top American General can say that there may now be doubt as to "whether there is more to fear from the Russian or from the German," it should not seem strange that British and French opinion as a whole no longer share our exclusive American preoccupation with the old Red menace.

The Right Answer

We cannot resist passing on this anecdote from Walter Trohan's "Washington Scrapbook" in the *Chicago Tribune*. Mr. Trohan attributes it to Louis J. Russell, chief investigator for the House Committee on Un-American Activities. It seems that a young woman applied for a clerical job with the committee some years ago and after satisfying her interrogator about her fitness for the job, she was asked:

"Do you believe in communism?"

"Of course not," was the reply.

"Do you believe in fascism?"

"Oh, yes," said the applicant eagerly. "Do you know what fascism is?" asked the astounded questioner.

"I haven't the slightest idea," was the answer, "but I read in some newspaper that this was a fascist committee and I'd certainly like to get the job."

Democrats as War Party

Eisenhower is dependent on Democratic votes for much of his program, but it is evident that on the central issue of reduction in armament expenditure, especially on aviation, he faces solid Democratic opposition. Symington is the spokesman for the air lobby. W. Averill Harriman made a speech attacking the "relaxationists." Francis Biddle at the ADA convention sounded off in a similar vein about the menace to national security. Even Congressman Chet Holifield had to balance off his speech last Monday attacking the atomic power grab with a salvo aimed at Eisenhower's reductions in arms expenditure. "To pull up short now," Holifield said, "and look for economies when the issue is nothing less than the survival of the free world is to trifle with destiny and to court disaster."

These stale Truman-Acheson era clichés are unworthy of people like Holifield and Biddle. Experience shows armament races lead to war. Tension rises as arms budgets go up, and tension must be maintained to maintain a high level of expenditures. Unless, to paraphrase Holifield, we pull up short soon, it will be too late to stop the slide toward war. These cries of alarm are all out of proportion to the actual cuts made by Eisenhower and Wilson in air force spending anyway.

Just as the desire for economy leads one wing of the Republican party toward peace, the easy spending proclivities of the Democrats make them the natural allies of the greedy aviation lobby and the trigger-happy Air Force bureaucracy.

Best News of the Week

Omitted by the Republican majority leadership in Congress from their list of "must" legislation for this session: the McCarran bill to deprive witnesses before Congressional committees of their privilege under the Fifth amendment in return for a spurious immunity.

That "Ammunition Shortage" and a New Stab-in-the-Back Myth

(Continued from page 2)

into the record during the executive hearing on April 20. One showed that Ridgway had vetoed, without submission to the Joint Chiefs of Staff, a Van Fleet plan for an amphibious landing behind the enemy lines on the East Coast on June 6, combined with a general offensive northeast from the Chorwon-Kumwa area. Among the reasons given by Ridgway were "the continuing capability of the enemy for offensive action" and "the small reward to be gained if the operation is successful."

The other document was a message to the Joint Chiefs of Staff from Ridgway on June 26 reporting, "Visited the United States I Corps front today with Van Fleet and Milburn. Nothing significant to report concerning enemy action and capabilities. . . . Van Fleet believes, and I concur, that advance to a general line north of a certain line while tactically and logistically feasible at present would entail unacceptable casualties."

Thus the documents presented by General Collins and his own first hand estimate of the situation in Korea shows

that Van Fleet's claim of a decisive victory thwarted by the truce talks was (as Van Fleet admitted) "a little overstated in the paper."

Unfortunately this admission, like the Collins testimony here quoted, was given in executive session. The headlines had already created the false impression, so that we even have the *New Republic* last week saying "It may be, as Van Fleet maintains, that we could have pressed our offensive to a successful conclusion in 1951." The myth goes marching on.

JENNINGS PERRY'S PAGE

Bill Oatis Free Finds the Way of Fact Is Hard

This week, Americans whose foible is reading their newspaper from back to front probably were first to see the little piece about Bill Oatis going to a sanitarium for treatment of a lung condition. The radio also had a spot on it. Apparently this is the ailment mentioned by Oatis when upon his return he was strenuously pressed to tell just how he was "drugged" by his Czech jailors. Oatis' reply, in which he was firm, that he was given injections for his lung condition but that these had no effect whatever on his mind, was not too well received. It was received no better, indeed, than his refusal to retract his confession or his persistence in reminding his interviewers that he was charged, tried and convicted not under the laws of his own country but under the laws of the country in which he was working as a correspondent of the Associated Press.

The relegation of the Oatis story to the inside pages need surprise none. There is no use blinking the fact that Oatis free has been a great disappointment to many members of our press who tied the whistles of their columns down on the subject of Oatis held in vile duress over there. His ordeal had been told and retold in detail; the build up of his martyrdom was tremendous. He had only to bring in a personal account backing up even roughly the harrowing tale of his vicissitudes already told for him for true—nay, to do no more than to profess not to remember—and the tale would have stood up as already spread and accepted. Instead he turned out, as surely it must seem to those who most angrily wept ink at his plight, a most "uncooperative witness."

He gave his own report of what happened to him in the Czech courts and in the Czech jails, and stuck to it. He denied that he was ever drugged, tortured or brainwashed. He would not say that he had not violated the laws of Czechoslovakia or that he had been ignorant of the law. Asked whether he felt he had violated the ethics of his profession, he repeatedly attempted to make the point that what is considered fair in newsgathering at home is not necessarily permitted in the work of newsgathering in other lands. His personal report had the earmarks of candor. The question remains of whether, in maintaining his own version of what happened to him, Bill Oatis in any way "let down" either his country or his

profession—whether, no matter what he experienced, saw or thought, he did not owe it to his country and profession to go along with the story of the enemy's atrocious treatment of Oatis written when Oatis himself could not get in a word?

For my part, I cannot see that this question has any bearing upon, or is borne upon by, the other matter left hanging by all the speculation to date—whether Oatis was or was not an American spy. I remember writing at the time of the arrest and trial that since our country also must be presumed to have spies, and since the work is entirely praiseworthy when done by our side, it would be contemptible to suppose that the patriotism of newspapermen would not be equal to it. I suggested then that the Czechs send Bill Oatis on home to his wife, as an evidence of their understanding of the under-the-rose facts of international life.

Oatis may or may not have been in communication with our intelligence officials in Prague outside the strict line of his professional duties; he has declined to make a statement on that. It stands to reason however, that if he were, his motives were those of a loyal citizen. He would have been "doing his duty as he saw it."

It does not follow that either loyalty or duty required of him, after his release, that he should shape his tale to conform to any and all representations made by our foreign office in connection with his case. Nor that the ethics of his profession require him to affirm, despite whatever he personally might know to the contrary, that the lurid and inflammatory "Oatis story" woven generally by the American press during his captivity was "the way it was."

The first article in the code of a good newspaperman is objectivity—and let the chips fall where they may. I cannot help feeling that throughout Bill Oatis has been a good newspaperman by that light, that he has tried before all to be loyal to Fact, and that the most onerous part of his experience has been the attempt of opinionated colleagues at home to "break down his story," to compel him to agree that the true history of his case is not as he recalls and reports it but as it has been set down and stylized in full cold war prose by those who were not there.

I. F. Stone's Weekly 6-6-53
 Room 205
 301 E. Capitol St., S.E., Washington 3, D. C.

Please enter the following subscription. \$5 for 1 year is enclosed. (See page 3 for foreign rates.)

Name

Street

City Zone

State

I. F. Stone's Weekly

Room 205
301 E. Capitol St., S.E.,
Washington 3, D. C.

Entered as
Second Class Mail
Matter

NEWSPAPER

I. F. Stone's Weekly

VOL. I NUMBER 21

JUNE 13, 1953



WASHINGTON, D. C.

15 CENTS

Challenging the Left: "Back Ike for Peace"

At the risk of complete and total Leftist excommunication—from the ADA straight across the board through the Communists to the Trotskyists—I want to put forward a daring slogan in the difficult and precarious weeks ahead: "Back Ike for Peace."

Those who live in a dream world may well believe that Eisenhower as President of the United States need only press a button to oust Syngman Rhee, recognize Red China, restore Formosa to the mainland, put Chiang Kai-shek in the laundry business and ensure peace forever by a quick talk with Churchill, Malenkov and Mao Tse-tung. In that dream world, Eisenhower is to be treated with suspicion until a global peace has been signed, sealed and delivered.

Others on the Left are as giddy as a punch drunk fighter who has had too many blows on the head. They are suddenly certain that the U.S. is so weak and unpopular with its own Western allies that it *must* make peace in Korea and call off the cold war.

But those with some conception of political realities must see the enormous odds against which Eisenhower has slowly been pushing toward peace in Korea. A powerful wing of the Republican party is against a settlement. The American military bureaucracy has been and continues to be opposed to a settlement. The military if given its head is quite capable of stretching out the talks for another year. There was an ominous ring in the happy announcement from Panmunjom as we went to press: "Remember this is not the armistice agreement. It deals with the prisoner of war issue only." The military are prepared if permitted to split hairs for many months more on the exact location of the cease-fire line and on the question of air-field construction during a truce.

As peace comes closer, Syngman Rhee and Chiang Kai-shek, the principal beneficiaries of the Korean war, grow more desperate. Eisenhower last week barely managed to get Senate leaders to withdraw an appropriations rider which would have had the effect of taking the U.S. out of the United Nations if Communist China were admitted. Syngman Rhee counts on the support of the same forces in his intransigence. The significant point in Rhee's attitude is that he nowhere calls for peaceful unification of Korea by elections under UN auspices; now, as in August 1950 when a truce seemed imminent and such elections were being seriously discussed, he fears an unfavorable verdict at the polls.

It is a mistake to believe that Eisenhower has to contend only with a few wild men and reactionaries. A peacefully unified Korea would be the natural cornerstone of an over-all settlement in the Far East, but such a settlement would require the recognition of Communist China and its admission to the UN. But even in the labor movement this

would command little support. John L. Lewis last week declared that admission of Communist China would be the death of the UN. George Meany of the AFL warned against Soviet peace moves as leading toward "a new Munich." A joint statement by the CIO, AFL and UMW to the forthcoming Stockholm conference echoes all the rightist shibboleths about "appeasement" and "liberation". The leadership of American labor is close in spirit to that wing of the Republican party for which Knowland spoke last week when he called for the "calculated risk" of war with Russia if the Korean truce talks fail.

Where then can forces be mobilized to support the drive for peace in Korea and to block a new intervention if Rhee sets the war going again? Eisenhower himself is the focal point of a big business group which wants peace. Their voice was heard in the Senate on June 3 when Senator Edward Martin, Republican, of Pennsylvania, said he had always been a strong supporter of military preparedness but that he had become convinced that under present conditions "it is almost impossible to provide sufficient money to assure an adequate defense", and that "if the present armament race continues all the nations of the world will go bankrupt."

Senator Martin spoke in support of a disarmament resolution introduced that day by another Republican business man, Senator Flanders, of Vermont. This resolution, co-sponsored by an impressive list of Senators from both sides of the aisle, would instruct the President to "develop a plan for the transfer of resources and manpower now being used for arms to constructive ends at home and abroad." This echoes the suggestion put forward by Eisenhower in his speech to the American Society of Newspaper Editors. A recent Gallup poll shows 65 percent in favor of diverting defense funds to world reconstruction. This was essentially FDR's idea and Wallace's, as it was later McMahon's. Despite the ugly clamor of hate in the press, it always seems to strike a favorable response. This popular response is most encouraging for what it tells us about the innate kindness and good sense of most of our fellow Americans.

I suggest that this resolution and the President's efforts for peace in Korea provide points around which the peace forces in this country may again rally popular support. Truman-Acheson "total diplomacy" sought to make "peace" a subversive word and succeeded in reducing peace agitation to negligible proportions. Here is a chance to break out of the repressive strangle, to raise the peace issue in a context in which people will not be afraid to discuss it. I suggest that "Back Ike for Peace" is a slogan hard to beat. I also suggest that unless in every town and city of this country people begin to talk of peace and call for peace, the bright hope dawning over Panmunjom may yet be suddenly eclipsed in a new and more terrible and wider war.

Trial by Press and Pillory

Frank Coe and The Austrian Money Plot

There is much the newspapers failed to report about the interrogation by the McCarthy committee last week of Frank Coe, former secretary of the International Monetary Fund.

The most striking omission was McCarthy's Freudian "lapse of memory". The Senator asked Coe, "In 1950 when I named you before the Tydings committee and that committee found you simon pure, were you at that time engaged in espionage?" Coe declined to answer.

The proceedings were being televised and the effect on the unwary listener must have been how-right-McCarthy-was-all-the-time. But the record shows that McCarthy never named Coe in his famous State Department charges before the Tydings committee and Coe is nowhere mentioned in its report.

Coe and Bentley

Coe's ruin was a mention by Elizabeth Bentley. On July 31, 1948, she told the House Un-American Activities Committee that as a Soviet agent she had obtained information from a group in the Treasury. When she was concluding, the committee's Counsel, Robert Stripling, asked her "whether or not there is anyone else in this group that you have not named":

MISS BENTLEY. Frank Coe. . . .

MR. STRIPLING. He was a member of the Communist party, according to your information?

MISS BENTLEY. According to my understanding, yes.

Coe's Denial

Two weeks later Coe took the stand before the committee and swore that he was not a member of any espionage ring, that he never had been a member of any such group, that he had never been a member of the Communist party or followed its line, and that he had never given official information "to any unauthorized person."

Three years later Miss Bentley was before the McCarran committee in the Institute of Pacific Relations inquiry and Robert Morris, the committee counsel, asked her "do you know Frank Coe?"

"Not personally," was Miss Bentley's answer. "He, again, was a member of the Silvermaster group, worked in the Treasury Department. I collected his Communist party dues from the Silvermaster group, and it was my understanding from the Silvermasters, again, that he had been a member of the party for quite some time."

These "understandings" were vague. But Coe may have feared that with the

changing atmosphere they might be enough for a perjury conviction. When the McCarran committee put the same 1948 questions to him in December, 1952, Coe changed his tactics and pleaded the Fifth amendment, as he did last Friday. He thereby lost his job as secretary of the Fund.

McCarthy's Secret Mission

Mundt was on the House Un-American Activities Committee when it heard the Bentley testimony in 1948 and Coe's denials. He was acting chairman of the McCarthy committee at the May 29 hearing in McCarthy's absence.

After the May 29 session was over, committee aides leaked to the press a sensational story, "Coe Hunted, Linked to Red Finance Plot". The subcommittee's chairman, McCarthy, was in Mexico on what he said was a secret mission. So was Coe. Was McCarthy's "mission" to have been the dramatic arrest of Coe as a fugitive from justice?

If the Senator was planning a grandstand play in Mexico, Coe robbed him of a headline triumph. According to Coe's own statement, he read a brief account of the charges against him in a Mexican newspaper next morning, May 30, and immediately bought a ticket to return to the United States. En route to Washington, he telephoned his attorney to arrange for a hearing before the committee, which the latter did on June 1.

The hearing, on Friday June 5, just one week after that closed session, illustrated how delusive is the idea that an accused person has any hope of a fair chance to state his own side of the case before these inquisitorial committees.

Calumny by "Leak"

Damaging charges were given out to all the newspapers and wire services after the closed session of May 29 without waiting to get Coe's side of the story. The story pictured Coe as a fugitive and accused him of using his power as secretary of the Fund to try and block an Austrian currency devaluation favorable to the U. S. and opposed by the Soviet Union.

Coe came rushing back from Mexico and was heard by the committee in executive session on Wednesday, June 3. But Coe was not allowed to see a transcript of the May 29 hearing until *after* he had testified on June 3. This means that he had to testify without knowing fully the allegations against him or their source. These committee hearings are exercises in entrapment, and this is typical of their procedure.

Stock Questions

Coe came to the hearing with a prepared statement. The devaluation charges warranted investigation. They involved not only Coe's official conduct but the honor and reputation of an international agency. But the questions which consumed most of the session dealt with the old Bentley charges, the inference to be drawn from pleading the Fifth amendment, and whether Coe could call himself a good American (this is Senator Symington's stock question) and still decline to say if he had ever been a Communist.

Not until the session was almost over did the committee get around to asking him anything about the Austrian currency story. Coe then said it might save time and answer many questions in advance if he were allowed to read his statement.

"You yourself said," Coe pointed out to Senator Mundt, the acting chairman, "that at some proper point you would allow me to read a statement in my own defense."

Mundt said that under Senate rules a statement had to be submitted to the committee 24 hours in advance. Mundt said it would be printed in the record. This is one of the familiar committee devices for effectively preventing a witness from telling his side of a story. The record may not be available for weeks and by then the story has been buried in new sensations.

Defense Ignored

The witness may give out the statement to the press, as Coe did, but usually little attention is paid the statement, other than to note briefly that in it the accused denied the charges against him.

The reason for keeping the witness from reading his statement was obvious to those who had a chance to read it. There were points in it which explode the whole Austrian currency sensation.

Coe said that though the press was informed that the subcommittee had evidence of a message in which he tried to block Austrian devaluation, "I cannot find in the transcript that either Mr. King or Mr. Kerekes, the two witnesses involved, said that I sent such a message. The only places in the transcript where such a statement appears are in questions and comments of Mr. Cohn, counsel of the subcommittee."

Most newspaper readers knew from a statement issued by H. Merle Cochran, acting managing director of the International Monetary Fund, that Coe was on an official mission in the Middle East at the time of the Austrian negotiations.

(Continued on Page Three)

I. F. Stone's Weekly

• Editor and Publisher, I. F. STONE

Published weekly except the last two weeks of August at Room 205, 301 E. Capitol St., S.E., Washington 3, D. C. Subscription rates: Domestic, \$5 a year; Canada, Mexico and elsewhere in the Western Hemisphere, \$6; England and Continental Europe, \$10 by 1st class mail, \$15 by air; for Israel, Asia, Australia and Africa, \$10 by first class mail, \$20 by air mail. Single copy, 15 cents. Tel.: LI 4-7087. Entered as Second Class mail matter, Post Office, Washington, D. C.

June 13, 1953  Vol. I, No. 21

COMMENT

Journalistic Distinction

Now that the Supreme Court has unanimously overruled the U. S. Circuit Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia (see "Jim Crow in the Capital" in our issue of January 31) and held that Negroes must be served in Washington eating places, a new distinction has been conferred upon the National Press Club. It will be one of the last Jim Crow eating places left in the capital. Walter White was served there once by accident. William H. Hastie, first Negro to sit on the U. S. Circuit Court of Appeals, was refused service when taken there as a guest. As a private club, the National Press can go on insisting that it has a right to be lily-white.

Truman Era Law

A Truman majority on the U. S. Supreme Court has just approved a particularly noxious Truman era innovation in American law. To convict a man without disclosing the identity of his accuser or even the exact details of the accusation is an ancient evil. It gained a foothold here with the Truman loyalty order of 1947. This permitted the FBI to withhold from an accused government employe (and even from his judges) the source and precise nature of an accusation when such disclosure in the FBI's opinion might "endanger its sources of information." Thus the convenience of the secret police was held superior to a man's right fully to defend his reputation.

The spread of loyalty procedures into other fields has spread this fungoid jurisprudence with it. Chief Justice Vinson and the Truman majority have now permitted its extension into the trial of conscientious objectors under the draft law. Those febrile concepts of emergency and security which served to excuse the erosion of ancient liberties and safeguards under Truman echo in the reasoning of his judges.

Chief Justice Vinson ruled, "It is always difficult to devise procedures which will be adequate to do justice in cases where the sincerity of another's religious convictions is the ultimate factual issue. It is especially difficult when these procedures must be geared to meet the imperative needs of mobilization and national vigilance. . . . Under the circumstances", the court could not hold that fundamental rights had been (unduly) violated by the use of secret informer testimony. The excuse of vigilance is as ancient as the evil. "The enemy is not yet so near the gates," Mr. Justice Frankfurter commented dryly in dissenting for himself and Mr. Justices Black and Douglas, "that we should allow respect for the traditions of fairness, which has hitherto prevailed in this country, to be overborne by military exigencies."

Mr. Justice Douglas added a separate paragraph dissent for himself and Mr. Justice Black which we quote in full.

"The use of statements by informers, who need not confront the person under investigation or accusation," Mr. Justice Douglas said, "has such an infamous history that it should be rooted out from our procedure. A hearing at which these faceless people are allowed to present their whispered rumors and yet escape the test and torture of cross-examination is not a hearing in the Anglo-American sense. We should be done with the practice—whether the life of a man is at stake, or his reputation, or any matter touching upon his status or his rights.

"If FBI reports are disclosed in administrative or judicial proceedings," Mr. Justice Douglas continued, "it may be that valuable underground sources will dry up. But that is not the choice. If the aim is to protect the underground of informers,

the FBI report need not be used. If it is used, then fairness requires that the names of the accusers be disclosed. Without the identity of the informer the person investigated or accused stands helpless. The prejudices, the credibility, the passions, the perjury of the informer are never known. If they were exposed, the whole charge might wither under the cross-examination."

Unfortunately this is the dissent, not the holding. Whatever the tradition of Anglo-American law, American law as now handed down by the Truman judges permits the use of anonymous informants in the interests of "national vigilance". This was the same reasoning used in the degenerate days Tacitus describes when Imperial Rome honored its informers and strangled those suspected of "subversion", then as now often a synonym for independence of mind.

Dangerous Fellow

While we are on the subject, and if J. Edgar Hoover will keep our identity a secret, we are prepared to inform him that the FBI nurtures a subversive in its bosom.

The Washington Post's columnist on government employment, Jerry Kluttz, reported recently that FBI agents last year voluntarily worked 2,849,016 hours of (unpaid, of course) overtime.

An anonymous letter signed "Government Worker" in last Tuesday's *Washington Post* declared this overtime "about as voluntary as are the votes of the masses in totalitarian countries."

"If the FBI agent's work day must be 9, 10 or 11 hours," the letter continued indignantly, "the democratic way and the dignified way, would be to establish the length of the longer work-day and raise salaries accordingly."

The letter writer says that this overtime practice is "far too criminal and Communist-like" to be "allowed to continue in this democracy," but Mr. Hoover will not be fooled by such patriotic phrases.

That man's a menace. First thing you know radicals under interrogation by FBI men will be asking them, "Brother, are you getting overtime for this?" and passing out union membership applications.

Austrian Money Plot

(Continued from Page Two)

But in his own statement, Coe added that he wrote Cochran and asked whether the records of the Fund showed that any communication had been sent signed "Coe" or "Secretary" asking for postponement of the Austrian devaluation.

"From Mr. Cochran's oral reply," Coe said in his prepared statement, "it appears that not only was no such message ever sent by myself but also that no one

in my office in the Fund sent such a message, and further, that nobody at all in the Fund ever sent such a message."

Coe denied that he was in any sense a fugitive. He said he went to Mexico in search of employment and that at the time he left Washington "I was not under subpoena by any other committee of the Congress, by any existing grand jury, or by any other tribunal."

But little if any of this got through to the newspaper reader. The statement will not be available until the full record is printed, and then it may be buried in an

appendix since it was not actually read at the hearing. The committee, having had the benefit of two executive sessions, was forewarned that it would be better to change the subject.

There will probably be new sensations before this issue of the *Weekly* comes off the press, and the Austrian charges will be left to dissipate themselves in thin air like another McCarthy stinkbomb. The Coe affair again shows how helpless are the reputations of men and institutions when left to this process of trial by public pillory, Senatorial malice and the press.

JENNINGS PERRY'S PAGE

We Set the Stage for Doomsday—and Lower Taxes

I honestly forget whether it is the eleventh bomb or the seventeenth we've now set off this spring in Nevada. Or perhaps, counting the ones previously set off out in the islands, it is the seventeenth in all. The remarkable thing is that it doesn't seem much to matter lately; the bigger they come the less noise they make in the world.

The publicity comes harder all of the time. If the last bomb had not had to be postponed on account of the weather, it probably would not have been noticed east of the Mississippi, what with everybody sighing in his democratic beer over Elizabeth our undoubted Queen.

The event well may have implications reasonable men can accept without indigestible distress. It could be, that is, that the apparently general falling off of interest in the fireworks at Frenchman Flats is a sign not just of boredom, nor of resignation, but of adjustment.

Boredom cannot be ruled out altogether, since after awhile one cloud that looks like a mushroom does come to look very like another cloud that looks like a mushroom. Nor need we scout the possibility that many or most of us simply have made up our minds, as have the committee of experts set up under Mr. Kelly by former Defense Secretary Lovett, that there is nothing to be done about the A-bomb save the arms race eternal, that the vulnerability of all nations leaves no option to any save to strive forever to make itself more feared than it is afraid.

It is the third way of looking at it, however, which discovers to us a more bearable prospect. For if our tendency from day to day to take atomic explosions as a matter of course really means that we are becoming used to the idea of living henceforth under the possibility of an all-destroying atomic doomsday, our situation is not hopeless. Though we may not escape fear, and though we must continue yet awhile to find billions of dollars (and rubles) for the arms race, an end to our effort can be envisioned. When we shall have set the stage for the doomsday, we shall be able to return our attention to the primary problems of existence.

Obviously it would be ridiculous for mankind to furnish

itself with more than a single means of obliterating mankind. One sure bomb based either on fission or fusion will be sufficient. How long it will be before we possess the magisterial weapon cannot be predicted to the day or the year, but our invention and production is advancing with great strides. The last ruddy mushroom we have thumped up on the Nevada flats was ten times the size of the first one; the flash of it, it is said, was visible in Los Angeles, five hundred miles away.

Meanwhile, the people on the other side of the world are busy, too. Our new intelligence reports (adjusted to the Republican administration's goal of "maximum strength with minimum strain" intimate that the other people will have enough bombs to wage war in 1956. It could be that by then both sides will have enough bombs to assure beyond a doubt that if either side moves to wipe out the other, the retaliation will be automatic, inevitable and equal. In that case we shall have a precise balance of power, the power of complete destruction, and with it about as much security all around as anybody will need.

War will have been eliminated not by renunciation nor by disarmament; these preventives having required an act of intelligence the race is not yet up to; but by human effort nevertheless in building up a situation of mutual and consummate fear. We shall have with us the bomb that is as surely suicidal as it is surely murderous, and we shall be, no doubt, quite as capable of adapting ourselves to this new feature of our environment as we have been of adapting ourselves to other terrors bearing upon the fact of our mortality.

We shall not then be able to boast greatly of our accomplishment, but we shall have proved that humanity has the hardihood to survive the A-bomb—just as the housefly and the potato bug have had the hardihood to survive DDT. And with the ultimate bomb set up and triggered, we can cease our labors in that direction, save for maintenance. The arms race will be over. By billions of dollars and rubles our tax rate at last can be cut.

I. F. Stone's Weekly 6-13-53
 Room 205
 301 E. Capitol St., S.E., Washington 3, D. C.

Please enter the following subscription. \$5 for 1 year is enclosed. (See page 3 for foreign rates)

Name

Street

CityZone.....

State

I. F. Stone's Weekly
 Room 205
 301 E. Capitol St., S.E.,
 Washington 3, D. C.

Entered as
 Second Class Mail
 Matter
 Post Office
 Washington, D. C.

NEWSPAPER

I. F. Stone's Weekly



Einstein, Oxnam and The Witch-Hunters

I

The background against which Einstein has issued his call for civil disobedience of the witch hunters is encouraging. There are signs of a growing revulsion against Congressional Inquisition. McCarthy has had the guidance of Father Edmund A. Walsh at Washington's ancient Jesuit university, Georgetown. But at its sister institution in the capital, Catholic University, the principal address at the commencement exercises last week was devoted to warning the graduates against the hysteria fomented by Congressional investigating committees. The Archbishop of Washington, the Most Rev. Patrick A. O'Boyle, presided and "some politicians" were criticized for their readiness to "seize upon any issue, real or spurious, to boost their fame and publicity."

There were similar warnings from an unexpected source at Radcliffe. There the commencement speaker was Senator Stuart Symington, a business man and a right wing Democrat from Missouri, himself a member of the Senate Government Operations committee over which McCarthy presides. Symington has distinguished himself on the committee in the past by asking witnesses some remarkably inane questions about whether they believe in God. Just what their private theological opinions had to do with government operations, the committee's field of authority, has never been explained. But at Radcliffe Symington executed a quick metamorphosis and turned up as a liberal to warn that the recklessness of the Red hunters could easily turn into "a new reign of terror." Symington's sudden conversion on the road to Cambridge, Mass., was gratifying, though important chiefly as a weather indicator. Symington wants to be President, and is prepared to move left or right with the prevailing winds. Eisenhower's own gratifying remarks at Dartmouth will help turn those winds against the witch hunt.

Another hopeful development last week was the appointment of a three man subcommittee by the House Rules committee to study proposals for regulating Congressional investigations to assure "maximum fairness, dignity and efficiency." The subcommittee was suggested by two liberal-minded Republicans, Keating and Javits of New York, and had the approval of Speaker Martin. The chairman of the subcommittee is an Eisenhower Republican, Congressman Hugh Scott of Pennsylvania. Another Republican, Chenoweth of Colorado and one Democrat, Howard W. Smith of Virginia, will serve with him. Though the last is the "Smith" of the Smith Alien and Sedition Law, he is said to find McCarthyism a little too much for him. "The real offender," he declared at a hearing on proposed regulatory legislation, "is on the other side. We can only change House rules." The reference to "the other side" was to the other side of the Capitol where the Senate sits and McCarthy operates.

There are four bills before the House and two before the Senate for the reform and regulation of investigating committee procedures. One of them is by Celler of New York, who has the distinction of having cast one of the two solitary votes this year (Wier of Minnesota, the other) against the annual appropriation for the House Un-American Activities Committee. Celler's bill (H. Res. 86) would authorize the Judiciary Committee to investigate the investigators—to hold hearings on the conduct of Congressional investigating committees and draw up a code of fair procedure for them. This would give victims of the witch hunt a forum in which to state their case against the witch hunters, but it has little chance of being reported out for a vote. No sizeable section of Congress is in the mood for so thorough-going an inquiry. But enough Congressmen have been hearing from home, chiefly because of the threat to investigate the churches, to make some semblance of activity on the subject desirable.

II

The regulatory bills themselves are less than drastic. H. Res. 29 by Keating of New York provides that the subject of the inquiry shall be clearly stated; that the witness, unless the majority decides otherwise, shall have the right of counsel; that every witness at the close of his testimony shall have the right to make "a brief oral or written statement"; that an accurate stenographic record shall be kept of all proceedings and made available to witnesses; and that any person defamed by testimony shall have the right to file a sworn statement, appear on his own behalf and, if a majority of the committee permits, cross-examine adverse witnesses and subpoena witnesses on his own behalf. This is hardly enough to end Inquisition into men's beliefs.

H.R. 4123 by Javits of New York is lengthier but no more fundamental. It provides that no major investigation shall be initiated without approval of a majority of the committee; that a majority vote shall be required for the holding of executive hearings, the release of secret testimony, and the publication of reports; "that no committee shall circulate on its letterhead or over the signature of its members or its employes charges against individuals or organizations except as the committee by a majority vote shall determine". In other respects the Javits bill is the same as Keating's, except that persons injured by testimony would be allowed (with majority consent) to submit questions to adverse witnesses through the committee instead of cross-examining directly.

H. R. 178 by Klein of New York is identical with S. Res. 83 introduced in the Senate by Morse and Lehman. This is much like the two bills already summarized except that it allows somewhat broader powers to defense counsel at hearings: counsel may not only advise the witness but make ob-

Einstein, Oxnam and the Witch-Hunters

jections and support those objections with "brief statements" and legal memoranda. No report based on adverse testimony or the adverse testimony itself may be issued "unless . . . the complete evidence or testimony offered in rebuttal thereto, if any, is published prior to or simultaneously with the issuance of the report."

All these bills assume that the situation would be materially improved if committee actions were dependent on majority vote instead of being left as so often happens to the chairman or the staff. But there is no reason to believe that McCarthy, Jenner and Velde cannot on most matters command a majority of their respective committees, or that the majority on these committees is better than the chairman. The *reductio ad absurdum* of this approach, and the most vivid illustration of the failure to deal with the basic evils, may be found in two provisions of Senate Concurrent Resolution 10, introduced by Kefauver and supported by an impressive list of Senators from both parties, including Hunt, Magnuson, Pastore, Mrs. Smith, Hennings, Neely, Murray, Ives and Morse. Section 5 of this measure says, "No subpoena to inquire into the private affairs of any individual shall be issued to any committee except pursuant to majority vote of the committee." And Section 7 says, "No witness before a committee shall be compelled to testify as to his religious or political belief unless the committee rules by majority vote that such testimony is relevant to the inquiry."

This is to say that a committee of Congress has the right to compel a witness to testify on his private affairs and his religious or political beliefs if a majority of the committee approves. The vice of all these bills is that they imply an unlimited right of inquiry on the part of Congress and assume that only procedural reforms are necessary to correct abuse.

III

The First Amendment says Congress "shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion." This means that it can establish no standard of orthodoxy. Can it inquire into beliefs it may not regulate? There are many Catholics and not a few Protestants who believe that heterodox opinions on certain fundamental religious dogmas create a political danger for the State by leading directly to "subversive" political views. But this connection of political danger with theological error is hardly new. The Pilgrim Fathers fled from just such inquisition in the England of their time and the provision against an Established Church was intended to prevent the development of similar practices here.

A characteristic of the American system is the denial of absolute powers to the government or any of its coordinate branches. No one would argue that Congress may pass a law taking a man's property without compensation or his life without trial. But the notion has grown up that the Congressional power of investigation, unlike all other governmental powers, is virtually unlimited. The recent Rumely decision was only the latest in a series of Supreme Court opinions which have held to the contrary, though the court has yet to apply the same protection to the privacy of men's

minds that it has in the past to the privacy of their moneyed accounts.

The witch hunt abuses of our time find their support in two fallacies which have nothing to do with the legitimate exercise of the Congressional power of investigation. One is that while Congress has no power to regulate opinion it has a right to expose, disgrace and pillory holders of opinions it regards as dangerous, subversive, heretical or un-American. The other is that which permits a committee of Congress to act as a roving grand jury for the discovery and punishment of individual crimes.

A section of the Fifth Amendment to which amazingly little attention has been paid in the current controversy over Congressional investigation says, "No person shall be held to answer for a capital or otherwise infamous crime, unless on a presentment or indictment of a grand jury." The purpose was to protect accused persons from having to stand the shame of public accusation and the expense of trial until a grand jury in secret session had determined that there was enough substance in any charge to warrant publicity and trial.

Ever since Martin Dies and John Rankin these Congressional committees have announced their determination to act as a peculiar new type of "grand jury", operating in public and more than content to leave the stigma of serious crime by hit-or-miss questioning of the sort that has been well termed a "fishing expedition." Congressman Keating referred to this type of abuse in a thoughtful speech last month to the San Francisco Bar Association. Keating said that an area which "should be scrupulously avoided" by Congressional committees "is the domain of law enforcement officers and the criminal courts." Keating pointed out that "Only in the case of impeachment does Congress have the right to determine whether a particular individual has committed a specific crime against society." None of the reform proposals now in Congress would prevent investigating committees from acting as quasi grand juries nor as pillories for holders of unpopular opinions.

IV

In this ripening situation, with public opinion slowly being aroused, Einstein's proposal for civil disobedience of the Congressional Inquisitors has the merit of getting down to rock-bottom. What McCarthy, Jenner and Velde are doing is wrong. It is therefore wrong to submit to them. They are poisoning the air of America and making people in all walks of life fearful of expressing opinions which may be a little "controversial." It is in this way that they are beginning to impose thought control.

The *New York Times*, objecting to civil disobedience of the witch hunters, says, "Two wrongs never did add up to one right." The old chestnut, in this sense, is quite untrue. Gandhi made two "wrongs" add up to one right by refusing to pay the British salt tax. Long before Gandhi, an earlier generation of Americans made two wrongs add up to one right by dumping that tea in Boston harbor rather than pay the British tax upon it. The white folk of the North who

Who Will Take The "Einstein Pledge"?

refused to obey the Fugitive Slave Law were adding the "wrong" of civil disobedience to the wrong of slavery, and these ultimately added up to the right of emancipation. Even more in point is the fact that our privilege against self-incrimination derives in large part from the civil disobedience of John Lilburne, who refused to testify before Star Chamber in 1637 when accused of importing heretical works from Holland and asked to identify his collaborators. The evil of compulsory testimony from which the Pilgrims fled to this country was eradicated by his bravery in refusing to testify at the expense of going to jail for contempt.

The need for such fundamental defiance is illustrated by the objections advanced against it. "One cannot start," the *New York Times* said, "from the premise that Congressional committees have no right to question teachers and scientists or to seek out subversives wherever they can find them; what is profoundly wrong is the way some of them have been exercising it." The fact is that one cannot start from any other premise without making defeat inevitable. To accept ideological interrogation is to make non-conformist views of any kind hazardous. To permit Congress to seek out something as vague, undefined and undefinable as "subversion" or "un-Americanism" is to acquiesce in a heresy hunt that must inhibit free discussion in America. One man's "subversion" is another man's progress; all change subverts the old in preparing the way for the new. "Un-American" is an epithet, not a legal standard.

The *New York Times* says "An investigation which had no taint of witch-hunting, no bias of anti-intellectualism, no prejudice, no distorted ideas of what is guilt and subversion would be irreproachable." A censorship of such immaculate virtues would also be irreproachable, but the Framers of the Bill of Rights thought it safer to rely on free discussion than on the miraculous possibility that the Archangel Gabriel might decide to take the civil service exam for the office of censor.

The *New York Times* says "it is one thing to fight the investigations because of the manner of their procedure and another to oppose the right of investigation, which has always been one of the fundamentals of our governmental system." Investigations have been fundamental but the kind of investigations utilized in this witch hunt are something new in American life. The first Congressional committee of this kind was the Hamilton Fish investigation in 1930, the Red-hunt precursor of the un-American Activities Committee. The idea that a committee of Congress could interrogate Americans on their political beliefs is a revolutionary excrescence not a fundamental of American government in the past.

V

One need only compare Einstein's approach with Bishop Oxnham's to see how right the great physicist is. One cannot at one and the same time object to investigation of the churches by the House Un-American Activities Committee and the Senate Internal Security subcommittee and at the same time insist on a hearing before them as the good Bishop has done. To ask for a hearing is to acquiesce in the committee's power, to establish a precedent by which other clergymen

may be hauled into the pillory. To defend oneself, as the Bishop did in that famous point-by-point rejoinder the *Washington Post* published last April 5, is to cut the ground out from under any principled objection to the Inquisition. To plead that one is not "subversive" by the standards of the Committee or of that ex parte blacklist drawn up by the Attorney General is to accept their right to establish a standard of orthodoxy and heresy in American political and religious thinking.

No one can "clear" himself or defend himself fairly before one of these committees. James Wechsler's experience before McCarthy should be demonstration enough of that. We are not dealing with men anxious to learn the truth or prepared to act honorably. We are dealing with unscrupulous political adventurers using the Red menace as their leverage to power. To try and explain to them that one is not a Communist is as humiliating as it is useless, unless one is prepared to go over completely to their service.

At the same time these committees regard the invocation of the Fifth amendment with equanimity. To invoke the Fifth is to brand oneself in the eyes of the public as guilty of any offense implied by the dirty questions these committees put. Those who plead the Fifth in most cases lose their jobs and reputations. This satisfies the committees, for their purpose is nothing less than an ideological purge of radicals and liberals from all positions of influence in American life and the demonstration to others that non-conformity is dangerous.

VI

Great faiths can only be preserved by men willing to live by them. Faith in free society requires similar testament if it is to survive. Einstein knows Fascism at first hand. History confirms his statement that "if enough people are ready to take this grave step" of defiance "they will be successful" but that if not "the intellectuals of this country deserve nothing better than the slavery which is intended for them."

The path pointed out by Einstein is that taken by the Hollywood Ten and the directors of the Joint Anti-Fascist Refugee Committee, all of whom went to jail for contempt. But tactics that did not succeed at a time when the cold war was begun may fare differently now when it is ebbing away. The Supreme Court did not hear those earlier cases and there has never been final adjudication on two major points of attack against the committees. One is whether they violate the First Amendment by inquiring into beliefs and the other whether they violate the Fifth Amendment by arrogating to themselves the functions of a grand jury. Neither point can be tested until someone dares invite prosecution for contempt.

This is the moment to try. Einstein has lent the world prestige of his name to such an effort. These committees deserve contempt, and I predict that another of the chairmen will follow J. Parnell Thomas to jail. I propose an association of American intellectuals to take the "Einstein pledge" and throw down a fundamental challenge to the establishment of an Inquisition in America.

JENNINGS PERRY'S PAGE

In Italy Vox Populi Tells Off Lord and Lady

It is too early, perhaps, to suggest recalling our ambassador from Rome for failure of mission. Our man for premier, Alcide de Gasperi, is in again by a mere squeak, it is true. As a result all sorts of troubles may be ahead of him. He may have to bring the Monarchists into his government. He may even find it necessary to water down his support of NATO in order to pull enough left Socialists to the side of his Christodemocrats to be able to govern at all.

But our Ambassador has done what she could, according to her lights, for the advancement of our foreign policy. Her intervention in the internal affairs of the Italian people, whether on her own or at the direction of her State Department superiors, employed the same wiles which, in her experience, had worked with other electorates. She cajoled, she warned, she threatened. How could she have known the Italians would take amiss what so recently her own countrymen had relished?

One of the telling—if low—blows struck in last year's American election was a fee-fi-fo-fum production put on the air with great artistry by Mrs. Luce at the very close of the campaigning. The piece was mainly a play back of excerpts of testimony recorded at various congressional loyalty inquiries and its purpose was to scare up Republican votes with the thought, archly supplied by the fair platter spinner, that the choice was between Eisenhower and—Stalin. That show went over big, and it was partly because of the lady's *success* in the political theater that in due course she was sent with ambassadorial rank to charm Rome and keep the Italian wards in line.

In Italy, Mrs. Luce campaigned to the same effect though less dramatically. A few days before the election, she called for an overwhelming vote for "stable, democratic government," for our friend Signor De Gasperi; or, as the British New Statesman pungently noted, for "domination by the conservative, clerical Centre." She did not, indeed, warn that the alternative was to turn the country over to the Communists, but adroitly as the American spokesman let fall a caution that, if the country should go Left, it need look no more to the American treasury for comfort and aid.

I find it hard to agree with some critics that popular resentment of our Ambassador's "impertinence" was entirely responsible for the disappointing outcome of the election, or, for all of that, that our side still may not find something in the outcome that is gratifying. The Communists and the Socialist followers of Signor Nenni did gain, of course, as did the smaller Monarchist and Fascist parties of the Right extreme. But De Gasperi's coalition of moderate parties came out nevertheless with slender majorities in the senate and the chamber of deputies.

De Gasperi himself does not despair. By no means the "stable" government our Ambassador called for, the Premier's new administration counts about the same preponderance of its partisans in the legislative body as does the Eisenhower administration in the United States in the American Congress. Its necessity of relying on the Monarchists for support in a pinch ought not to be too grave a handicap: the Republicans over here have found it possible to summon votes from the opposition benches for their pet measures time and again.

As for "democratic" government, if that is our real concern, the Italian people seem inclined to practice it with full faith and fervor, casting in last week's election very near 100 per cent of the vote to which their law entitles them. The fact itself that the balloting did not go overwhelmingly as Mrs. Luce advised it to go is evidence that these people take their freedom seriously, equating the right to vote with the right to choose. For reasons sufficient to them many Italians voted left who have not voted left before and were stopped neither by the threat that American aid would be withdrawn nor by the more terrible threat, issuing from the Vatican, that their souls would be denied paradise.

This would be the doughtiest democracy, I suppose, where the electorate refuses to be either bought or intimidated, where any dictate is scorned and where the people headily regard themselves competent to pass on the public affairs. Ambassador Luce has been unable to fascinate or overawe the self-conscious Italian democrats. They probably admire her looks and cleverness. It would be a pity to bring her back before she completely appreciates their political independence.

I. F. Stone's Weekly

• Editor and Publisher, I. F. STONE

Published weekly except the last two weeks of August at Room 205, 301 E. Capitol St., S.E., Washington 3, D. C. Subscription rates: Domestic, \$5 a year; Canada, Mexico and elsewhere in the Western Hemisphere, \$6; England and Continental Europe, \$10 by 1st class mail, \$15 by air; for Israel, Asia, Australia and Africa, \$10 by first class mail, \$20 by air mail. Single copy, 15 cents. Tel.: LI 4-7087. Entered as Second Class mail matter, Post Office, Washington, D. C.

June 20, 1953



Vol. I, No. 22

I. F. Stone's Weekly

Room 205

301 E. Capitol St., S.E.,

Washington 3, D. C.

NEWSPAPER

Entered as
Second Class Mail
Matter
Post Office
Washington, D. C.

I. F. Stone's Weekly

VOL. I NUMBER 23

JUNE 27, 1953



WASHINGTON, D. C.

15 CENTS

Only Rhee's Removal Can Save Peace

Next month may prove to be the most critical July since 1914. A headstrong satellite, secretly abetted by officials pursuing incendiary policies of their own, may again be able to plunge the reluctant great Powers into a war for which they have long been preparing. One difference is that today we have two Serbias—Germany as well as Korea. It is too early to tell whether the East German disorders represent a spontaneous worker uprising—it is difficult to associate spontaneity with the German character—or coordinated action exploiting labor grievances but carefully prepared by a military underground for some crucial moment. The moment for the Reich is crucial; beyond Bermuda looms the possibility of a Big Four or Big Five gathering—and Adenauer's anguished comments reveal how clearly the Germans understand that their bargaining power and recovery depend on the maintenance of East-West hostility. The East German "revolt" may help to upset Churchill's plans for a relaxation of tension.

The importance of the German rising lies in its effect on Moscow and Washington. Here it is strengthening those liberationist delusions so prominent in last year's campaign. Eisenhower, said the June 26 issue of *U. S. News and World Report*, "is beginning to be a little less eager to follow the lead of Sir Winston Churchill" since "German workers showed some disdain for the might of Russia." It reports triumphantly that John Foster Dulles would like to say "I told you so" to the British "who have ridiculed his idea that there is real sentiment in Eastern Europe for liberation from Communist rule." American military officers—according to the same source—have started figuring "how many Russian divisions would be required to police all of the cities of Eastern Europe in event of real trouble with the people of satellite countries." It is on such hashish that the Germans feed their dream of a new American-financed *drang nach Osten*.

The effect on Moscow may be as bad. Churchill in his historic speech calling for an end of the cold war laid great stress on the changes which had occurred within Russia since Stalin's death. He warned against doing anything which might "impede any spontaneous and healthy evolution which may be taking place in Russia." The German disorders followed on the heels of sweeping changes in the East German regime, which included plans for de-communizing and de-militarizing that Soviet satellite in preparation for peaceful unification of the Reich. The violent reaction in East Germany might have been calculated to discredit those forces in the new Russian regime which have advocated more moderate policies at home and abroad. A return to the rudeness and rigidity which were such prominent features of Russian diplomacy under Stalin would serve German purposes by making relaxation of world tension less likely.

A fear that moderation may be taken as a sign of weakness

has haunted nations into war before, and may play its part in the equally fateful and even more critical events unfolding on the other side of Eurasia. The release by Syngman Rhee of war prisoners was an affront to the new China, done without any face-saving disclaimers or subterfuges. Rhee boldly took responsibility for his action. It was important to his plans that there be no appearance of accident. The purpose was to inflict a maximum loss of face on the enemy, and to bring into sharp relief the inability or the unwillingness of the American government to control Rhee. According to a United Press dispatch from Tokyo published by the *New York Times* on June 19, General Mark W. Clark knew that Rhee would not hand over the prisoners, "Dr. Rhee told him so" and "General Clark had notified Washington that he thought Dr. Rhee's first move against the truce agreement might be the release of the 34,000 anti-Communist North Korean captives."

General Clark's explanation last Sunday was as weak as it was wordy. The Chinese can hardly be blamed if they see bad faith. There was at least criminal weakness, a weakness for which a heavy cost in lives may yet be paid. And there is no sign as yet that either Washington or Tokyo HQ is prepared to learn anything from this experience. Rhee showed that he was not bluffing. He wanted this war; he may have started it; he has tried to block a truce every time one seemed possible; and he has said that he would not abide by a truce if it were reached. Our irresolution is his strength. It is folly to believe that a truce can be reached without him *so long as he remains in power in South Korea*. He can prevent the neutral commissioners from landing. He can start the war up again and force the U. S. to support him for inescapable reasons of prestige, strategy and domestic politics. There will be peace only if the U. S. has the resolution to impose martial law, remove Rhee from power and deal directly with those elements in South Korea which want peace, relentlessly smashing the mercenary and terroristic "youth groups" on which Rhee's power largely depends.

At the moment there seems no possibility whatsoever of such drastic action, though Congress is sick of the war; McCarthy and McCarran significantly were the only voices raised in support of Rhee. Those who think Rhee really speaks for South Korea should read the article by a former British official of the United Nations Korean Reconstruction Agency in the June 20 issue of the *London New Statesman*. It reveals the stage-managing and the paid demonstrators which have gone into the anti-truce rallies of the past, and it points out that "it was only the support of the U. S. Army which kept Rhee from being deposed" in his clash with the National Assembly last June: "Even the heads of the Korean Army and Navy opposed him." If Rhee is not removed, the war will go on. If he has his way, Seoul will yet be our Sarajevo.

Rosenberg Aftermath: Wild Words Will Not Help Peace

The ghost of the Rosenberg case will haunt the United States for a long time to come. The sentence was barbaric. The speed with which it was imposed last week was indecent. It is almost as if the government were afraid that if the Rosenbergs were not killed as quickly as possible the case might blow up in its face. The Attorney General, in the application which led the Supreme Court swiftly to reconvene, said it was important "in the national interests that this case be brought to a final determination as expeditiously as possible." Mr. Brownell never put forward a more dubious proposition.

On the contrary, just because there had been fantastic distortions in the world-wide campaign for the Rosenbergs, it was important in the national interest that the convicted couple be given every right due them under the law, that doubt of their guilt be allayed, and that we show the same "decent respect for the opinion of mankind" we ourselves invoked at an earlier stage of our history. When a campaign for clemency enlists the Pope, when so famous an atomic scientist as Dr. Harold C. Urey questions the verdict, the national interest called for cautious deliberation rather than speed. As it is, the execution will seem a slap in the face to millions the world over. The final touch was moving the execution back a few hours so as not to conflict with the Jewish Sabbath! That the defense was equally hypocritical in exploiting religious sentiments which meant little to the Rosenbergs or most of their supporters does not make the government's action less sickening.

Some forgotten history may throw new light on the terrible events of the past week and on Justice Douglas's courageous last-minute attempt to stay the execution. When the Atomic Energy Act was originally drafted by the McMahon committee, it not only contained no death penalty for atomic espionage but provided that no prosecution might be initiated without consultation by the Attorney General with the Atomic Energy Commission. The purpose, as the National Committee for Civilian Control of Atomic Energy protested when this provision was taken out of the bill in the House, was to protect scientists against reckless accusations. "Since atomic energy is a field of sensational publicity value, and subject to possible hysteria," the Committee wrote, "this consultation provision was designed to assure that prosecutions would not be initiated without review by persons having the technical and scientific background necessary to determine the significance of the acts complained of."

In the light of the Rosenberg case, the protest seems prophetic. Had the provision remained in the bill as passed, there could hardly have been all the exaggeration in which the prosecution, the judge and the press have indulged. Whatever Greenglass and the Rosenbergs may have given the Russians, it was hardly the "secret" of the atom bomb. A case in which the Atomic Energy Commission participated would have deflated the charges. Unfortunately protest did not succeed in restoring this provision.

It was also in the House that an amendment by Hatton W. Sumners of Texas added the death penalty to the bill. This passed without debate or roll-call. The Senate conferees objected strongly to the death penalty but the best they could

wring from the House was a further amendment specifying that neither the death penalty nor life imprisonment could be imposed except on recommendation of the jury and "only in cases where the offense was committed with intent to injure the United States."

This is where Justice Douglas came in. The application of this law to the Rosenberg case would have upset the verdict. The death penalty had not been recommended by the jury. There had been no attempt to prove intent to harm the United States, since the U. S. and the U.S.S.R. were war-time allies at the time the theft of atomic information is supposed to have occurred. The maximum penalty under the Atomic Energy Act would therefore have been 20 years in jail.

As applied to the Rosenberg case, the question is a difficult one. They were tried and sentenced to death under the Espionage Act of 1917. The overt acts occurred in 1944 and 1945; the Atomic Energy Act was not passed until 1946. But this was a conspiracy indictment and the conspiracy was alleged to have continued until 1950. There is also a doctrine which holds that where a man is tried for a crime, and the penalty is reduced by law before he is tried, he has a right to the lesser penalty, even though the crime was committed before the penalty was reduced.

The government countered with another argument. The Espionage Act, as the *Washington Post* said in an editorial last Saturday, "was in no way limited or changed by the Atomic Energy Act. Consequently, there was no warrant for the stay granted by Justice Douglas." The premise is too sweeping; the conclusion, fallacious. It is true that the section of the Atomic Energy Act which deals with unlawful handling of information says "This section shall not exclude the applicable provisions of any other laws . . ." But it also adds, "except that no government agency shall take any action under such other laws inconsistent with the provisions of this section." What does one do in a case where the Espionage Act calls for the death penalty and the Atomic Energy Act for 20 years in jail? Obviously the question cannot be resolved as easily as the *Washington Post's* formulation would imply.

The authoritative work on the subject, "The Control of Atomic Energy," by James R. Newman and Byron S. Miller, gives a different answer. Newman was counsel and Miller assistant counsel to the McMahon committee in the framing of the Atomic Energy Act. "We do not see," they wrote, "how it is possible to hold other than that when Congress adopted Section 10 of the Atomic Energy Act it intended to prescribe the exact punishment to be applied for all violations involving the unlawful dissemination of restricted atomic energy data." Their opinion in that book published five years ago was that, in saying the applicable provisions of other laws were not to be excluded, Congress "meant to guard against possible omissions rather than to give a prosecutor the option of proceeding under other laws against offenses fully covered by the Atomic Energy Act for the sole reason that under such other laws these offenses bore heavier penalties."

The passage quoted foreshadowed the problem raised before Justice Douglas. "The difference," Newman and Miller

(Continued on Page Three)

I. F. Stone's Weekly

• Editor and Publisher, I. F. STONE

Published weekly except the last two weeks of August at Room 205, 301 E. Capitol St., S.E., Washington 3, D. C. Subscription rates: Domestic, \$5 a year; Canada, Mexico and elsewhere in the Western Hemisphere, \$6; England and Continental Europe, \$10 by 1st class mail, \$15 by air; for Israel, Asia, Australia and Africa, \$10 by first class mail, \$20 by air mail. Single copy, 15 cents. Tel.: LI 4-7087. Entered as Second Class mail matter, Post Office, Washington, D. C.

June 27, 1953  Vol. I, No. 23

Comment

Best news of the week and the most unexpected was the 4-3 Supreme Court decision reversing the conviction of Harry Bridges, and his two associates in the longshoremen's union, Henry Schmidt and J. R. Robertson. It is now 20 years since the government began its long campaign to deport or jail Bridges. Will the government make itself look ridiculous by trying again?

Next best was the Court's 6-1 decision in *Barrows v. Jackson* giving what appears to be the final death blow to racial restrictive covenants in real estate. Chief

Justice Vinson, who seems to be becoming the extreme right wing of this court, was the lone dissenter.

Warning to students: A government employe from out-of-town, visiting with friends in the civil service, passes on and vouches for this story. An FBI-man, during the course of asking a local government employe about a man he was investigating, said: "When I come across applicants from certain big city colleges and I see that they say they did not belong to the American Student Union or the Young Communist League or any other radical organization while they were in college, then I really get suspicious. I ask them, 'Why, didn't you belong?'"

Compliment, well, sort of: Two readers have sent in clippings of an editorial from the *Minneapolis Star* of June 6. "Now and then," said the *Star*, "even the wrong-headedest dissenter says something worth listening to. The ultra-Left I. F. Stone does so in writing about the deportation of Cedric Belfrage, English editor of the pro-Communist *National Guardian*." The editorial goes on to quote liberally from our issue of June 30 and concludes by saying, "With Belfrage's refusal to testify we have no patience, and for his departure we have no fears. But what Stone says about the real threat of McCarthyism to the American concept of freedom and justice is profoundly true. Dont shrug it off just because a pinko said it."

Hat's Off: To Senator Lehman of New York, the Senate's most consistent opponent of "creeping Fascism", for his great Jackson Day dinner speech at Milwaukee last Saturday, taking the offensive against McCarthyism and attacking those who turn "the legislative branch into a series of star chambers, with unchecked power of destruction over the lives and reputations of countless individuals."

And while we're on the subject: McCarthy's resurrection of J. B. Matthews to be his principal assistant in witch-hunting, should serve to alert the clergy to the need for some kind of organization of mutual aid and counter-attack. A taste of what may be coming is provided in Matthews' article in the July *American Mercury*, which begins, "The largest single group supporting the Communist apparatus in the United States today is composed of Protestant clergymen." Note the adjective, "Protestant."

Recommended: Helen Bryan's "Inside" (Houghton Mifflin, \$3), an account of her stay in prison for contempt of the House Un-American Activities Committee, by the executive secretary of the Joint Anti-Fascist Refugee Committee. Written with simplicity, humanity and insight, as gripping as a first-rate novel, generally cold-shouldered by the literary reviews for political reasons. You won't put it down once you start reading.

Wild Words Will Not Help Peace

(Continued from Page Two)

said of the conflict between the two acts, "can only be resolved by judicial decision." This is how Justice Douglas was trying to resolve them when the full court was hastily convened. Counsel had to argue the merits before the full court on a day's notice, against the background of a demand in Congress for the impeachment of Justice Douglas and pressure for haste from the Attorney General. This was hardly full and fair consideration of such subtle questions, especially in a case where the lives of the appellants were at stake.

Had the stay remained in effect, it would have given the defense time to press on with its petition for a new trial on the basis of new evidence. The motion for a new trial rejected last month by Judge Kaufman contains material which casts doubt on the verdict, notably the production of the console table which figured so strikingly *in absentia* at the trial. This deserved a fuller review than the cursory hearing given counsel for the Rosenbergs in the Circuit Court. It was not in the interests of justice or the good name of the United States to execute sentence before this evidence could be evaluated. The many "reviews" supposedly granted in the case were mainly refusals to review and as Justice Black said, "It is not amiss to

point out that this Court has never reviewed this record and has never affirmed the fairness of the trial below."

There were dangerous myths germinated in this case, and it is tragic that there may now be no way finally and definitely to expunge them. One is the myth, which began with Judge Kaufman and runs through President Eisenhower's denial of clemency, that the Rosenbergs somehow gave the Russians the "secret" of the atom bomb; one has only to read the testimony of General Groves in the framing of the Atomic Energy Act to see what nonsense this is.

The other myth arose from the constant effort of the defense to equate the United States with Nazi Germany; to picture the Rosenbergs as the victims of a racist murder and anti-Semitic plot. This fit neatly with Soviet propaganda but it hurt the Rosenbergs more than it helped them; it antagonized the American Jewish community; it was poisonous folly. The final straw was the readiness of those who propagated the "Nazi America" line to believe the worst about the accused Jewish doctors in Moscow and the Joint Distribution Committee before the new Malenkov regime suddenly reversed the verdict.

The haste with which the Rosenbergs were executed after three years is hardly

the same kind of haste with which the Czechs shot Slansky overnight, without appeal. In the Soviet bloc, where there has been little justice and less mercy, there is no cause to condemn the treatment of the Rosenbergs. When persons accused of espionage and counter revolutionary activity in the Soviet zone are allowed to agitate and defend themselves, when independent counsel are permitted to defend them and attack the government, then the Communist movement will have grounds for criticism. But by the standards of law and justice in which we purport to believe the Rosenberg case will appear more plainly with the years to have been a shameful episode in cold war hysteria. The contrast with the treatment of the Fuchs and Allen Nunn May cases in England is not flattering to ourselves. It is still not clear just what the Rosenbergs did nor clear beyond a reasonable doubt that they did it.

Their composure was impressive, their conduct in the face of death heroic. They deserve a better tribute than the wild and irresponsible outpourings which marked their funeral. It will be more than a pity if a campaign to clear their name is carried on in the same mood. It will be a downright menace to the fight for peace and a saner world.

JENNINGS PERRY'S PAGE

A Remarkable Faith Furnished Farmer's Wings

Less than 24 hours before Judge Kaufman summarily turned down his plea for a writ of habeas corpus for the Rosenbergs, styling him "intruder and interloper," my friend and neighbor Fyke Farmer sat in my study 1100 miles from New York explaining his necessity and cherishing his remarkable faith.

He had just sent off two wires. One to Dan Marshall in Los Angeles asking him to join him in the plea. Another to the Rosenbergs' attorneys in New York advising them that he would be in his hotel there after midnight. He had his packed briefcase and his plane reservation. What he did not have, three hours before plane time, was his fare or the means of meeting his hotel bill.

Farmer believes the Rosenbergs to be innocent. At that time, he believed also that Judge Kaufman would listen "fair-mindedly" to his grounds for staying the execution of the Rosenbergs. Only a few days previously he had been present as an observer when the Judge had denied the last defense plea for a rehearing and had been impressed by what he took to be the efforts of the bench to evoke a better presentation of the defense.

Farmer was unnoticed at that hearing. A Times reporter had spoken to him in the corridor; a Herald-Tribune man had asked him for some "background." His interest in the case was not considered important. For weeks, he had been trying to persuade the defense attorneys to take up his contention that the Rosenbergs had been illegally sentenced to death, but his points of law had not been pressed in court.

He had been compelled to interrupt the preparation of his own brief, which he was determined to file independently as a last resort, and return home for the wedding of his daughter. The trip had exhausted his funds. His unfinished brief remained in New York; he had unsuccessfully offered it to the Rosenbergs' lawyers. He could not pay the stenographer's fee . . .

The mockingbirds in the trees at my house sang excitedly as the day wore on and the air was refreshed by the coming evening. It was one hour till plane time. My friend's dark eyes kindled with anxiety. It was too late now to call

the few people we knew in distant cities who "might help."

"These people ought not to die," Farmer protested, rising and pacing the narrow room. "They are innocent. But right now it is just a question of that—of keeping them from dying. Nobody really wants them to die."

I agreed with him that in all probability the members of the Supreme Court would welcome a presentation of the matter on a valid point of law that would be new in the case, whereby without abandoning any position already taken by the Court they might spare the Rosenbergs and square their own—and the national—conscience. I tried to share his conviction that there "must be a way" of reaching the court with his plea. But it was very late . . .

I have known Farmer for years, the humanity of his views, the headlong sincerity of his drives and the "reckless" optimism of his faith in the essential goodness and rationality of the race. His training is in law. He has no doubt but that in our moments of great resolve we have subscribed to compacts sufficient to bring peace and to insure individual liberties—if only, and simply, we will "just live up to our laws."

Three months ago he was aroused to the possibility of a miscarriage of justice in the Rosenberg case by a letter written by the wife of a member of the faculty at Fisk University. He procured a transcript of the case and studied it day and night. It appeared to him not only that these people were innocent of the crime charged but that their civil rights had been abrogated through the failure of defense counsel to point out fatal errors in their prosecution by the Government.

He had no hesitancy now about "intruding" in the case; he did not weigh decorum against his purpose. There was an effort on the side of justice to be made, and what did it matter that he was an outsider and unknown? What immediately mattered was that the court of first contest was hundreds of miles away, that he had a plane seat and no fare.

Unfortunately I could only wish him well. He left my house cheerfully, knowing where he was going but not how. "You may hear of me," he said. "I'll do my best." I do not yet know

We canvassed the corners where he might hope to obtain even \$100. There seemed no real hope in any corner . . .

I. F. Stone's Weekly 6-27-53

Room 205
301 E. Capitol St., S.E., Washington 3, D. C.

Please enter the following subscription. \$5 for 1 year is enclosed. (See page 3 for foreign rates)

Name

Street

CityZone.....

State

I. F. Stone's Weekly

Room 205

301 E. Capitol St., S.E.,

Washington 3, D. C.

NEWSPAPER

Entered as
Second Class Mail
Matter
Post Office
Washington, D. C.

I. F. Stone's Weekly

VOL. I NUMBER 24

JULY 4, 1953



WASHINGTON, D. C.

15 CENTS

How Long Is The U.S. to Be Rhee's Satellite?

The Communist rejection of that incredible letter from General Mark Clark makes sense. It makes sense from every point of view, whether that of world peace, Chinese "face" or American dignity. To try a truce with Syngman Rhee uncommitted (he ought to be put away) is to invite provocations that might easily ignite World War III. The fighting now is at least limited to Korea but were a truce to be broken by Rhee it would be easy in the confusion to represent it as enemy treachery and thus give their head at last to those MacArthurite forces who have been longing for full-scale war with China.

The United States has been put in a most humiliating position by Rhee. The great Power which aspires to lead a "liberation" crusade against the Soviet third of the world has shown itself impotent to control and remodel tiny South Korea. Graver humiliations would be risked were a truce to be made with Rhee still in control of the South Korean police and army. What if he carried out his threat and refused to let neutral commissioners from India into the country? The question seems much less fantastic after the events of the past few weeks.

What is the answer? The answer ostensibly has been in General Clark's hands for several weeks. He has been given power to declare martial law in South Korea. If Washington had half the backbone shown by the crusty old tyrant in Seoul it would order Clark to put martial law into effect at once. The most important single political and moral act which could be performed by the "unified command" would be to use force to free Chough Pyung Ok from "protective custody". It is shocking that under the noses of our troops a member of the Korean National Assembly, leader of a major opposition party, should be beaten and imprisoned for saying in South Korea exactly what Eisenhower has been trying to say from Washington! Chough's crime was that he criticized Rhee for releasing POW's without consulting General Clark and declared Rhee's threat to go it alone would be national suicide.

This is supposed to be a war to make South Korea safe for democracy. The situation is made downright ludicrous when a political leader there dare not even voice a pro-American line! We have become Rhee's satellite when it is he who can call the tune of policy at home and abroad. The time has come when we must either do Rhee's bidding, which means to move closer to World War III, or oust him as head of South Korea. The task is not as formidable as it looks if one remembers that Rhee overwhelmingly lost the election held on the eve of the Korean war, and that he had to use martial law himself last year to force the South Korean Assembly to change the Constitution and make his

reelection as President possible. His real strength is not to be measured by noisy demonstrations or by the Fascistic "youth groups" on which he has depended to terrorize the opposition.

A combination of military and political measures is necessary if more Americans are not to die in Korea and perhaps many many more in China. Military measures are required to show that we mean business and that advocates of peace may speak up in South Korea without fear. To end Rhee's scarcely veiled dictatorship would make it possible to win the support of the National Assembly. The great mass of the Korean people on both sides must be sick to death of a war that has made their tiny country a bloody training ground for the armies and air forces of the great Powers. If we believe in democracy, let us make it possible for the Korean people to speak. Under such conditions a program calling for unification of Korea and free elections under UN auspices to pick a new unified government would make sense as the political basis for a permanent peace. Any other kind of patched up truce would merely be a short breathing spell until we were summoned again to put out fires ignited by Rhee.

It is important at this juncture to remember that Rhee—for all his talk of unifying his country—was one of the few leaders who pressed originally for establishment of a separate State in South Korea despite Australian and Canadian misgivings and the opposition of most Korean political leaders right or left. They foresaw that separate elections would lead to civil war. It is also important to remember that Rhee has always opposed unification and free elections. His program has been for us to conquer North Korea by force and then hand over control of it to Rhee. Like Adenauer in that other Korea on the other side of Eurasia, Rhee has always feared that free elections in a unified country would be the end of his regime.

We have been paying with the blood of our sons for our political errors in Korea. We treated the Koreans all through World War II as an inferior breed, refusing them arms and the basis for a postwar government. After the war, MacArthur was consistently pro-Japanese in dealing with Korean problems. In the Korean occupation, we fumed but acquiesced in Rhee's high-handedness and in the terror and assassinations with which he liquidated opposition. After the war began, our troops treated as "gooks" the people we had come supposedly to liberate. Now we permit Rhee to beat and imprison those who dare speak up for peace. The contempt they must feel for us is easy to imagine, yet these are the people we must mobilize for peace if we are ever to disengage ourselves from an endless and futile war.

Paradoxical Picture in The Search for Peace

The nightmare had come to pass. There was a General in the White House and a General Motors executive in the Pentagon. By all the stereotypes cherished left of center, the General in the White House should have meant more power for the military and the GM executive in the Pentagon more arms orders for big business. Eisenhower and Wilson between them should have been producing the biggest arms budget in peacetime history. The paradox is that last week they were engaged in a major struggle against the military bureaucracy to put the brakes on armament spending. The Republican "party of big business" had supported them in two showdown votes, while ex-President Truman had emerged from a brief retirement to lead the Democratic "party of the little man" into battle on behalf of the military and aviation lobbies. This was the weird story unfolding in Washington.

The House had voted 234-108 to uphold Eisenhower's storm-provoking Reorganization Plan No. 6. Only 11 Republicans voted against the President and only a minority of Democrats had voted for him. The issue was obscure, and had been made more so by the sudden outcry that Eisenhower was trying to create a "Prussian-style" General Staff. Former President Hoover lined up against Eisenhower. David Lawrence denounced the plan daily. Clare Hoffman of Michigan, chairman of the House Committee on Government Operations, tried his best to kill the plan. On the surface all it seemed to do was carry unification of the armed forces a few small steps further. It was calculated to increase the power of the Secretary of Defense and under him of the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff to weld three jealous and competing armed services a little more closely into a team.

The real issue was evident in the fear expressed by former Secretary of the Air Force, Thomas K. Finletter. "This move toward a centralized authority in a single department," Finletter told Clare Hoffman's committee, "is going to hit air power—hurt air power . . . Reorganization Plan No. 6 . . . will interfere with the proper presentation of the case of air power."

Finletter said "We are indeed at this moment seeing an example in the debate over the budget for the fiscal year 1954 of the failure to provide the proper mechanism for the presentation of the air-atomic point of view." The day the Reorganization Plan was approved in the House, the aviation lobby suffered another defeat at the hands of the Administration and the Republican party. The powerful Appropriations Committee of the House not only rejected Air Force protest against a 5 billion dollar cut by Eisenhower and Wilson in the 1954 aviation budget but added another quarter billion dollar reduction on its own.

The Republicans are thinking in terms of "economy"—and driving hard for a tax cut in time for the next Congressional elections. The Democrats are still thinking of armament and war as a kind of gigantic "boondoggle"—they hope to pick up votes as a shrinking arms budget reduces jobs. In this picture the military are lined up with the Democrats—and so is labor. Armament has become a kind of pork barrel, as rivers and harbor legislation used to be, and every cut in an arms contract mobilizes local members of Congress and Sena-

tors with the labor unions and the aggrieved contractor for reinstatement. At Willow Run outside Detroit last week workers continued at work on cancelled Air Force contracts for overpriced C-119's and S-123's. A petition was circulated offering to work 30 days without pay to help Henry Kaiser get new business while Michigan's Senators, Ferguson and Potter, and Congressman George Meader put pressure on Secretary of Air Talbott to provide a new "fixed price" aircraft contract for Willow Run.

There was a revealing bit of dialogue on the Senate floor last week when Symington of Missouri, a Democrat, chief spokesman of the air lobby, used his maiden speech for a bitter attack on the cuts in the air force program. Senator Kerr, Democrat, of Oklahoma, put a question which disclosed an attitude of mind typical on the Democratic side:

MR. KERR. Is there not abundant evidence of the fact that the hard-dollar policy of the administration was more influential in the decision made by the Secretary of Defense than an appropriate understanding of the necessities for the Nation's defense?

MR. SYMINGTON. I believe the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma is entirely correct.

Hatred of the "hard dollar" has been a characteristic of the popular party in this country as far back as Shay's Rebellion; Beard's "Economic Interpretation" showed the part agrarian and debtor desire for cheap money played in the original battle over the Constitution. But cheap money policies which financed reform and improvements under Franklin D. Roosevelt had become the vehicle for perpetual alarm and arms spending under Truman. To read the ex-President's speech to the Reserve Officers' Association, always a sounding board for the military bureaucracy, was to see that he slipped naturally from arguing the need for greater armament into a quite different kind of attack on "economizers". "What did we hear in 1939 and 1940? Why, we heard that a few billion dollars more of Federal spending would wreck the economy" and then after Pearl Harbor "We forgot all about those alleged dangers of wrecking the economy. We spent nearly \$350 billion on armaments and war. We increased the national debt 400 percent. And our economy, after all that, didn't show the slightest sign of being wrecked . . . our economy came out of the Second World War in good health and, basically, it got steadily healthier throughout the postwar period."

What did Truman mean by economic health? "Whether people who want to work can find jobs at decent wages—whether national production is going up—whether businesses are growing . . ." But was it economically healthy, was it safe, was it decent to keep an economy pumped up by war and fear of war? This was the easy and popular way out. "Too few of us," said another voice in this debate, "have a real conception of the substantial portion of our economic vitality that is siphoned away as a result of our past approach to military programs." The speaker was the Deputy Secretary of Defense, Roger M. Kyes, before the U. S. Chamber of Commerce. The difference in approach is the difference in attitude of the two parties toward military spending. That difference is important for peace.

I. F. Stone's Weekly

• Editor and Publisher, I. F. STONE

Published weekly except the last two weeks of August at Room 205, 301 E. Capitol St., S.E., Washington 3, D. C. Subscription rates: Domestic, \$5 a year; Canada, Mexico and elsewhere in the Western Hemisphere, \$6; England and Continental Europe, \$10 by 1st class mail, \$15 by air; for Israel, Asia, Australia and Africa, \$10 by first class mail, \$20 by air mail. Single copy, 15 cents. Tel.: LI 4-7087. Entered as Second Class mail matter, Post Office, Washington, D. C.

July 4, 1953

Vol. I, No. 24

COMMENT

Footnote on Book-Burning

What is currently being called McCarthyism is, of course, much older and has more respectable beginnings and backing. In the current uproar about "book-burning", it is useful to recall that stricter surveillance of librarians and libraries was among the measures advocated by the U. S. Chamber of Commerce in the series of annual pamphlets it has issued since the war on community action against Communism. These pamphlets—to which I first called attention in the New York *Daily Compass*—blueprinted the drive toward thought control in America.

The 1948 pamphlet, "A Program for Community Anti-Communist Action", called for the extension of loyalty purge standards to all professions dealing with opinion. It mentioned teachers and it said "Librarians likewise are not beyond public scrutiny." The U. S. Chamber of Commerce said, "In spite of some highly publicized protests against 'censorship', it must be remembered that a public library is a public trust. It should not be used as a vehicle for publicizing Communist propaganda."

If libraries are not to be a "vehicle for Communist propaganda", somebody must decide what books are Communist propaganda and whether they should be allowed in the library. This is censorship. The Chamber of Commerce said cautiously that it did not mean "we should protest because a library carries the works of Marx, Lenin, Stalin. But we should be concerned when (1) The amount of Communist or pro-Communist literature is out of proportion to factual anti-Communist literature and (2) pro-Communist studies are promoted in library literature as objective or recommended studies." This means encouraging busy-bodies to snoop around libraries for what they may consider pro-Communist books.

That program five years ago already outlined a drive to "purge" the book reviews as well as the libraries, foreshadowing that lengthy analysis of literary reviews by the McCarran committee in its search last year for books and reviewers

critical of American Far Eastern policy and of Chiang Kai-shek. "The real danger in this field," the U. S. Chamber of Commerce said in 1948, "is not usually the attitude of the librarians themselves. It is the fact that many of their important book review sources are infiltrated by Communists or sympathizers."

Thought Control and Labor

In the same pattern is the drive to subject the labor movement to the Subversive Activities Control Board. This has long been the goal of the Chamber of Commerce and the National Association of Manufacturers, both of which supported the McCarran Act under which that Board was established. The Goldwater-Rhodes bill, which would have given the Board sweeping powers over labor unions, bogged down in unfavorable publicity. But the Jenner committee was off on a new tack last week-end with the announcement that hearings would soon be held by a special "task force of the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee" on a similar measure by Senator Butler, R., of Maryland, McCarthy's protege in his successful fight against Tydings.

The "task force" has been nicely chosen for this task. Butler, Welker and McCarran will make up the subcommittee and several weeks of hearings will be held this month. Butler's bill would enable the Subversive Activities Control Board to put out of business any union it regarded as subversive. McCarran has a bill to bar "subversives" from labor unions and allow employers to fire them at will. It remains to be seen whether the labor movement can rise above its own intra-mural feuds and obsessions to see the danger in such legislation to all militant trade unionism.

Giddy Air Force

A chart on page 281 of the House Appropriations Committee hearings on the Air Force shows the giddy way arms budgets are made up and billions juggled. Originally the Air Force asked 22 billions for fiscal 1954. The Department of Defense staff experts cut this to 15 and a half billions. The Air Force came back with a revised estimate of 19 and a half billions. The Department of Defense in submitting final estimates to the Budget Bureau split the difference and asked for 17 billions. The Budget Bureau cut this down by one billion and Truman put it up a half billion in the estimates he sent Congress last January. This 16 billion dollar figure was cut three and three quarter billions by Eisenhower and Wilson. The House Appropriations Committee cut another quarter billion off the total last week, recommending 11 billions or just one half the original Air Force request.

143 Wings and Garrison State

The figures show a growing gap between the amounts appropriated for the

Air Force and the amounts spent. The carry-over at the end of this year, according to Senator Ferguson will be 28 billions. The House Appropriations Committee pointed out that even with the cuts it recommended the Air Force—thanks to the carry-over—would have more than 36 billions to spend in the fiscal year beginning this week. Flanders of Vermont went to the point when he told the Senate after Symington's attack on Air Force budget reductions, "It has been very evident that we have appropriated beyond our ability to build without going on a wartime basis."

Dulles on East-West Trade

Official responsibility and economic reality have had their sobering influence on John Foster Dulles, at least in respect to East-West trade in Europe. The recently released Senate Foreign Relations Committee hearings on the Mutual Security Act of 1953 disclose an unexpected moderation on the part of the Secretary of State when he was asked about East-West trade by Senator Smith, R., of N. J.

Secretary Dulles said East-West trade in Europe now amounted to about \$800,000,000 "a year both ways, and it is our present thinking at least that it would not be desirable to try to cut that trade off. It would impose upon us a very heavy additional responsibility . . . It would either mean a very sharp decline in the economic conditions in those countries or we would have to compensate by increased aid from ourselves."

"And furthermore," Dulles went on, sounding quite unlike himself, "I believe that kind of trade can be definitely to our advantage in particularly awakening the satellite countries to the possibilities of closer relations with the Western countries as what they can get through their present relations with the Soviet Union."

The Secretary of State as an example told the Senators he had spoken with the U. S. Ambassador to Hungary "and he said that there was a very great desire on the part of Hungary to have closer relations with the West of an economic character and to lose even its economic dependence upon the Soviet Union." Under the circumstances Dulles thought it would be unwise "to cut off that trade", except for the Battle Act restrictions on strategic materials.

Senator SMITH. Some of us, of course, are bothered by the thought that almost any article today is of some strategic value.

Secretary DULLES. Yes, that is quite true, but by the same token you might say what we get from them is of strategic value to us.

The idea expressed is that trade is mutually beneficial. The idea was no longer novel in the days of Homer. But its rediscovery in cold war Washington is news.

JENNINGS PERRY'S PAGE

Bright Postscript by the Ku Klux Klan

The day after my friend and neighbor Fyke Farmer returned from Washington, two days after the sentence of the court in *The People vs. Julius and Ethel Rosenberg* had been executed, I was his guest for dinner at his home. Afterward, as the evening darkened and cooled, we sat in his sun porch and he spoke of the piece he was thinking of writing, "Why I Believe the Rosenbergs Were Innocent." "Who would publish it?" he said. I mentioned Life . . . "After all, the Pope was interested." He was called to the phone and I sat with Mrs. Farmer. She is a quiet woman with graying hair; her strong face makes you think of the Pioneers. She had a kitten on her lap. There was a little brown dog in the porch. We talked of their pets, of their children who were at summer camps. Fyke came back grinning. "John Beverly; we were at Vanderbilt together." Beverly had called to tell him that friends at his house were saying Farmer must be a Communist. "He called to tell me he had 'stood up for me,'" Fyke said. "They'd had a drink or two around." The little brown dog was behaving nervously. Mrs. Farmer went to the door and let him out.

What had led him to believe they were innocent was the record; they had told a "straight story" all the way through. Greenglass' testimony was given "under duress, his life was at stake." Under the same duress the others would not change their story to save their lives. "They could have *invented* something . . ." Outside, the dog was barking so excitedly I could not hear the rest of his sentence. A plane was going over, the 10 o'clock transcontinental, westbound. With a murmur of exasperation Mrs. Farmer let the dog in.

She took him away to another part of the house, and we heard her cry "There's a fire." I glanced over my shoulder. There was indeed a small, lively blaze down at the foot of the lawn, under the trees. Someone burning leaves . . . But then, at the front door, she cried more sharply, and Fyke and I went out to the veranda.

In the still black night, the cross was flaming silently. It was about eight feet tall, at the side of the street. Fyke went down the steps and halfway across the lawn and came back to the house. "Perhaps I should call the police, or the sheriff.

Would you call the police or the sheriff? Or the paper?" "If anybody," I said, "I'd call the fire department." We returned to our chairs in the sun porch. The light from the blazing cross flickered on the windows. A boy's voice called at the door: "It was three young fellows in a big car, Mr. Farmer. A black car." Fyke thanked him. He handed me some manuscript sheets. "I've just started writing it," he said. "I want to see Justice Frankfurter's dissent first." His wife stroked the white kitten in her lap. She said nothing but I noticed that she could not help glancing up at any noise in the street.

A car grated in the drive; a reporter and a photographer knocked at the door at the end of the porch. "We got a call about a cross burning out here, Mr. Farmer." Mrs. Farmer said softly, "I think I know who called." The blaze was about out.

"In Tampa, when Al Smith was running," I told Mrs. Farmer, "the Kluxers came into town and burnt crosses in the cigar-making section. It was midnight. When they drove out Seventh Avenue in Ybor City, the Cubans stood on boxes and yelled at them 'Viva Al Smeet!'" She smiled, but very faintly. I do not think she was alarmed, but this was her home. She said, "I don't want any more publicity." Fyke heard her, and told the reporter and the photographer, "No pictures. That's the story. Thanks." They went away.

"Do you know what he asked me?" Fyke said. "Whether I'd been in Washington. Where were we?" Mrs. Farmer brought us mint tea and sat down again and stroked the kitten. Their house is on a shaded street where the houses are far apart. Occasionally there was voices in the street and Mrs. Farmer lifted her head at these sounds. Their high school son came in and put up the car and passed, whistling, through the house toward the kitchen. They said nothing to him of the incident.

"Do you sometimes wonder," Fyke said suddenly, "whether in the end we'll be able to keep our democracy?" I tried to reassure him. "I'm pretty sure it's been a fight since the beginning. A good fight." I thought they would feel better in the morning. When I drove out of their gate, not a spark of the hate-stick remained.

I. F. Stone's Weekly

7-4-53

Room 205

301 E. Capitol St., S.E., Washington 3, D. C.

Please enter the following subscription. \$5 for 1 year is enclosed. (See page 3 for foreign rates)

Name

Street

CityZone.....

State

I. F. Stone's Weekly

Room 205

301 E. Capitol St., S.E.,

Washington 3, D. C.

NEWSPAPER

Entered as
Second Class Mail
Matter
Post Office
Washington, D. C.

I. F. Stone's Weekly

VOL. I NUMBER 25

JULY 11, 1953



WASHINGTON, D. C.

15 CENTS

Eisenhower's Air-Conditioned Answer

The British and French emissaries in Washington this week-end for the Foreign Ministers Conference would do well to begin by considering the events which occurred here on July 1.

On July 1 the new Republican Administration woke to find itself confronted with (1) what seemed to be an opportunity to make good on all its campaign talk of "liberation" for Soviet-held Eastern Europe and (2) the largest peacetime deficit in U.S. history. The two were linked by more than coincidence. Even to dabble in intervention would mean a larger deficit. To concentrate on the deficit, conversely, was to reduce the military means available for that rollback of the Russians which was so recently Mr. Dulles's favorite theme. The Administration decided to concentrate on the deficit.

The decision was evident at the President's press conference that day. The headlines and the cables were full of disorder and unrest in East Europe, much—but far from all of it—exaggerated; the Polish "revolt" seems concocted but the abject "mea culpas" of the East German Communist leaders and the riots which produced them were all too real, as were the dissatisfactions reflected by Czech Communist scoldings, Hungarian Communist reforms and Bulgarian Communist penal sentences for absenteeism.

But when Roscoe Drummond of the Christian Science Monitor asked Eisenhower whether he was considering "any tangible action to support liberation", this was the air-conditioned answer, "A. Well, of course, we had always said we were for free elections in those countries. He did not believe there was any thought of taking any physical action of any kind that could be classed as intervention." There has not been so much caution in the White House since Coolidge.

The President was in no mood for clarion calls. In the House of Representatives that same day, the chairman of the Appropriations Committee was reading a letter from General Eisenhower criticizing the tendency of the military to "seek after total or at least disproportionate military protection." The President wrote, "I should like to re-emphasize that our plan for national security, in contrast to earlier programs . . . seeks to avoid the exceedingly costly, demoralizing, short range effort premised upon an imaginary date of maximum danger." This year no Soviet submarines were sighted off the coast in time for the vote on the military appropriations.

On much else the Republican party may be divided, but not on this decision to concentrate upon the deficit. It was a straight party vote by which the House last week passed a budget cutting more than 6 billion dollars from military requests. It was the Democratic party which Symington rallied in the Senate this week with a bitter attack on "the inexperienced Pentagon civilians", "the money-first men", who had

dared cut 5 billion from the Air Force budget and question Air Force General Vandenberg's judgment. The millionaire Senator from Missouri was assailing the Republicans for thinking of "money first"; the operating heads of General Motors (Wilson and Kyes) were attacked as inexperienced in production!

In the Senate, with a one-vote margin, the Administration may not be able to prevent amendment of the budget to add the extra \$1,175,000,000 asked for the Air Force by Vandenberg. But the signs there, too, indicate a general revulsion against past policies of alarm and intervention. The crass theme implicit in the debate over the new foreign military aid program was that we need friends abroad because we need their bases. There was much sympathy for Gillette of Iowa when that moderate Republican said he was voting against the MSA program this year because "I believe we have lost sight of our goal of peace in our pursuit of the goal of world military security." There was much agreement with his warning, "The Soviet government can defeat us without war if we prepare to defend ourselves only against war." Both parties in the Senate showed themselves eager to wind up MSA.

This is an Administration of conservatives not adventurers, at a time when the prevailing mood is one of civilian weariness with military demands. The anxieties of the Republicans, as of the country, are domestic. Once again the chief interest in foreign affairs is the effort to find some place abroad to dump troublesome farm surpluses. The prize for which the two parties contend again as farm prices fall and a new dust bowl spreads is the farm vote; the lack of adequate public grain storage facilities is the issue which may decide the next elections. The Republicans are fighting hard to make some progress toward a balanced budget and a tax cut by November, 1954; the liberation they want is from the shameful necessity to raise the debt limit. The setback which obsesses the Administration was its forced reversal of deflationist policy; the expansion of an already over-inflated credit base so it could borrow six billions last week—an unprecedented sum—in tax anticipation warrants to meet its current bills.

At this juncture the Administration would like nothing better than a new Joshua somehow to make the sun stand still abroad. It does not want to meet with Malenkov, or to risk new talks on Germany, and it wishes Korea North and South would obligingly slip into the sea. The "Wall Street warmongers" now running the show here want peace and quiet. But peace and quiet are what Syngman Rhee is determined they shall not have, and behind Rhee—giving him leverage—is the American military, who see their budgets further menaced by a relaxation of tension. It is this which lies behind the spate of stories from Korea on how helpless the UN forces would be without Syngman Rhee.

A Steel Magnate's Plea for Peace and Co-Existence

For several years the steel magnate, Ernest T. Weir, whom we all attacked so bitterly during New Deal days when he successfully opposed unionization of Weirton Steel, has been carrying on a campaign for world peace.

The article which follows is made up of excerpts from the new pamphlet he has just issued on his observations abroad during April and May of this year, his fifth such trip since the end of the war. Copies of the pamphlet may be obtained by writing his office, 2800 Grant Building, Pittsburgh 19, Pennsylvania.

Weir was sharply critical of Truman cold war policies and supported Eisenhower in the last election. Weir's views are of especial interest because of his long business association with George M. Humphrey, Eisenhower's Secretary of the Treasury. Weir founded National Steel Company. Humphrey was chairman of its executive committee.

BY ERNEST T. WEIR

The European attitude toward the situation now existing between the Western and Communist worlds may be stated in three sentences:

1. They feel that European nations cannot continue to spend the large amounts presently devoted to defense because they have neither the money nor the credit.

2. They do not think there is any imminent danger of war.

3. They believe the time is ripe for a positive approach to peace . . .

They know that no Western nation would initiate war. Of all other nations, there is only one that has sufficient industrial and military power to even think of war—Russia.

Europeans do not profess to know more about what is going on inside Russia than we do. But they reason that the same forces are at work in Russia and the satellite countries as in the Western nations. Their people, too, know the destruction and suffering of war. They also know that a third war would be far more terrible than the last one.

To assume that these people would willingly undergo such an ordeal is to declare

them inhuman. And to assume that Russian leaders would attempt to take the unwilling citizenry of their own and other countries into a war of such magnitude is to ascribe to those leaders a degree of stupidity that they have not yet shown.

Further, although totalitarian governments do not have the same problems of debt and inflation per se; the same effect is produced by utilizing great quantities of material and labor for war production which otherwise could be devoted to improvement of the countries and of living conditions of their peoples . . .

Since Stalin Died

Just as they believe the danger of war is absent from the current situation, Europeans are convinced that a definite possibility of peace is present. For one thing they believe that there has been a significant change in the attitude of Russia since the death of Stalin. None of the present Russian leaders has anything approaching the stature of Stalin in the eyes of the Russian people. The new leaders require time and stable conditions to consolidate their position and win the support of the people. An assured peace would meet their needs to a far greater extent than war or threats of war . . .

I have been unable to see the logic in the position of those persons in the United States who have been so critical of Europe and so opposed to any attempt at negotiation with Russia. The apparent basis of their thinking is that Russia can never be trusted, that she is likely to outsmart us in any negotiations, and that, in any event, an agreement acceptable to Russia could not be acceptable to us—therefore, we do nothing.

Negative Thinking

This is negative thinking. It offers nothing constructive. Its implication is that the United States and the countries of Europe must go on year after year spending huge sums of money and devoting a great part of their productive capacity and manpower to military purposes and go on year after year prepared to meet Communist countries with force of

arms whenever our interests clash with theirs anywhere in the world.

That presents a grim prospect which is all the more grim because it inevitably would lead to world war. When nations continue to enlarge their military machines, there is ever present danger that the machines will be used. Of this I am sure. If such thinking becomes the basis for our national course of action, the United States will become a leader without followers . . .

Suppose we just continue the way we are going? What will be the consequences? From a material standpoint alone, the prospect is appalling. The present high cost of government is due chiefly to the cost of defense. Even with continuation of extremely high taxes it is dubious that we can balance our budget. If we cannot, then we are headed in the same direction as the countries of Europe . . . Even the United States cannot continue indefinitely to devote a huge proportion of its wealth and productive capacity to military purposes. If we fail to bring our debt and spending under control our eventual fate will be the same as with every other country that has failed . . .

Property Values and Peace

Parenthetically, it amazes me that there are some people who actually seem afraid of peace. The decline in the stock market that has been taking place for some weeks over the prospects of a Korean truce, for instance, is ridiculous. Everything we own will be worth more if we have genuine peace than if we have war or continuance of the present tension.

We have become so accustomed to a war economy that some people think we must have it to sustain employment and production. The plain fact is that war production is economic waste. Progress is not built on waste. All the great advances in human history have come in times of peace. If peace can be established, the prospects for development of the world economy are so great that there is not an individual anywhere who will not benefit . . ."

HAPPY ½ BIRTHDAY

The Weekly is six months old today. We thank our readers for their support and for their many kind letters. Growth has been steady and encouraging. One way you can help while on vacation is to pass out copies to friends. We will be glad to send you free sample copies in small quantities of this or any particular past issues for the purpose. Just drop a postcard request to 301 E. Capitol Street.

I. F. STONE'S WEEKLY

Independent in The Cause of Peace and Civil Liberty

I. F. Stone's Weekly

• Editor and Publisher, I. F. STONE

Published weekly except the last two weeks of August at Room 205, 301 E. Capitol St., S.E., Washington 3, D. C. Subscription rates: Domestic, \$5 a year; Canada, Mexico and elsewhere in the Western Hemisphere, \$6; England and Continental Europe, \$10 by 1st class mail, \$15 by air; for Israel, Asia, Australia and Africa, \$10 by first class mail, \$20 by air mail. Single copy, 15 cents. Tel.: LI 4-7087. Entered as Second Class mail matter, Post Office, Washington, D. C.

July 11, 1953 Vol. I, No. 25

COMMENT

Happy Solution

Our heart goes out to the FBI and the Atomic Energy Commission in the case of Robert L. Condon, the California Congressman they barred as a security risk from the atomic weapons test at Las Vegas.

The affair illustrates a weakness in our system of loyalty and security precaution. Congressmen fulfill a far more important function than ordinary government employees, teachers or defense workers yet they are allowed to take office without being cleared by the FBI.

It is argued that Condon was elected by his constituents with full knowledge of past Leftist association. This does not prove Condon's loyalty. It merely casts doubt on the loyalty of his constituents.

The only solution we can see is, admittedly, a radical one. No one should be allowed to vote for a member of Congress without first obtaining FBI clearance.

On second thought, since this might prove expensive, perhaps the same result might be achieved by just leaving members of Congress to be picked by J. Edgar Hoover.

Propaganda Day-Dream

This business of disseminating literature abroad as propaganda has its complexities. In the reply sent by John Foster Dulles to Senator Hennings, D., of Missouri, the Secretary of State said he wanted to make sure the United States Information Service "would not disseminate information which might advance the cause of Soviet Communism."

At first blush this would seem clearly to bar the writings of Doxey Wilkerson from U.S.I.S. libraries abroad. Doxey Wilkerson is one of McCarthy's less sensational discoveries. Wilkerson publicly joined the Communist party in June, 1943, as educational director for Maryland, wrote a column for the *Daily Worker*, and published a recruiting pamphlet, "The Negro People and The Communists".

McCarthy likes sitting ducks. Wilkerson has been "investigated" over and over again. As recently as last March he was before the Jenner committee. It is about as difficult to detect traces of communism in Wilkerson as it would be for the Holy Office to detect traces of heresy in the writings of Brann the Iconoclast. When a copy of Wilkerson's "Special Problems of Negro Education" turned up in the USIS library in London, it was duck soup for the Senator.

Should the American government use the taxpayer's money to buy books by a Communist for USIS libraries abroad? As Senatorial rhetoric, the question may seem unanswerable. But I cannot imagine a better piece of propaganda for the United States at this moment than to take a Britisher into the USIS library in London and say, "What's all this about McCarthyism? Here you have a book by a Communist, a Negro Communist, on one aspect of our touchiest problems, made available to readers abroad at our government's expense. Furthermore the book was written for the President's Advisory Commission on Education. Who says America is afraid of free discussion?"

Lest some patriotic reader in London act upon this day-dream, we hasten to warn him that the Wilkerson book got into that one library by accident, that the President's Commission was not Eisenhower's or Truman's but FDR's, that it passed out of existence before the war, that the Wilkerson "book" is really a pamphlet written as a special study ("Staff Study, No. 12") for the Commission, that Wilkerson was not then a Communist and that the book—far from being the bitter and inflammatory work McCarthy made it seem to be—is a scholarly but pedestrian statistical work with conclusions which appear ultra conservative today. Wilkerson did not attack separate segregated schools for Negroes. All he argued for was a "just and equitable" distribution of funds between white and Negro schools in the South.

And anyway the book's off the shelf in London by now.

Thick Plot Thickens

One of the darkest plots ever to come before McCarthy remains veiled in darkness because the Senator's researchers in this hot weather have been slighting their work. Among the authors hauled up before the McCarthy committee last week was the gifted Richard O. Boyer. One of Boyer's books, "The Dark Ship", has been found in a USIS library abroad. Part of this book had originally been printed in *The New Yorker* as a profile of Joe Curran, head of the National Maritime Union. Just about the time the book was going to press Curran broke with the Communists.

In the book as it appeared some last-minute additions about the break differed

markedly from the laudatory tone in which the profile had been written. The enthusiasm for Curran had evaporated. A reviewer in *The Nation* (August 9, 1947) referred to the book as illustrating "the occupational hazards confronting a journalist who follows the Communist party line." The reviewer was another of the authors recently favored by the McCarthy book inquiry. The name signed to the review was James A. Wechsler.

Now it is McCarthy's theory that Wechsler has been writing anti-Communist articles (and perhaps even, as one famous question implied, authoring attacks upon himself in the *Daily Worker*) as protective coloration. A fascinating question would have confronted the Great Investigator if his researchers had not missed this item. If Wechsler attacked others (including Boyer) in order more effectively to carry on his own nefarious work for the Party, what was Boyer really doing when he appeared to echo party line? Infiltrating the waterfront for the D.A.R.?

Subversive Geometry

Dr. Julius H. Hlavaty (see "The Case of The Cooperative Teacher" in our issue of March 21), now fighting for reinstatement as teacher of mathematics in the Bronx High School of Science, was one of the authors "purged" from libraries abroad by our house-broken State Department.

"I remember," Dr. Hlavaty writes us, "reading with some interest in your February 28 number that if Velde had his way Lobachevski's paper on non-Euclidean geometry might some day be marked 'subversive'. Today I find that even Euclidean geometry is not safe. The modest little opus of mine which had been banned from the overseas libraries is a 50-page booklet entitled 'Review Digest of Solid Geometry.' Perhaps if I had stuck to Plane Geometry, or better yet, to one dimensional geometry, I might have obtained clearance."

Subtle Candidate

Temus R. Bright, a used car dealer in Baltimore who is also a Republican candidate for Governor of Maryland, unveiled a monument last week-end to McCarthy. This seemed an obvious effort to get the pro-McCarthy vote. But the nature of the monument makes us wonder whether this might not be a more ambivalent vote-getting maneuver. The Associated Press delicately termed the monument a "shaft". But the *Baltimore Sun*, which was on the scene for the unveiling, described it frankly as "an 8-foot high granite tombstone dedicated to Senator McCarthy." We can just see Mr. Bright hauling the anti-McCarthy voter into the back room and whispering, "Why, man, I hate Joe so much I even got his tombstone ready."

JENNINGS PERRY'S PAGE

Korea Could Be Man's First Peace Preserve

I do not see how Reason can fail to like very much Sen. Knowland's plan for cutting the Korean knot—by setting up the country as a neutral guaranteed by the "great powers."

I hope it is a plan. The suggestion has been exercised in this column in all weather for the past three years. But the weather is more favorable now for a resort to reason, and the Californian, highly placed in our present administration, is in an excellent position to champion the proposal.

The time for great resolves is when we are grown sick and tired of bloodletting, and the time to push for major reforms in human behavior is when the object lesson of futile destruction is fresh before us. To establish the neutrality of Korea by a contract of the powers would snatch one brand from the burning—and might well show us the way back to other and wider undertakings we subscribed to in our elan at the close of the last world war.

The case for making Korea a little "park of peace" for, say, the next hundred years is from all viewpoints strong. Certainly the unfortunate peninsula has served its turn as a battleground; it has been beaten and bombed and blooded from one end to the other. All the new weapons but one have been tried out upon it. A hundred years would be a reasonable time to allow it for repairs.

An extension of this imposed and underwritten neutrality to the whole nation is, one gathers, the essence of Sen. Knowland's plan. The expeditionary armies would withdraw, disarming the native population as they went by repossessing all of the death-dealing weapons which have been brought in and distributed by one side and the other. The 16 divisions we have trained and armed would go back to their rice fields and hat shops, and all the Red divisions that have been trained and supplied by the other side would perforce do likewise. As neutrals the Koreans would need no armed establishment, which obviously they cannot afford, and in time would compose a government satisfactory to themselves by civil means, and prosper.

Thus the intervention of the United Nations would stand up at last as the police action it was declared to be, and the threat at the Yalu which brought the Chinese into the war would be permanently removed. Humanity at large could point to one corner of the earth at least set apart by the most powerful guarantee as a peace preserve.

Sen. Knowland is of the opinion that all of the nations would welcome the creation of the Korean sanctuary and would pledge their word to it. Of course this would mean that our own nation as well as those on "the other side" would have to shake hands all around on the proposition. For example, we would have to shake hands with the Chinese and recognize in them a capacity for good faith—that is a valid kinship in the human family.

And we would have to be prepared for the resurrection of the other peace projects I have mentioned above, which seemed so natural and fair at the end of World War II. For if it is a good thing to solve the Korean problem simply by exempting Korea from the two-worlds line up, and sparing Koreans the necessity of bearing arms, it must follow as a good thing that the neutrality of other nations that have served their time as battlegrounds, and that previously have been snatched from the burning, should be proclaimed by contract and guaranteed by disarmament.

The effort of Japan to cling to her morning-after renunciation of war and of military power would, by the same logic, claim universal respect and support. And the efforts of the victors on both sides to outfit the irresponsible Germans with another war machine would be abandoned for the grand folly that it is.

If the world cannot bring itself to get out from under its arms all at once, it should pass up no opportunity of getting out from under them piecemeal. At this moment, being sated with battle in Korea, it could discharge Korea from guard mount with no pain. It could declare Korea hors de combat henceforth, neutral itself and out of bounds for all armies. And it then could begin to add other neutral territories to this bit to cut down the room left on earth for any war.

I. F. Stone's Weekly 7-11-53
Room 205
301 E. Capitol St., S.E., Washington 3, D. C.
Please enter the following subscription. \$5 for 1 year is enclosed. (See page 3 for foreign rates)
Name
Street
City Zone.....
State

I. F. Stone's Weekly
Room 205
301 E. Capitol St., S.E.,
Washington 3, D. C.

Entered as
Second Class Mail
Matter
Post Office
Washington, D. C.

NEWSPAPER

I. F. Stone's Weekly

VOL. I NUMBER 26

JULY 18, 1953



WASHINGTON, D. C.

15 CENTS

Full Story and Text:

Last Refuge of Dissenters in Danger

I

Late Thursday, July 9, at the tail end of a weary night session, the U. S. Senate passed a new McCarran bill. This one might be termed a bill to repeal the Fifth amendment. It would give Congressional investigating committees a means of destroying the last Constitutional refuge of "uncooperative" witnesses—that provision of the Fifth amendment which says no man shall be compelled "to be a witness against himself", the so-called privilege against self-incrimination.

Little attention was paid the bill in the press. News of its passage was swamped in dramatic events. That was the day J. B. Matthews was forced to resign as executive director of the McCarthy committee. That night, just before debate began on the bill in the Senate, the wires carried the news of Beria's downfall in Moscow. Newspapers as conscientious as the *New York Times* and the *Washington Post* were able to give only a few paragraphs on inside pages to passage of the bill.

Yet this bill may prove fateful for liberty in America. If passed, it would (as pointed out in the *Weekly* for May 16) create an unwilling army of informers. Anyone who has ever had Left wing associations of any kind would lose the last remaining means of refusing to answer questions which might bring others into disgrace in the current American heresy hunt. Going to jail for contempt would be the only recourse left for conscientious objectors to Congressional inquisition.

The bill has gone to the House, where it was automatically routed to the Judiciary committee. Normally, this late in the session, passage in the House would be doubtful. There would be protracted hearings and debate. But this bill was reported by the Senate Judiciary committee without public hearings. The same thing could happen in the House, where McCarran's ally, Walter of Pennsylvania, is still the most powerful single influence on the House Judiciary committee. Walter and McCarran do not always see eye to eye, but another McCarran-Walter bill is possible. So is hasty passage without debate in the crowded hours of a Congress eager to wind up its business and get home.

If the bill reaches the House floor, passage is certain. Rarely has so fundamental a legal change been proposed with so little public discussion and understanding. The average member of Congress will see it only as a bill "to make Communists talk." Actually the measure would have the force almost of a constitutional amendment, undercutting a fundamental right which has its origin in the same grievances which drove the Pilgrim Fathers to Holland and then America. The 5th amendment privilege arose in the early Seventeenth century struggle against compulsory testimony under oath before those inquis-

itorial courts of Star Chamber and High Commission with which the English Crown sought to root out political and theological dissent as subversive heresy.

The bulk of this week's issue is being devoted to the bill. The hope is to Paul Revere enough interest to block the measure in the House. It is important to focus the attention of every organization interested in civil liberty upon the bill, to demand that full public hearings be held in the House, and to organize pressure on members of Congress to vote against the measure if and when reported out. The time necessary for hearings would be enough to block passage this session.

This is another in the series of those "McCarran bills" which are creating a new America, remodelled for conformity, unsafe for dissent, a chrome-plated version of George Orwell's 1984. McCarran continues to be the principal instrument for the achievement of the U. S. Chamber of Commerce's blueprint for thought control in America. The new "immunity" bill is in the same pattern as the McCarran bills which established the Subversive Activities Control Board and set up proto-Fascist regulations over immigration, our own little Iron Curtain.

II

This is the third year McCarran has been trying to get a bill through Congress which would enable investigating committees to bypass the Fifth amendment. In 1951 the McCarran bill for this purpose got out of committee but failed to come up for a vote in the Senate. In 1952, it was passed but then buried on a vote to reconsider. This year it almost achieved passage on the consent calendar in May but was blocked by Senator Taft (See *Hat's Off* in the *Weekly* for May 30). Last Thursday, July 9, at around 9 p. m. the measure was called up for a vote by the acting majority leader, Knowland.

The bill would compel a witness to give up his privilege against self-incrimination by granting him immunity from prosecution on any matter to which he testified. "The most important thing," McCarran told the Senate, "is to expose the conspiracy. Punishment of individual conspirators is a secondary thing." Actually the mode of punishment in the witch hunt is by publicity—to disgrace and deprive of employment anyone who has had Left connections in the past. The "immunity" does not protect from a public smearing.

The so-called "conspiracy" is so tenuous that even the top leaders of the Communist party have been prosecuted for nothing more tangible than "conspiracy to advocate." There is still no way to prosecute a man for support of Left wing causes or past membership in the Communist party. McCarran admitted that most of the victims are guilty of no crime for

A Southern "Reactionary" Defended The Bill of Rights . . .

which they could lawfully be prosecuted when he expressed the conviction that "many witnesses who claim their privilege . . . are improperly asserting that privilege." Fear of frame-up, unwillingness to inform on others and opposition in principle to political interrogation have led many to invoke the privilege, as indeed it was invoked three centuries ago under similar circumstances by dissenters.

For gangsters and criminals, the immunity offered by the McCarran bill would be a Godsend. For them, the immunity would be real enough. But for today's political dissenters and non-conformists, the "immunity" would be spurious. This is a device for widening the impact of terror-by-inquisition and enlarging the blacklist.

The first voice raised in objection Thursday night was that of Kefauver (D. Tenn.) but he limited himself, as he has in the past, to arguing that such immunity should not be granted without permission of the Attorney General. The Senate's one dependable liberal, Lehman (D., N. Y.) rose to fight the bill in principle. Kilgore (D., West Va.) had obtained a series of letters opposing the McCarran bill from Governor Dewey of New York, former Attorney General Francis Biddle, John W. Davis, Telford Taylor, Paul A. Freund, Dean Erwin N. Griswold of Harvard Law School, former Attorney General William D. Mitchell, Professor Lindsay Rogers, former Solicitor General Philip Perlman, and Donald Richberg. Lehman put these letters (by some oversight Richberg's was not included) in the Congressional Record. Lehman said the bill struck at the separation of powers and would "encourage persons to seek to avoid the penalties of crimes by accusing others."

Monroney (D. Okla.) wondered whether the bill might not be used by a clever lawyer or by a small group entrenched in some Congressional committee to give immunity to "a person who perhaps should be prosecuted for a million dollar income tax fraud, or even . . . on a charge of treason." Kefauver agreed, and repeated his favorite argument—that David Greenglass could have used this means to escape prosecution in the Rosenberg case. John Sherman Cooper (R. Ky.)—the only Re-

publican Senator to oppose the bill—did not think that the power to compel testimony by granting immunity should be exercised at all by Congressional committees. "The granting of immunity," he said, "ought to be under definite safeguards" as "in a court of record" where "a judge or presiding officer guards the interests of the witness and of the government."

Senator Cooper went on to a more fundamental objection. He agreed that "undoubtedly" Communists used the Fifth amendment and he saw no reason why any "loyal or good American, or innocent American" should be unwilling to answer questions as to Communist party membership. But he said that while he wanted to protect the country from "subversion", he also wanted "to protect the free structure itself." He said the Bill of Rights protects "the individual who may be guilty, as well as the individual who is innocent" but that only so could "the guaranty of individual rights from oppression" be made effective. "When for reasons of expediency or emergency, we weaken these individual rights and give inordinate powers or emergency powers to any branch of our government," Cooper warned the Senate, "it is the record of history that at last that power will be used wrongfully, or will be used unwisely, or against innocent individuals."

The roll was called. Among the Democrats who answered were some who are usually or occasionally on the liberal side: the minority leader, Sparkman (D. Ala.), Douglas (D. Ill.), Jackson (D. Wash.), Magnuson (D. Wash.), Humphrey (D. Minn.), and Murray (D. Mont.). None of these said a word during the debate. As on an earlier occasion this year when Senator George of Georgia expressed grave misgivings about the McCarran bill, it was left to a right wing Southern Democrat, Hoey of North Carolina, to make the most sweeping attack upon the bill.

Senator Hoey expressed his friendship and admiration for McCarran. He said he usually followed McCarran's leadership. But Hoey said, "I am opposed to the entire bill. I believe we are going right in the face of the Constitution. The Constitution of the United States provides that no person shall be re-

Full Text of The New McCarran Bill as Passed By the Senate

"No witness shall be excused from testifying or from producing books, papers, and other records and documents before either House, or before any committee of either House, or before any joint committee of the two Houses of Congress on the ground, or for the reason, that the testimony or evidence, documentary or otherwise, required of him may tend to incriminate him or subject him to a penalty or forfeiture, when the record shows—

"(1) in the case of proceedings before one of the Houses of Congress, that a majority of the Members present of that house, or

"(2) in the case of proceedings before a committee, that two thirds of the members of the full committee, including at least two members of each of the two political parties having the largest representation on such committees

"shall by affirmative vote have authorized that such person be granted immunity under this section with respect to the transactions, matters, or things concerning which, after he has claimed his privilege against self-incrimination, he is nevertheless compelled by direction of the presiding of-

ficer or the chair to testify. But no such witness shall be prosecuted or subjected to any penalty or forfeiture for or on account of any transaction, matter or thing concerning which after he has claimed his privilege against self-incrimination he is nevertheless so compelled to testify, or produce evidence, documentary or otherwise.

"No official paper or record required to be produced hereunder is within the said privilege.

"No person shall be exempt from prosecution or punishment for perjury or contempt committed in so testifying.

"At least one week in advance of voting on the question of granting immunity to any witness under this act the Attorney General shall be informed of the intention to consider such question, and shall have assented to the granting of such immunity: Provided, That if the Attorney General does not assent to immunity within one week after requested by the committee, immunity can nevertheless be granted by the committee if by resolution of the particular House of the Congress having jurisdiction over the committee, said House by a majority yea-and-nay vote authorizes the granting of immunity."

... While The "Liberal" Morse Helped McCarran Put It Over

quired to testify against himself. We are undertaking to say that a committee of Congress can do what a court cannot do. The courts can grant immunity, but they cannot force a witness to testify against himself . . . The Constitution says a man does not have to do that. I do not believe Congress ought to pass a measure such as the one before us."

I am in hearty accord," Senator Hoey went on, "with all the purposes to go after the Communists, to investigate and prosecute them, and all that, but . . . I do not believe we should forget the fact that the Constitution is for the protection of all the people. There are other persons besides Communists in this country. I do not believe we should confer upon any committee of the Congress the power to take away the rights which the Constitution gives to every individual and to every citizen."

III

Given some leadership, the liberals might have been rallied behind this appeal from one of the respected conservatives of the Senate. But when Hoey finished, Morse of Oregon, took the floor, and on this occasion as before in this session (see the *Weekly* for last March 14), he helped McCarran.

It was a smooth performance. The Independent from Oregon did not think the issue ought to be decided on "the basis of a black or white determination." There was no doubt, Morse said, that McCarran was correct, "when he points out that there is a dangerous conspiracy abroad in the land, which I think threatens our internal security". On the other hand, Morse could not "escape the conclusion expressed by the Senator from North Carolina . . . that the proposal of the Senator from Nevada in its present form—and I shall offer an amendment to it before I close—would create the possibility of abuse." The italics are added. They call attention to the distortion of Hoey's argument by Morse. Senator Hoey did not object to the bill "in its present form." He was against *any* measure which would compel a man to testify against himself.

Morse then offered his own "compromise." But this abandoned the fight against compulsory testimony in principle and focussed on the procedure by which testimony was to be compelled. Kefauver wanted to make the grant of immunity subject to the approval of the Attorney General. The most McCarran would offer was an amendment giving the Attorney

General a week's notice, during which that official might state any objections to the committee.

Morse proposed as a compromise that if the Attorney General did not assent within ten days to the proposed grant of immunity, the grant might nonetheless be made on a two-thirds vote of the house to which the Congressional committee belonged. Kefauver, for some reason, asked that this be made one week instead of 10 days. Morse agreed. Then McCarran said he would also agree if Morse would change his amendment to provide that the resolution compelling testimony might be passed by majority instead of two-thirds vote.

The difference is considerable. It is the difference between a situation in which a determined minority may defend a witness and one in which the majority party may do as it pleases. But Morse accepted the change, declaring "I want to say to the Senator from Nevada that we have not been as far apart in our objectives as some of our remarks might seem to indicate."

The Independent from Oregon, not at all independent where McCarran and McCarthy are concerned, had succeeded in diverting debate from principle to procedure, and then watering down even procedural safeguards. The final outcome is wide open to abuse.

The bill, as thus amended, was passed (as they say in the Senate) by yea-and-nay, without a recorded vote. After such a vote, any Senators who wish to be recorded may rise and announce their vote. Only ten Senators asked that their names be recorded as having voted against the bill. The lone Republican among them was Cooper of Kentucky. Two right wing Southern Democrats were among the ten—Stennis of Mississippi and McClellan of Arkansas, the latter one of the three Democrats who resigned last week from the McCarthy committee. "I believe the bill is unconstitutional," McClellan said. The other recorded dissenters were Magnuson and Jackson of Washington, Kerr of Oklahoma, Lehman of New York, Hennings of Missouri, Murray of Montana, Hayden of Arizona.

McCarran's bill to circumvent the Fifth amendment had finally cleared its first hurdle. Whether it passes the House may depend on how much public sentiment may be aroused to force hearings. We urge every reader to act. Write your Congressman. Alert your friends.

Extra Copies of This Special Issue Are Available

Voices Raised Against The New McCarran "Immunity" Bill

Dean Erwin N. Griswold, Harvard Law School: "Even when immunity from prosecution is granted, there is a certain element inconsistent with our traditions in requiring a person to give testimony which reflects against himself."

Former Solicitor General Philip B. Perlman: "The power to grant immunity from criminal prosecution should not be vested in a legislative body."

Donald R. Richberg: "I must express my feeling of doubt as to the wisdom of giving Congressional committees the right to over-ride the constitutional objection of a witness by granting him immunity from prosecution."

Former Attorney General Francis Biddle: "I can sense a reluctance on the part of several Senators to change so fundamentally our basic law with respect to claiming con-

stitutional rights under the Fifth amendment. It is my sincere hope that the bill may be referred back to committee for further consideration."

Governor Thomas E. Dewey, New York: "The granting of immunity is an extraordinary power which should in all cases be carefully restricted."

Donald C. Cook, chairman Securities and Exchange Commission: "Unless the agency which is empowered to decide whether or nor to grant immunity is in position of sufficient facts and has sufficient knowledge of the laws involved that it can predict the consequences which would flow from a particular grant of immunity, it cannot possibly use the power with sufficient wisdom to protect the public interest."

JENNINGS PERRY'S PAGE

The Cold War Needs More Than a Change of Name

With that item of the report of the President's committee on information which suggests that the time has come to decommission the terms "cold war" and "psychological warfare" it is impossible not to be bemused. One wonders instantly whether this might be the opening wedge for a great new policy of verbal disarmament, the beginning of a transition from the diplomacy of epithet to the diplomacy of the soft word that turneth away wrath. In support of the possibility one hopefully recalls that from Truman to Eisenhower there has been *some* modification of language, and indeed of tone, in official references to the other side. Where the former could not say "Red" without a gritting of teeth and frothing at the lips General Ike has been able to discuss "those people" if not dispassionately at least without snarling. It just could be that in the judgment of the advisory committee querulousness now should be replaced by a more adult, a more civil address in international communications.

In the summary of the report released at the White House, the information committee headed by New York banker William H. Jackson gives the opinion that the "war" words not only are outmoded but fail to do justice to the efforts of the West to build "a world of peace and freedom." Unquestionably the point is well taken: the usage ill fits the aim. Unfortunately, however, much of the content of the report was withheld as highly secret and the quotations made public offer no guidance whatever to the rest of us who still will have to call the cold war something.

The oversight is especially regrettable since the good words which would handsomely describe our efforts have been preempted. While we have been speaking blithely of "psychological warfare" and the "cold war," the other people have been waving doves and intoning "peace" for years. We do have our dignity: we are not copycats. Up to now our limited awareness of the lameness of our own usages has been manifested mainly—almost solely—in a desultory attempt to discredit by hyphenation the good words seized upon by the other side; we have endlessly scoffed at their "peace offensives," "peace tricks," "peace propaganda." And even though in these associations the bad words have not

completely corrupted the good, we hardly at so late a date could adopt, for the improvement of our own style, any of these terms we have in the dreary progress of the cold war held up to ridicule.

Unless, of course, what we now are seeking is not merely a euphemism—but an actual appeasement of the world's situation; unless what the President's committee is proposing is that we move to end the cold war itself—not merely to change its name. In that case, we should as glibly and as light-heartedly as anybody else talk of "peace" day in and day out, and if we should find our voice in tune with a chorus already resounding, why, so much the better for all.

Personally, I am eager to think that the sections of the Jackson group's report not published *did* consider and support the proposition that the cold war should be relegated in more than name only. The gain would be negligible, it seems to me, if, having cudged our wits to discover a really winsome name for our major foreign policy, it should turn out that the very substitution was a ruse, a stratagem of sound effects, a part of the same old cold war. By the same token it is difficult to imagine anything more surely dispiriting than a fine new national effort, at the suggestion of the information committee, to prosecute psychological warfare right on, for the rest of our lives, under a dressed-up rose.

Peace, at the best humanity can hope to achieve, will be relative. There is no possibility that, while man keeps his imagination, the rivalry of social systems will not continue. We on our side and others on theirs always will point to our and their "higher standard of living," or to the promise of it, and seek thereby to appeal to the minds and hearts of the people.

But this competition need not be spiteful and poisonous, as the world has suffered it under the cold war; it can be cordial and instructive. And it need not and cannot be accompanied by hoarse, habitual counter-crying "Assassins, hate-mongers, enslavers!" The President may have been so advised; and if happily so, the parts of the Jackson committee's report held secret must have more meat in it than the parts thus far exposed.

I. F. Stone's Weekly

• Editor and Publisher, I. F. STONE

Published weekly except the last two weeks of August at Room 205, 301 E. Capitol St., S.E., Washington 3, D. C. Subscription rates: Domestic, \$5 a year; Canada, Mexico and elsewhere in the Western Hemisphere, \$6; England and Continental Europe, \$10 by 1st class mail, \$15 by air; for Israel, Asia, Australia and Africa, \$10 by first class mail, \$20 by air mail. Single copy, 15 cents. Tel.: LI 4-7087. Entered as Second Class mail matter, Post Office, Washington, D. C.

July 18, 1953  Vol. I, No. 26

I. F. Stone's Weekly

Room 205

301 E. Capitol St., S.E.,

Washington 3, D. C.

NEWSPAPER

Entered as
Second Class Mail
Matter
Post Office
Washington, D. C.

I. F. Stone's Weekly

VOL. I NUMBER 27

JULY 25, 1953



WASHINGTON, D. C.

15 CENTS

McCarthy's Bluff, and Two Who Called It

McCarthy has been engaged in a bluff. Last week two witnesses—Harvey O'Connor and Leo Huberman—called him on it. The bluff is this: Congressional investigating committees are not the possessors of a universal writ. They may not inquire into any and everything. The subjects into which they may inquire are limited to those specified in the rule or resolution establishing the committee.

What is McCarthy authorized to investigate? He is chairman of the Senate Committee on Government Operations, known until last year as the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Department. The old name indicates the true purpose and authority of this committee. It is a kind of super auditing body. Its name was changed last year but not its authority. It still operates under subsection (g) of Rule XXV of the Senate. This rule—the full text is reprinted on page two—gives McCarthy no authority to inquire into the political beliefs and associations even of persons employed by the government, much less of editors and writers not on the public payroll.

McCarthy's two competitors in the witch hunt may lay claim rightly or wrongly to broad powers of inquisition. Velde is chairman of the House Committee on "Un-American Activities", a term vague enough to cover any person or idea the committee may consider objectionable. Jenner's subcommittee of the Senate Judiciary Committee operates under as loose and sweeping a standard—its concern is with "internal security". But McCarthy's lawful province is with "budget and accounting measures" and with the effect of executive reorganizations. His broadest grant of investigating power is to study "the operation of government activities at all levels with a view to determining its economy and efficiency."

This can be stretched to cover the purchase of books for overseas libraries—to ask who bought them and why, even to inquire into their contents. But it gives him no authority to subpoena writers and editors and question them about their political beliefs and affiliations. James Wechsler of the *New York Post* submitted to a non-existent authority when he allowed himself to be interrogated by McCarthy and gave McCarthy a list of persons Wechsler had known as Communists. Cedric Belfrage and James Aronson of the *National Guardian* let themselves in for the usual smear-by-implication when they pleaded their privilege before McCarthy instead of challenging his authority.

Last week two well-known writers, O'Connor and Huberman, taking their cue from Einstein (see Einstein, Oxnam and the Witch Hunt in the *Weekly* for June 20) declined to plead self-incrimination and thereby challenged McCarthy to cite them for contempt. This was the first time since the case of the Hollywood Ten that writers have challenged the authority of a Congressional committee to inquire into politi-

cal beliefs. Like the Hollywood Ten, O'Connor and Huberman pleaded the First Amendment in their refusals to answer. But the Hollywood Ten were before the House Un-American Activities Committee. These new challenges were to the more limited authority of the McCarthy committee. The two writers refused to answer questions not only on constitutional grounds—the fact that the First Amendment protects freedom of expression from restriction by Congress—but also on the ground that the questions were beyond the scope of the authority conferred by the Senate on McCarthy's committee.

O'Connor declined to answer any questions as to political beliefs and associations. We are reprinting the full text of his testimony on page 3 for its value as news, inspiration and example. The celerity with which McCarthy got the author of "Mellon's Millions" off the witness stand was eloquent.

Huberman in a prepared statement said he had never been a Communist but was a Marxist and Socialist who believed "in working together with others, including Communists, to the extent that their aims and methods are consistent with mine." Huberman said he was stating that much under oath "not because I concede the right of this Committee to ask for such information, but because I want to make it crystal clear that Communism is not an issue in this case and to focus attention on what *is* the issue—my right as an author and editor to pursue my occupation without interference from Congress or any of its committees." (The full text of Huberman's testimony will be published in the August issue of the *Monthly Review*, which he edits with Paul Sweezy.)

Huberman was asked over and over again by Mundt and McCarthy to explain how his views "deviated" from those of Communism. Huberman declined to answer and declined to invoke the Fifth, declaring himself ready for a judicial test of his right to resist inquisition into his political views. At the end Mundt covered the committee's retreat with a lengthy statement, suggesting that Huberman not be cited for contempt since he had (1) admitted authorship of his books and (2) said that he was not a Communist. This suggests that the committee is unwilling to venture a contempt proceeding against a writer who says he is not a Communist but refuses to answer other questions about his political beliefs or affiliations.

O'Connor's challenge had to be taken up or risk complete collapse of the McCarthy Committee's pretensions to indulge in ideological inquisition. The committee has voted to cite him for contempt. A majority vote of the Senate is needed to initiate a prosecution. Should O'Connor be indicted, the stage will be set for a fundamental battle against McCarthy and McCarthyism, in which every American who cares for freedom must support Harvey O'Connor.

I. F. Stone's Weekly

• Editor and Publisher, I. F. STONE

Published weekly except the last two weeks of August at Room 205, 301 E. Capitol St., S.E., Washington 3, D. C. Subscription rates: Domestic, \$5 a year; Canada, Mexico and elsewhere in the Western Hemisphere, \$6; England and Continental Europe, \$10 by 1st class mail, \$15 by air; for Israel, Asia, Australia and Africa, \$10 by first class mail, \$20 by air mail. Single copy, 15 cents. Tel.: LI 4-7087. Entered as Second Class mail matter, Post Office, Washington, D. C.

July 25, 1953 Vol. I, No. 27

Communique

Last week's special issue about the new McCarran bill was our biggest yet: 20,000 copies were printed—and, thanks to interested individuals and organizations—distributed. Enough of an alarm has been raised about the bill to make action on it by the House Judiciary Committee this session doubtful. But if Congress is still at it in August, there remains the danger that the bill might slip out onto the floor some hot night as it did in the Senate and pass. If it does, a lot of radicals will have a choice of turning informer or going to jail. The bill would virtually repeal the Fifth Amendment's privilege against self-incrimination by compelling testimony in return for a rather dubious promise of immunity from prosecution.

It is important that as many organizations as possible formally ask the House committee for a hearing before action is taken on the bill, since hearings alone would delay the measure enough to make passage impossible this session. The response so far to our bit of midsummer Paul Revering has been most gratifying and makes yours truly feel like a live, useful, crusading newspaperman again, not just a wee voice in a tempest.

This is a fight which can be won. The Attorney General dislikes the bill. The

House committee seems dubious of it. What you and I do may turn the scales. We repeat: write your Congressman and alert your friends.

Accolade Apropos

A New York Times dispatch from Bonn last Monday on a rally for the formation of a new neo-Nazi party in Germany reports one speaker, Edward A. Fleckenstein, of Weehawken, N. J., "president of the Voters Alliance of Americans of German Descent . . . told the neo-Nazis that Germany's true friends in the United States were Senators Joseph McCarthy, Pat McCarran, Everett M. Dirksen and William E. Jenner. He denounced democracy as a glorification of mediocrity."

J. Edgar and Joe

Too little attention has been paid to the fact that after J. B. Matthews was ousted, McCarthy let it be known that he was conferring with J. Edgar Hoover on the problem of finding a successor. A few days after, Frank P. Carr resigned as supervisor of the FBI's New York office to become McCarthy's new staff director.

The effect was to give McCarthy some badly needed moral support and glamorous prestige at a very difficult moment in his career.

All this happened while McCarthy was smearing the CIA, the government's other civilian intelligence agency. There is an old rivalry between FBI and CIA, and newspapers which have friendly access to the FBI have several times published sensational "exposes" of the CIA. The friendly relations between McCarthy and J. Edgar Hoover represent a dangerous alliance for the Administration as for the country.

The FBI has a powerful position in the witch hunt. An ex-FBI man, Velde, is head of the House Un-American Activities Committee. Another will now be staff director for McCarthy. The kind of "un-evaluated" material disclosed by the Coplon case in the FBI files is the kind of rubbish in which the witch hunters revel.

Is The G.O.P. Disloyal?

Congressman Robert L. Condon of California, defending himself in the House last week against the anonymous allegations which led the AEC to bar him from an atomic test in Nevada, presented some curious proofs of "loyalty." He cited his record in Congress and said his votes there had always placed "security above economy. I have voted," he said, "against every cut in appropriations for the Department of Defense. I believe that a strong Air Force is essential in this atomic age to protect our country, and I have voted to keep it strong."

The plea illustrates the way in which the anti-Red hysteria has made prisoners of the liberal Democrats; they dare not oppose the military lest this be taken as proof of subversive sympathy. But if voting against cuts in military appropriations and voting for a bigger Air Force is proof of loyalty, what of Condon's Republican colleagues in the House who recently voted to cut the Air Force budget? Are they less loyal?

And what about Charlie Wilson, that R—d from General Motors, who cut the Air Force by five billion dollars? And Eisenhower, who supported Wilson against the Air Force? Are they subversive?

H. Styles Marx

And while we're on the subject, it pains us to notice that Senator H. Styles Bridges, R., of New Hampshire, whom we had always regarded as stratospherically above suspicion, turned in a report last week-end criticizing the French for not using heavier income taxation.

Income taxes, as we have several times been reminded by DAR ladies and Westbrook Pegler, were advocated by Marx and Engels in the Communist Manifesto. "Taxation of the rich," the Bridges report says of the French fiscal system, "is on a primarily low level . . . income taxes represent only a small part of the country's revenue." This will please *Humanité* no end, and just goes to show you can't trust anybody anymore, except possibly an avowed Communist. At least, he might turn out to be an FBI man.

Full Text: McCarthy's Only Authority as Investigator

The powers of the standing committee of the Senate are established by Rule XXV of its "Standing Rules." These, as passed by the Senate, set forth the function and sphere of authority of each committee. A committee cannot lawfully go beyond them, and it cannot lawfully punish a man for contempt if he refuses to answer a question which is outside the limits of its authority. Here is the text of that portion of the rule which deals with the Committee on Government Operations headed by McCarthy:

"(g) (1) Committee on Government Operations, to consist of thirteen Senators, to which committee shall be referred all proposed legislation, messages, petitions, memorials, and other matters relating to the following subjects:

"(A) Budget and accounting measures, other than appropriations.

"(B) Reorganizations in the executive branch of the government.

"(2) Such committee shall have the duty of—

"(A) receiving and examining reports of the Comptroller General of the United States and of submitting such recommendations to the Senate as it deems necessary or desirable in connection with the subject matter of such reports;

"(B) studying the operation of Government activities at all levels with a view to determining its economy and efficiency;

"(C) evaluating the effects of laws enacted to reorganize the legislative and executive branches of the Government;

"(D) studying intergovernmental relationships between the United States and the State and municipalities, and between the United States and international organizations of which the the United States is a member."

Despite Rhee (and Dulles) The Odds Still Favor Peace

The Eisenhower Administration is as split over Korea as over the military budget. The Republican party politicians see in a firm truce their only hope of winning next year's Congressional elections and beginning to reduce taxes. The military bureaucracy, smarting from defeat in Korea, see in a firm truce the danger of further cuts in military spending.

The difference is that while the Republican majority in Congress controls the military budget, it does not control the situation in Korea. There the military have their hand on the vital levers. On Korea, as on the budget, Eisenhower stands with the party civilians. But lines of policy laid down by the White House can be distorted by those whose job it is to carry them out. The military are still hoping that something will turn up so they can try out their new atomic weapons in Korea. They dream of a new "end run" up the East coast of Korea, with victory on the Yalu.

The State Department is closer to the Pentagon in this than to the White House. Between the military and the diplomats, Rhee is encouraged to be obstreperous. In his TV report last week with Assistant Secretary Walter S. Robertson, Dulles exhibited at their fullest the rather nauseating talents which made him so valuable at Sullivan & Cromwell. "The Com-

munists have been pretending," he said, "that there cannot be an armistice because the United Nations command does not guarantee the future conduct of the Republic of Korea. That is absurd. The proposed agreement does not guarantee the future conduct of any government." If it is being signed in good faith, it certainly guarantees that the future conduct of the governments signing it will conform to their promises.

Such oily evasions would have been unnecessary if Dulles and Robertson had any real assurances from Rhee. There were many at State Department and Pentagon last week who hoped the Chinese would break off the talks altogether rather than accept such humiliating swindles.

Some new desperate action by Rhee to prevent the signing of the truce would be welcomed. A rearguard action to prevent world settlement is being fought by Dulles and the American military. Their biggest windfall was the Beria affair in Moscow which indicates serious political instability in the new Soviet regime and helps discourage a big power conference. The effort here is to stave off solutions, whether in Germany or Korea. Some prefer drift because it is easier. Others prefer it from more sinister motives. Yet the odds still favor peace.

Full Text: Harvey O'Connor's Testimony

Mr. O'CONNOR: Mr. Chairman, may I make a brief statement?

The CHAIRMAN (Senator McCarthy): No. You will answer the question.

Mr. O'CONNOR: About my objection to the jurisdiction of this committee?

The CHAIRMAN: Yes, you may make a statement on that.

Mr. O'CONNOR: Thank you.

Under the First Amendment to the Constitution, my writings, my books, and my political opinions are of no legitimate concern to this committee. If I have violated any laws in the writings that I have written, that is a proper concern for the law enforcement agencies and not the proper concern of this committee.

The CHAIRMAN: Will you get nearer to the microphone, Mr. O'Connor, so that we can hear you?

Mr. O'CONNOR: My second point would be that this committee has no right to inquire into my writings, under the point of the constitutional limitations on the powers of Congress and its committees. I might say in that regard that I have not known until this moment that my books were in overseas libraries, and most certainly I had nothing whatever to do with their selection there.

In the third place, I would object to the authority of the committee, under the statute by which it was created by Congress, to inquire into my writings or my political views.

The CHAIRMAN: Just for your information, Mr. O'Connor, we are not concerned with any political views of yours. We would not be concerned about your writings. You are entitled to write whatever you care to write. Any American or anyone else is entitled to purchase your book, your writings. You are here this morning because your writings were purchased by the old Acheson State Department, distributed throughout the world, ostensibly for the purpose of fighting Communism. Now, when the taxpayers pay for your books, when the royalties of your books, paid by the taxpayer, go into the Communist coffers, then this committee is concerned with that. For that reason, I again ask you the question: At the time you wrote the books which

were purchased with taxpayers' money and put in our information libraries throughout the world, at that time were you a member of the Communist conspiracy?

Mr. O'CONNOR: I object to the question on the three grounds I have already stated.

The CHAIRMAN: You can object. Now you will answer, unless you feel that the answer will tend to incriminate you.

Mr. O'CONNOR: I do not feel that the answer will tend to incriminate me.

The CHAIRMAN: Then you are ordered to answer.

Mr. O'CONNOR: I have already answered.

The CHAIRMAN: I apparently did not hear your answer, then. You are ordered to answer whether or not you were a member of the Communist party.

Mr. O'CONNOR: On the three grounds I have stated, I have declined to answer.

The CHAIRMAN: Let us have the record clear, so that we will know what you have declined to answer. I will repeat the question. At the time you wrote the books which were purchased by the old Acheson State Department and distributed in our information centers, were you a member of the Communist conspiracy?

Mr. O'CONNOR: My political affiliations or lack of political affiliations are no legitimate concern of this committee.

The CHAIRMAN: Do you refuse to answer?

Mr. O'CONNOR: Apparently.

The CHAIRMAN: Not "apparently". Do you refuse to answer?

Mr. O'CONNOR: I refuse to answer.

The CHAIRMAN: You are refusing on the ground that the answer might tend to incriminate you?

Mr. O'CONNOR: I am not asserting the privilege against self-incrimination.

The CHAIRMAN: You are not asserting the privilege against self-incrimination. All right. You may step down.

Incidentally, I think Senator Mundt wishes that a meeting of the subcommittee be called to have this man immediately cited for contempt. I will call a meeting of the subcommittee at the earliest convenience for that purpose.

Your other witness, Mr. Cohn?

JENNINGS PERRY'S PAGE

Free Groceries Find Takers Anywhere on Earth

By now, the first of our ships rushing vittles to the hungry East Germans should be well out on the seas. And whether or not this \$15,000,000 worth of flour, lard, dried milk and beans, or any part of it, ever finds its way through the Curtain to the hungry East Germans they and we already have reaped substantial satisfactions from our shrewd humanitarianism.

Shamed by our charity and, according to the wires, "infuriated" by our enterprise the Reds have begun flooding the East German food shops with butter and fish and have taken potatoes off of rationing for the first time in years. This is the kind of competition among social systems all must applaud. Using calories instead of cannon.

On our side, all in being kind to others, we have gotten rid of some of our embarrassing surpluses, made loads for our shipping and perhaps put up the market a point or two. Such incidental returns can be counted, of course, irrespective of whether any hungry East German gets to savor the flavor of a single powdered American egg. The same is true of the fun we have had of the whole thing up to now, the spiritual lift given by the cleverness of our idea, which we have run to point out to each other and which, having been felt to the full, cannot really be reclaimed from us now by any course events may take.

It would be indelicate to say that we have gloated at the reports of famine in East Germany which provided the opportunity for the dramatic stroke "designed to seize the initiative at a time when Russia is torn by strife in the Kremlin itself and facing bitter unrest in the satellite countries." Our sympathies at the man to man level could not have been entirely untouched. The gift without the giver still is bare; and though our native practicality may have suggested to us that here was too good a chance of seizing the initiative to miss, our great heart would have insisted that feeding the hungry was the nobler aim.

That was why we could chortle with a clear conscience when West Berlin Borough Mayor Willi Kressmann set up his rolling groceries at the border to dispense spuds and fruit and

milk to east burghers flocking through the Curtain to shop with him. It was so obvious a relief measure not to have been thought of before, and the instant success of it proved (1) that the East Germans were indeed hungry and (2) that despite Moscow's red-faced rejection of our President's gracious offer of shiploads of produce there was a way of succoring the suffering.

In showering our compliments upon the kindly and ingenious Mayor, who displayed his wares at one-fifth the going prices across the border, it hardly seemed loyal or necessary to reflect that the same bargain set up in any American street would exert the same pull upon the regular customers of any homeside store, no matter how well-stocked its own shelves and bins. The comforting inference we drew instead was that if Mayor Kressmann could attract thousands of East Germans over the line merely by slashing prices, we surely, by spreading out our \$15,000,000 worth of flour, butter, eggs, soybeans, etc., free should be able to bring tens of thousands over.

It ought to work out this way in Berlin since undoubtedly it would work out similarly anywhere else in the world. A trainload of alfalfa hay tendered for free in drought-stricken Texas would find eager takers; but the same hay tendered for free in Bucks County, Pennsylvania, where the pastures are lush, would find eager takers, too. The hitch is, and I think we should be aware of it in our charming new move to feed the hungry and seize the initiative, that the willingness of a population to rush for free goods neither proves its acute want nor assures its common gratitude.

This fact invites us to hedge a little the delights we anticipate, and have already begun to enjoy, as a result of our undertaking to get food to the hungry East Germans. The more we are prone to regard our effort as a game of tricks or treats, the faster our disappointment may be when our stuff shall have passed over the border. But if we can forget the cold war for a minute, it should be sufficiently gratifying to us that we have an excess of store in our larder to pass on to fellow beings for the sole reason that we believe they have room in their bellies for it.

I. F. Stone's Weekly

Room 205 Entered as Second-Class Mail Matter Post Office Washington, D. C.

NEWSPAPER

Subscription form for I. F. Stone's Weekly, Room 205, 301 E. Capitol St., S.E., Washington 3, D. C. Includes fields for Name, Street, City, State, and Zone, and a note to enter the following subscription rate: \$5 for 1 year is enclosed. (See page 3 for foreign rates).

I. F. Stone's Weekly

VOL. I NUMBER 28

AUGUST 1, 1953



WASHINGTON, D. C.

15 CENTS

Now The UN Must Liberate The USA

With the signing of a truce in Korea, the main political task of the UN in a sense must be the liberation of the USA. There can be no independent Korea until the United States has regained its own independence of all those forces symbolized and mobilized by the China Lobby. It will be difficult to unify Korea until some progress has been made in unifying the United States. More serious than the 38th parallel across Korea is the wall of paranoid suspicion crypto-Fascist forces here have been erecting around and across the United States, dividing Americans from each other and the rest of the world.

The Korean war would have been avoided if the UN had resisted pressure from Syngman Rhee and John Foster Dulles for the creation of a separate State in South Korea. The war with China might have been avoided if the UN in the winter of 1949-50, had rescued Acheson and Truman from imprisonment by the China Lobby, and insisted on the admission of Communist China to the UN. The task now is harder, the danger greater. The problem now is to avoid World War III. The principal beneficiaries of the Korean war, Syngman Rhee and Chiang Kai-shek, are determined to see it resumed on a larger scale than ever, for if the truce becomes a peace neither can survive as a political force. In a peaceful world, recognition of Communist China is inevitable. It took martial law to ensure Rhee's reelection as President last year; he cannot hope to survive in a unified Korea, unless indeed it is unified for him by American arms and his government is given the means to fasten the same kind of police state on North Korea that Rhee rules in the South.

The key to a settlement in the East is unification of Korea; as the key to settlement in Europe is the unification of Germany but in both areas neither of the two contending great Powers has been willing to let go of its own satellite share for fear the other's bloc might get the whole of it. Both have been agreed on unification in principle but both in practice have appended conditions unacceptable to the other. One way out for the U.S. would be to offer to withdraw from Korea altogether and hand over the problem of unification to the neutral Asian powers, if the Russians and Chinese would do the same. Such a move would create much good will for the U.S. and wipe out entirely the ugly effect of the "let Asians fight Asians" slogan, which translated itself too easily into using colonial colored peoples as cannon fodder against those who had won their independence. An offer of the kind suggested here would imply a sort of Monroe Doctrine for Asia and create the cement necessary to hold the area together as an independent bloc between the Powers. But such bold and creative diplomacy seems to be made impossible by the obsessions of containment, and the political comfort of a mulishly

inert diplomacy.

Now if ever is the time for the smaller powers to use their UN leverage creatively. They have much to learn from the Korean war. Korea was a terrible object lesson for all countries and areas which allow themselves to be divided between the America and the Russian power. The war showed that the American people, though instinctively kind and generous in dealing with distress, may easily be doped and duped by military leadership into permitting the kind of unnecessary havoc our Air Force wreaked in many parts of Korea. The war also showed that the American Air Force is infested with publicity men who are among the world's biggest liars; their inflated figures and inflammatory reporting are a menace. The war demonstrated again the delusion of victory by airpower and firepower, the ability of colonial colored peoples to handle jet planes and anti-aircraft radar effectively, the tremendous military power of the new China, and the willingness of the Chinese and the Russians to swallow one provocation after another in their desire for peace.

In this picture, the American people seem a passive mass. The military have been able to drag out the truce talks by one phoney issue after another for many months without popular protest in this country. The desire for peace is there, but the thought control drive has succeeded in stifling the forces and organizations which would have given it expression. The fear that peace might mean loss of jobs and business has been a potent factor, too, affecting workers as much as their employers. Militant rightist minorities easily sway this sheep-like mass, and cut down sharply the political and diplomatic maneuverability of the Eisenhower Administration. The new President promised peace in Korea and has fulfilled his promise, but the achievement of a precarious truce seems to have just about exhausted the political potency of the new Administration. Eisenhower's own desire for peace is a positive factor, but as against this the promise to walk out of a political conference after 90 days gives tremendous power for evil to Rhee and the American military men behind him.

Were there a peace movement left in this country, two of its main objectives in the crucial six months ahead would be clear. One would be to restore greater political freedom in South Korea so that peace forces there could provide some check on Syngman Rhee. The other would be to focus the spotlight on the coming Rhee-Dulles talks. These two Catos were among the chief architects of the war. The key point to watch are the conditions to which Rhee will try to commit the United States for unification of Korea. His own conditions require unconditional surrender, and that way lies resumption of the war.

The Oxnam Affair: Protestantism Is Subversive

When a Bishop appears before the House Un-American Activities Committee to deny that he is a Communist, the spectacle is not conducive to political sanity. Bishop G. Bromley Oxnam's valor in appearing before the Committee was better than his judgment. His intentions were good. His appearance was a mistake.

The Bishop's purpose was not merely to clear his name but to expose the methods by which the Committee assembles its one-sided dossiers and distributes its unverified slanders. But the disorderly procedure of the Committee made it possible to bury his replies in irrelevant digressions. The Bishop's supporters will feel vindicated by the final resolution declaring that he is not a Communist. (The meek gratitude with which this monumental bit of cheek was accepted tells a tragic-comic story about present-day America.) The Bishop's detractors will be encouraged to go on with their stale libels by Congressman Walter's ugly postscript, "I don't know why anyone would say he was cleared, because no one ever charged him with anything." The Committee's ranking Democrat gave the cue to the anti-Oxnam pack when he insisted the Communists made dupes of many high placed persons and "I place Bishop Oxnam . . . in this category."

For this unsatisfactory verdict, the good Bishop paid a heavy price. He has opened doors the Committee did not quite dare open on its own. Chairman Velde created an uproar among his Congressional colleagues by suggesting that the Un-American Activities Committee might investigate the Churches. McCarthy was forced to get rid of J. B. Matthews as research director because the latter had questioned the loyalty of Protestant ministers.

At such a time, the House Committee would never have dared subpoena a Bishop of the Methodist Church, largest Protestant denomination in this country. Bishop Oxnam, by asking to be heard, gave the witch hunters an excuse to do under the guise of fairness what they had been itching to do all along. The Bishop also gave Velde and Kit Clardy an excuse to dig up three ex-Communists of ancient vintage, Gitlow, Kornfeder and Manning, exhausted lemons from which there is little left to squeeze, and ask them in executive session about Reds among the clergy. They "exposed" familiar targets—the Methodist Federation for Social Service, and two men long associated with it, the venerable Dr. Harry F. Ward and the long-harried Rev. Jack R. McMichael.

The testimony of the ex-Communists was used to draw the Bishop into "putting the finger" on his old friend, Dr. Ward, and on the Rev. McMichael. To discuss them and their views before the House Committee was improper. In effect the Bishop was led into smearing them in order to clear himself. He was not discussing political and doctrinal differences before men of honor and good-will. He was throwing two other Methodists to the wolves and opening his whole church to smear treatment via another "exposure" of its unofficial Left wing, the Methodist Federation for Social Service. The result was to "prove" through the Bishop himself that there had been "infiltration" by "subversives." This gives the witch hunt open sesame to the pulpit.

The hunt for radicals in the Church is logical if one keeps in

mind the basic purpose of the witch hunt. It is no accident that Bishop Oxnam's grilling touched on his past criticism of the free enterprise system. The witch hunt is more concerned with doctrinal fidelity to Mammon than to God. America is to be made unsafe for social criticism and nonconformity. The Chamber of Commerce crowd still remembers what the Churches and indeed Dr. Ward himself did to the 12-hour day in steel after the 1919 steel strike seemed to have been safely smashed. Nor has that crowd forgotten what part such groups as the Methodist Federation played in helping the New Deal in the 30's.

The Churches, especially the Protestant Churches, could not hope for exemption from the thought control drive. Though Marx called religion the opiate of the people, the possessing classes have always feared that it might turn into a heady wine. It has never been easy to equate capitalism with the Brotherhood of Man. A religious system like Protestantism which glorifies individual judgment and conscience encourages "error" and "subversive" ideas. Ever since Protestantism and its forerunners unchained and translated the Bible, making it available to the common man, revolutionary lessons have been drawn from it. The communistic Anabaptists and the socialist Levellers testify to the inflammatory radicalism which may be distilled from Holy Writ. Men like Dr. Ward and the Rev. McMichael were in a familiar tradition if indeed they found Marx's "materialism" closer to Jesus and the Hebrew Prophets than the spiritual pretensions of a system which has its apex in the Chase National Bank.

Such deviations into fields closely akin to the communism of primitive Christianity are natural in the loose confines of an unpoliced system like Protestantism. This is the reality behind the convergent attacks upon it. J. B. Matthews paints the Protestant clergy as the largest single support of Communism in this country. Conversely Cardinal Ottaviani in Rome upholds restrictions against Protestant missionaries by declaring they find their "strongest allies and supporters among the Communists." The authoritarians of the right fear the freedom of opinion which is at the basis of Protestantism. It cannot submit to the witch hunt without losing its spiritual essence and abdicating to its ancient enemies. As seen from Rome, Protestantism is "subversive." When it ceases to be "subversive," it will cease to be Protestant.

The answer to the witch hunt in the Churches is that the Constitution says Congress shall make no establishment of religion. Church and State are separate, and Congress—unlike Parliament—may declare no doctrine orthodox. To inquire into the political beliefs of Churchmen is to plunge into a doctrinal controversy. Roman Catholicism and Fundamentalist Protestantism regard Liberal Theology as a breeding ground of political radicalism. To extend the Inquisition into the Churches is to turn the clock back three centuries to just such a situation as that from which the Pilgrims first fled, to link theological heresy again with political subversion, and to make the State the policeman of the Church. The only firm ground of defense is to deny the right of Congress to inquire into opinion, theological or otherwise. Ideas are no concern of the State in a free society. These premises Bishop Oxnam abandoned.

I. F. Stone's Weekly

• Editor and Publisher, I. F. STONE

Published weekly except the last two weeks of August at Room 205, 301 E. Capitol St., S.E., Washington 3, D. C. Subscription rates: Domestic, \$5 a year; Canada, Mexico and elsewhere in the Western Hemisphere, \$6; England and Continental Europe, \$10 by 1st class mail, \$15 by air; for Israel, Asia, Australia and Africa, \$10 by first class mail, \$20 by air mail. Single copy, 15 cts. Tel.: LI 4-7087. Entered as Second Class mail matter, Post Office, Washington, D. C.

August 1, 1953 Vol. I., No. 28

COMMENT

Cheerful Note

None of our readers will be unduly depressed to learn that thanks to the penny-pinching habits of those money-grubbing Republicans, the Department of Justice is being forced to abandon detention camps it had ready for "subversives" under the McCarran Internal Security Act of 1950.

The news was tucked away unnoticed in the recent testimony of James V. Bennett, Federal director of prisons, before the Senate appropriations Committee. "Two years ago, at the time the Internal Security Act was passed," Bennett explained, "we took over six surplus Army cantonments and began putting them in repair for possible use in the event of an emergency."

Under the detention camp provisions of the McCarran Act, subversives were to be thrown into camps in the event of war. Bennett said he had gotten some of the camps "fairly well in order" but that the reduction in estimates imposed by the economy minded Eisenhower Administration "will require the closing of at least half or perhaps all of these camps." Bennett added philosophically, "Perhaps the need for these camps may be fading into the distance a little."

Deportations Delirium

The shocking arrest for deportation of Jacob Burck, the brilliant Pulitzer Prize winning cartoonist of the Chicago Sun-Times, because he was once a radical, may serve to remind us that we are in the midst of a deportations delirium, quieter but much more extensive than that which followed World War I. Some figures on this were also provided by the Senate Appropriations Committee hearings.

There are now, thanks to the McCarran-Walter Act, "some 700 grounds" for deportation. At the end of the fiscal year, there were more than 11,000 persons being investigated for deportation as subversive, "more than double the figure of 4,500 such cases" pending at the close of the previous fiscal year. There were also in excess of 4,000 persons ordered de-

Asleep at The Switch

S. R. 147, citing Harvey O'Connor for contempt, was called up by Majority Leader Knowland in the Senate on Thursday, July 23, and passed without a voice being raised in protest, without discussion, without a record vote and without a single "nay."

O'Connor, as our readers know, took the "Einstein pledge" position before McCarthy, refusing to invoke the Fifth Amendment but declining to answer all questions as to his political beliefs and associations. He challenged McCarthy's authority to ask such questions under the First Amendment and under the powers conferred on his investigating committee by the Senate rules as enacted in the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946.

Exactly ten days before the contempt resolution came up, Senator Mike Monroney (D. Okla.), in an attack on McCarthy, refusing to invoke the Fifth Amendment but declining to answer all questions as to his political beliefs and associations. He challenged McCarthy's authority to ask such questions under the First Amendment and under the powers conferred on his investigating committee by the Senate rules as enacted in the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946.

Yet neither Senator Monroney nor Senator Lehman nor any of the liberal Senators who have been fighting Mc-

Carthy raised a voice in defense of O'Connor nor sought to have the contempt resolution reconsidered, as it might have been, on the two legislative days following.

Nor were the Senators the only people asleep at the switch. The newspapers fighting McCarthyism have been silent. The New Republic has not even mentioned O'Connor's fundamental defiance of McCarthy. Yet if as we believe and Senator Monroney believes, McCarthy has no lawful authority to inquire into opinion, then the issue should have been debated before the contempt resolution was passed by the Senate.

Millions of words have been written on how to fight McCarthyism, but when one brave American like O'Connor risks going to jail in order to challenge McCarthy's authority under the Senate's own rules and under the First Amendment, remarkably little interest is shown by the liberal press. Yet if the O'Connor case is won, as it can be won, a real blow will have been struck at McCarthy.

The author of "Mellon's Millions" lives at Little Compton, R. I. We urge all readers to write O'Connor and to line up all the support they can.

ported to countries which would not take them. But a Mr. Kelly of the Immigration Service testified that progress was being made in forcing them to leave "by reason of the—I don't like to use the word harass—compulsion that we were able to put on them by keeping them in detention."

The following humane colloquy took place at this point:

Senator ELLENDER. Is there anything under the law you can do so aggravating that they want to leave the country?

Mr. KELLY. As I say, we have done that.

Senator ELLENDER. What is it?

Mr. KELLY. By invoking the provisions.

Senator ELLENDER. Can you not jail them?

Mr. KELLY. We are holding them in detention.

Senator ELLENDER. I thought this new act would give you full power to make conditions so distasteful that they would not want to live in the United States. I would sure try it.

Without Hobgoblins

Secretary of Defense Charles Wilson, when he said the Russian air force was largely defensive, was treated as one treats children who do not know better than to use certain words in the front parlor. But General Alfred M. Gruenther, Supreme Commander of NATO, a General who seems to operate without benefit of hobgoblins, gave much the same estimate in his Senate Appropriations Committee testimony.

When Senator Robertson (D. Va.) asked General Gruenther how the Soviet air force compared with ours, this much

of the reply was left in the heavily censored record: "The Soviets have three main types of missions for their air force," Gruenther said. "One is interceptor or air defense, the second is long range strategic air, and the third is ground support planes. The long-range strategic airplanes are the B-29 type which is an obsolescent type so far as we are concerned." At that point the discussion went off the record.

The General also said (1) that the Russian ground forces of 175 divisions "is substantially the same as the Russians had four years ago" (2) that a sizeable portion of this force must be kept in the Far East and cannot be deployed in Europe and (3) "I do not think war is ever going to come." General Gruenther, who deserves an award of some kind for plain speaking, said he thought the danger lay not in war but in efforts to divide the NATO forces.

That is something Washington often does more effectively than Moscow.

Bulletin

The McCarran "immunity bath" bill to get rid of the Fifth Amendment privilege against self-incrimination seemed safely bottled up in House Judiciary committee as we went to press. It has not yet been referred to a subcommittee and if Congress adjourns soon, as expected, will be dead for the session. Our hat is off to the many live wires among our readers who pitched in on this fight. It is important to build up greater awareness of this measure, since McCarran will certainly introduce it again next session.

JENNINGS PERRY'S PAGE

Times Mend, the Witch Doctors Sit Shakily

It seems to me that for a people who always have admired forthrightness in international communications we have become distressingly coquettish and that somewhere along the way in the past decade we have shamefully shuffled off both our "passion for knowledge" where the public affairs are concerned and the good democratic arrogance which used to prompt each of us to "have his idea" and to "speak his piece." For some reason our leaders actually appear to be afraid of face to face talks with the leaders of other countries with which we maintain differences; such interviews are not sought but are avoided from month to month and from year to year. What could we be afraid of: of being out-talked, of being taken in by the tricks of language, of fatal exasperation, of losing our temper and rushing into combat?

It was rather understandable in Mr. Truman's time. Our President then bravely went and sat in his place at the big conference table—because his predecessor had. He went only once, and painfully discovered that the world is large and that history is long and full of end results doubly confusing to one who before he became President was notoriously a poor scholar. Mr. Truman found it easier to pontificate from Washington than at distant tables to gnaw at problems rooted in causes old and hardy even before Columbus.

But Mr. Eisenhower, now, had been around. He knew that peoples in different lands spoke different tongues. He had met his opposite numbers in all kinds of uniforms and, suavely but trenchantly, had uncovered the common interest in the thickets of misunderstanding. The American people had expected him to be their capable and willing spokesman among the spokesmen of other peoples, to sit down and "talk sense" as man to man with other men in high places presumably as aware as he himself that "All wars are stupid." Thus far, his countrymen have waited in vain for the fulfilment of their hopes in the hero who could "talk to anybody anywhere" and have had increasingly to share with everybody everywhere the want of top level parleys for which the time is never "ripe."

With one of the great peoples who share the globe with us, the Chinese, with whom we have been at war, we will not speak at all. Surely nothing in our times is more fantastic than

the pretense, which is our national policy, that the government of these people does not exist or at any rate that it is beneath our dignity to recognize its existence, now or ever. Over and over again, our Mr. Dulles is required to disclaim any plan for passing so much as the time of day with the government of the Chinese. The tabu is sheepishly bowed to by almost all of the members of our Congress. Yet no amount of ritualistic auto-suggestion can persuade us for long that what we see is not there, and nothing really comes of our strained and supercilious ignorance of China but peptic ulcers in our national colon. Nobody else is fooled, and we do not in fact fool ourselves.

I say that when we were healthier in our minds, when we stubbornly insisted upon facts instead of fairytales, the American people would not have permitted themselves to be put off or put upon by these arrant make believes. We should not have needed to be told by someone "in authority" that one day but not now it might be safe to risk frank discussions with "the Kremlin" on the common problem of building more bread instead of more bombs, or that "Peking" after all does have a form and a soul worth considering human.

I say that when we regain the health of our minds, as people sincerely dedicated to the proposition that all men (not just certain superpatriots) were created equal, we will not need to wait for Bishop Oxnam to assert our right to think and to speak. That we will not wait for the Cloth to run interference for our secular say-soing. And that in mid-Twentieth Century we will brush aside the silly efforts to impose orthodoxy upon our seeing, thinking and speaking as sturdily as we were used to doing from the beginning of our nation up to only a time not long ago we all can recall.

"Democracies move slowly." But the deep roots of our genius are in our ability, after a time of panic, to become disgusted with our aberration, to reject the dictates of any judgment but our own. We the people are feeling a little more assertive now. The new witch doctors sit shakily. If we do not soon find fearless spokesmen, we should recapture the self-confidence to speak sense back to and over the heads of our censors and weakling wizards.

I. F. Stone's Weekly 8-1-58
 Room 205
 301 E. Capitol St., S.E., Washington 3, D. C.

Please enter the following subscription. \$5 for 1 year is enclosed. (See page 3 for foreign rates)

Name

Street

CityZone.....

State

I. F. Stone's Weekly
 Room 205
 301 E. Capitol St., S.E.,
 Washington 3, D. C.

Entered as
 Second Class Mail
 Matter
 Post Office
 Washington, D. C.

NEWSPAPER

I. F. Stone's Weekly

VOL. I NUMBER 29

AUGUST 8, 1953



WASHINGTON, D. C.

15 CENTS

The U.S. Prepares to Go It Alone With Rhee

On the eve of the special session of the UN General Assembly, the Eisenhower Administration is preparing to go it alone. During the hearings before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee on the Mutual Security Act, there was a little noticed exchange between Senator Knowland and Secretary Dulles. "If our so-called allies don't realize the facts of life," the Senate's acting majority leader said, "why it becomes a question in my mind as to how long we tie the hands of this government and our foreign policy." Secretary Dulles said, "Those observations are very pertinent." They were followed by a proposal which foreshadows the policy now being followed.

The Mutual Security Act provided that funds were to be made available to the United Nations Korean Reconstruction Agency. Knowland proposed to add "or for such other Korean rehabilitation aid as the President may determine." "I could foresee a situation," he said, "where the United Nations in its General Assembly or Security Council might vote to divide Korea at the 38th parallel. I don't believe any such decision would be acceptable to the Republic of Korea. They might, quite properly, both resent and not welcome the United Nations agency there under those circumstances."

Were relief and reconstruction funds in the hands of a United Nations agency, the organization would have leverage with which to make Rhee submit to its decisions. This is what Knowland wanted to avoid. "I would not want the President to be foreclosed, if that situation did develop," Knowland continued, "for these rehabilitation funds to be made available to the Republic of Korea by either the United States doing it itself, or doing it in conjunction with the Korean government."

The special \$200,000,000 Korean relief appropriation passed by the Senate last week was framed to accord with Knowland's views. The fund was not made available to UNKRA but to "such officers or agencies" as the President may designate. Knowland said that "certainly during the period of cease-fire, before we learn whether ultimately there will be a peace, it will be handled by the United States authorities as distinguished from UNKRA." He also assumed it would be handled "in cooperation with the President of South Korea." Ferguson (R. Mich.) said he hoped the Army would handle the reconstruction job. "I believe", he went on, "we should be greatly disappointed if this fund were to be administered by others, such as the United Nations."

This discussion took place on the floor of the Senate the afternoon of the same day that the New York Times published James Reston's revealing interview with Rhee in Seoul. In this Rhee made it clear that the only solution he would accept was "that all Korea should be governed by

his regime" and insisted that the U. S. had promised "immediate and automatic action" against the Communists if they failed within the specified 90 days to accept these terms. Though the New York Times next morning headlined, "Senators Shocked by Rhee War Stand", not a single comment was obtained from a Senator willing to let his name be used, not a single protest was made on the floor. No one rose to oppose the point of view taken by Knowland and Ferguson, and the aid bill drafted to give Rhee freedom from UN interference passed unanimously.

Rhee's arrogant assumption that he could run the foreign policy of the United States was not publicly challenged. His supporters are a minority but vocal; the majority which dislikes him is scared stiff lest criticism of Rhee be used to make them appear pro-Communist. In this atmosphere Dulles is proceeding with his preparations, and these are preparations to ensure the failure, not the success, of the forthcoming political conference on Korea. There is no point in holding a conference if a major participant makes it clear in advance that it will not negotiate any item on the agenda. There are three items and Dulles is rapidly shutting the door on discussion of all three.

One item on the agenda calls for withdrawal of all foreign troops from the peninsula, and he has come up with a plan—cute is the only word for it—for keeping American troops in Korea "to assist in rebuilding the devastated land." Another item calls for free elections and the third is an "etc." The latter was a euphemism to spare American feelings while covering the crucial question of Red Chinese recognition, without which there can be no stability in the Far East. Dulles shut the door firmly on that at press conference, without waiting to consult America's Western allies.

The remaining item is unification by free elections. But here Rhee still insists that the only elections he will accept are elections in North Korea to fill the 23 seats left vacant for it when the South Korean Republic was originally set up. On this the Administration has as yet made no firm commitment—at least not publicly—but the American military in Tokyo are already acting as if it would be unthinkable to oppose Rhee on this. Nor is this Rhee's position only. In the summer of 1950 when peace seemed near and the holding of free elections began to be discussed at Lake Success, Warren Austin on August 17, 1950 revealed that the U. S. wanted the elections held on the basis that the Republic of Korea's jurisdiction would be extended over North Korea automatically. (See the chapter, Free Elections? in my *Hidden History of the Korean War*). It will be a miracle if Rhee does not get his chance to start up the war again. But, then, the truce was something of a miracle, too.

Extending The Witch Hunt to The Church

Like the Queen in Alice, the House Committee on Un-American Activities often beheads the victim first and tries him afterward. In 1951, in a pamphlet on Communism and religion the Committee called the Methodist Federation for Social Action "a tool of the Communist party." A year later, the Committee devoted a full report to the Methodist Federation, but avoided conclusions. The Committee said only that the record "as presented herein may be of some aid to those who are interested in determining whether the Federation has been favorable to, or supported, Communistic objectives." This year for the first time the Committee has gotten around to questioning a Federation official, the Rev. Jack R. Mc Michael, until recently its executive secretary. Thus the Committee published its verdict of guilty in 1951, released an interim report in 1952 and began to hold hearings in 1953. Lewis Carroll would have been delighted with the sequence.

The Committee's helter-skelter methods of investigation were displayed in last year's report, which put together a miscellaneous batch of past newspaper and magazine articles on the Federation (all but two of them hostile), with no attempt at evaluation, logical order or summary. The result is weirdly anachronistic. The Federation is linked guilt-by-association style to the anarchist, Roger Baldwin; to Professors Charles A. Beard and George S. Counts who are accused of "bootlegging Marxism" into the public schools, and to Henry Ford, "who has made millions out of his Communist commercial connections." One of the more recent clippings, from the *Chicago Tribune* of 1951, reports a Federation meeting at Evanston, Illinois, where the speakers denounced everything—including Communism—but notes wistfully, "No one spoke a good word for capitalism." Unfortunately this is in the Christian tradition. There is little in the Gospel which can tactfully be inscribed over bank entrances.

From the Committee's point of view, Mc Michael last week made an unsatisfactory witness. The Committee likes the victim to lie quiet, to answer "yes" or "no" to loaded questions and to identify without further remark its favorite "documents"—photostats from the *Daily Worker*, which its researchers study as theologians once did Holy Writ, poring over every jot and tittle. The Committee was prepared to prove that the Rev. Mc Michael during the past two decades had been an indefatigable joiner and sponsor of endless causes left of center, and that these sundry causes had been "cited" as subversive. Mc Michael insisted on reminding the Committee that dozens of respectable Americans supported such causes, that many of them were not "cited" until years later, and that "citation" is not as impressive as it sounds when one remembers that the Attorney General acts without notice, hearing, or argument.

Mc Michael—Georgia born—affects the bucolic manner of a back country preacher, and has a disconcerting habit of saying "amen, brother" to Committee members. Tall, handsome, gangling, with balding sandy hair, he looks a good deal like

Lindbergh and exhibits filibustering gifts which would have made him a worthy colleague of Tom Connally. There were times when he, rather than the benevolent looking Velde, seemed to be running the show. The heavy jowled counsel, Robert Kunzig, strove vainly against McMichael's irrepressible flow of argument. The Rev. McMichael insisted on discussing "documents" and "citations" his own way. "I'm no lawyer," he said at one point, "but I didn't get my eye-teeth yesterday."

Amid the *Daily Worker* photostats were some glimpses of how spy-ridden America has become. A confidential New York City police report was read into the record showing that Mc Michael had spoken at an official gathering in 1941 on the eighth anniversary of the resumption of diplomatic relations between the U.S. and the U.S.S.R. Mc Michael was alleged to have praised the Soviet Union for realizing in practice Christian ideals of racial equality.

The Committee has a long standing reluctance to let anything into the record which might reflect favorably on a witness. It even fought hard to keep Mc Michael from getting into the record one of its own past reports, that of January 3, 1940, which listed 11 organizations as Communist fronts but did not include among them the American Youth Congress of which Mc Michael was then national chairman. Mc Michael also tried hard to show what the files of both the *New York Times* and the *Daily Worker* confirm, that after the Nazi attack on Russia he won a majority of the American Youth Congress to support a resolution opposing American military intervention in the European war. The Young Communist League was for all-out aid including a new A.E.F. but abstained from voting. This was Mc Michael's prize exhibit in support of his denial that he had ever been a Communist or a member of the Young Communist League.

The stage is set for a test by perjury prosecution. Two ex-Communists employed by the government as informers and witnesses identified Mc Michael in secret session as a Communist. Manning Johnson, who left the party in 1939, said he knew Mc Michael as a member of the National Committee of the Young Communist League. Leonard Patterson said he was with Mc Michael in the New York district of the YCL in 1934 until Patterson left in 1935.

The dates may prove crucial. Mc Michael entered Emory University outside Atlanta in 1934 and graduated in 1937. He was in China in 1938 on a YMCA student exchange fellowship and did not come to New York until 1939 when he entered Union Theological Seminary. When confronted with Johnson, a burly man with wary eyes, Mc Michael denied ever having known him. Patterson did not appear but the Committee produced two other witnesses, Mr. and Mrs. John J. Edmiston, who said they were undercover FBI operatives in 1940-41, posing as Communists, and saw Mc

(Continued on Page Three)

I. F. Stone's Weekly

• Editor and Publisher, I. F. STONE

Published weekly except the last two weeks of August at Room 205, 301 E. Capitol St., S.E., Washington 3, D. C. Subscription rates: Domestic, \$5 a year; Canada, Mexico and elsewhere in the Western Hemisphere, \$6; England and Continental Europe, \$10 by 1st class mail, \$15 by air; for Israel, Asia, Australia and Africa, \$10 by first class mail, \$20 by air mail. Single copy, 15 cents. Tel.: LI 4-7087. Entered as Second Class mail matter, Post Office, Washington, D. C.

August 8, 1953  Vol. I, No. 29

COMMENT

The Difference

The respected and independent *Philadelphia Bulletin* tried its best last week to make the new Smith Act arrests in that city the occasion for a liberal editorial of a kind.

It said "the FBI arrested several Philadelphians on charges of conspiring to overthrow our government by force and violence . . . while these persons have not been tried and found guilty, the evidence against them is of a different quality from that adduced against others by a Congressional investigating committee. None of them has been arrested because back in the forties his name was on the letterhead of some organization with a high-sounding name that subsequently proved to be a Communist front. None is accused . . . because he expressed doubt of the guilt of Alger Hiss . . ."

The *Bulletin's* criticism of Congress-

sional committees is correct but its interpretation of the Smith Act arrests is not. Its opening statement is inaccurate. Those Philadelphians were not arrested for "conspiring to overthrow our government by force and violence." If the editors will look at the indictment they will see that these men were charged with "conspiracy to advocate" revolutionary doctrine.

The difference is considerable. The first charge requires proof of conspiratorial preparation to use force and violence against the government. The second only requires proof of preparations at some future time to *advocate* overthrow. The former deals with concrete acts, the latter with books and ideas. These and their proper interpretation will be on trial in Philadelphia, as they were on trial at Foley Square.

Unlike many witnesses before Congressional witch hunt committees, the men arrested are Communists. But the charge against them when examined in the light of the criminal law is tenuous. The Smith Act for the first time since the Alien and Sedition laws made advocacy of revolutionary doctrine a crime in peacetime. But in Philadelphia, as elsewhere, the government has yet to indict a single Communist for advocacy. All have been indicted for *conspiracy to advocate*. This, like the related seditious conspiracy of the old English common law, is a long way from the tradition which holds that a free government does not punish for ideas, but for overt acts.

"Conspiracy" at its best is a vague category of crime, open to abuse. Conspiracy to advocate is conspiracy at its worst. So far the government has proceeded only against national and local leaders, but the dragnet is flexible enough for small fry. Anything done in furtherance of a conspiracy makes one a party to it.

Just as a man may be ruined by a Con-

gressional committee because he once joined some Popular Front organization, so a man who joined the Communist party because he felt deeply about some social evil it was fighting in perfectly legal ways may end up by going to jail as part of a conspiracy to advocate revolutionary doctrine. Both procedures have the effect of frightening liberals and radicals into inactivity. This is the way conformity is imposed. This is the mechanism of thought control.

For Senator Taft

The Chicago Tribune praises Senator Taft for having defended the secessionists during World War II. We remember with gratitude his more recent defense of academic freedom. We sent the Senator a note of appreciation and best wishes for his recovery some time ago when he was still well enough to acknowledge it, as he graciously did. We join with men of diverse views in expressing our respect and regret at his passing.

Little Europe Crumbles

The fall of de Gasperi last week and the broadside fired at Adenauer by the German trade unions foreshadows the end of that truncated Catholic "little Europe" which American policy helped create after the war. Unfortunately in Italy and in Germany, the successor regimes under present circumstances are apt to prove worse. History may see the de Gasperi and Adenauer governments as little more than interim caretaker regimes which held precarious power while Italian and German Fascist forces revived. As moderate Catholicism fails, U.S. policy is already turning toward the neo-Fascists rather than the Socialists for an alternative alliance.

Will Thought Control Be Extended to The Pulpit?

(Continued from Page Two)

Michael with known Communists at a Youth Congress meeting in Columbus, Ohio, in June, 1940.

Mc Michael could not recall ever having met them or been at that meeting in Columbus, Ohio. Mrs. Edmiston testified, "Our appearance was different when we were working with the Communist party. We were trying to play a part." She testified Mc Michael was not "identified to us as a Communist party member" but added, "The question is, who is doing the most damage, the Communist party member who rolls the poison pill or the person who, in the guise of religion, shoves it down our throats?" Congressman Clyde Doyle (D. Calif.) asked Mrs. Edmiston, "Did you try to identify Mc Michael as a Communist? You made an effort but failed?" Her answer was, "Right." These inconsistencies may explain why Senator Byrd was able to state in an interview that J. Edgar Hoover told him the FBI had no information on which any clergyman could be prosecuted as a Communist agent.

The inquiry into the churches is underway. The Committee released testimony taken in executive session two years ago when Congressman Donald L. Jackson (D. Calif.) sitting as a one-man committee questioned another progressive clergyman, the gifted Rev. Stephen H. Fritchman of the First Unitarian Church in Los Angeles. Rev. Fritchman pleaded his privilege under the Fifth to a series of questions linking him with various liberals and radical causes. The three top officials of the Methodist Federation in a statement expressing their faith in the integrity of Mc Michael put the basic issue when they said the purpose of such inquiries is "to intimidate all clergymen . . . so they will leave social issues alone." The question in the Mc Michael case is not how, whether or to what degree he followed party line but whether churchmen will let themselves be frightened out of the right to speak the truth as they see it, and have the courage to close ranks in defense of those who exercised that right in the past.

JENNINGS PERRY'S PAGE

But For Buffer Zone Foes Might Make Friends

In Korea, as after every cease-fire in every war, the first problem of the opposing brass has been the inclination of their troops to cross over and shake hands with the other side. And this is a sign to be cherished, I am sure, by all who look for natural man in the end to survive and surmount the recurrent torrents of synthetic hate with which history is besmirched.

Apparently it is impossible completely to indoctrinate the young men sent to shoot each other. Left to themselves they would swarm together immediately the guns are put down to swap gadgets and grins. In the buffer zone in Korea it was the old story. The officers had to be very stern about it. A good case can be made for the possibility that the buffer zone is needed not to prevent clashes among the men but to prevent fraternization.

We see how that is far from the battle lines where it is much easier to preserve the calculated illusion that the Enemy is all-foul, sub-human, feral and treacherous. It will be easier in Korea, too, to keep the young men adjusted for mortal combat if they are not permitted to trade cigarettes face to face. They actually get to serenading each other. Our command had to order that cut out. Two days after the pullback began and just before the neutral commission took over the zone, the press wires out of Munsan did however carry this quaint paragraph:

"The U. S. 8th army eased its 'no fraternization' order to allow Marines and Chinese to work together in identifying the dead."

With the dead, of course, the grounds of common humanity safely can be recognized. Dust to dust was not spoken only of the West or of the East. There is no danger that the dead will realize that after all the man who sped the bullet he stopped was a pretty good Joe, much like himself except around the eyes. The Marines who will work with the Chinese sorting out the bodies undoubtedly will find it much more difficult than Mr. Dulles does piously to assume that these people do not deserve to be admitted to the family of the nations. Working with the dead leaves little room for snobbery.

The pity is that for the living we must actively resist

the drift toward conciliation and understanding which instinctively begins whenever the battle is quieted. The troops in Korea cannot be allowed to mingle and strike hands; they must be kept, as Gen. Mark Clark warned on leaving for home, in "battle fitness and alertness." Hard training—"running up and down the hills"—is scheduled for them, as well as more amusements and interests. It could be that operation Big Switch will provide new accounts of atrocities to sustain "morale," a prospect already anticipated by some of the stateside press.

Here we have to appreciate the size of the task of the brass, our brass and the Red brass also. For though we have done everything we can think of to hold down the world's elation at the event in Korea, to take the joy out of the cease-fire and hedge against the hope of peace, there is a rather general conviction that the war cannot be started up again and a rather general suspicion that the painfully negotiated armistice is a more important triumph—of intelligence—than any victory simple force ever could achieve.

The soldiers of the opposing armies in Korea have at this juncture, it must be remembered, an attitude vis-a-vis each other uncommon in the ranks after other wars. There are no victors and no vanquished. There can be no condescension, no resentment. In addition to the mutual respect the fighters on both sides have gained in the course of the inconclusive war there is inevitably a feeling of equality in the present situation. Fraternization would be natural, and it is doubtful that a physical separation of two miles is far enough to discourage a sense of companionship among GIs where UN or Red resting without danger so close together.

All along, the Korean war has had notable elements of unconventionality, thus encouraging the hope that history need not again drearily repeat itself. In many ways it is regrettable that the rules of conventional posture now should prohibit peaceful intercourse among the young men in the services. Associated culturally instead of at gun-point, they well might discover broader bases of friendship and tolerance than can develop in such limited acquaintance as that furnished by the sole permissible fellow-traveling—in picking up the dead.

I. F. Stone's Weekly 8-1-53
Room 205
301 E. Capitol St., S.E., Washington 3, D. C.
Please enter the following subscription. \$5 for 1 year is enclosed. (See page 3 for foreign rates)
Name
Street
City Zone
State

I. F. Stone's Weekly

Room 205
301 E. Capitol St., S.E.,
Washington 3, D. C.

Entered as
Second Class Mail
Matter
Post Office
Washington, D. C.

NEWSPAPER

I. F. Stone's Weekly

VOL. I NUMBER 30

AUGUST 15, 1953



WASHINGTON, D. C.

15 CENTS

Co-Existence or *Non-Existence*

Publicly the line in Washington is to treat Malenkov's announcement of a Soviet H-bomb with skepticism. The word passed out is to laugh it off. Privately, however, there is no disposition to assume that Malenkov was bluffing. When Molotov in 1947 said the "secret" of the atom bomb had "long ceased to exist", the Atomic Energy Commission called this a misleading statement for home consumption. This time the Commission's reaction is sober. Malenkov's wording is important. Molotov in 1947 spoke only of the atom bomb's "secret". Malenkov now says, "the U. S. has no monopoly in the production of the hydrogen bomb either." Note the word "production".

It is not impossible that the U. S. S. R. may have beaten the U. S. in the race for the H-bomb. Truman directed work on the H-bomb in January, 1950. But at least four years earlier, the Austrian physicist, Hans Thirring, with no access to secret information, American or Russian, devoted a chapter to describing the theory and mechanism of the hydrogen bomb in his book, "Die geschichte der atombombe" (Vienna, 1946).

It would be naive to suppose that the Russian government had to wait for this book to appear before it was aware of the H-bomb. Fuchs is said to have learned of it when he was in Los Alamos from 1944 to 1946. The Russians may well have tackled the problems of the atom bomb and the H-bomb at the same time. If Malenkov spoke truthfully, the Soviets are already producing the hydrogen bomb. Whether we have produced it yet is not known. The well-informed *Washington Post*, which follows atomic developments closely, speaks of the "thermonuclear device" exploded in the Pacific last year as "the forerunner of the hydrogen bomb." Since U. S. military-diplomatic policy has been based on the hope of frightening the Russians into submission, the production and test of an American H-bomb would probably be well advertised.

Unlike the Pentagon, the Kremlin did not use its announcement as an occasion for threats or bluster. Malenkov followed his news about the H-bomb with another plea for peaceful co-existence of the U. S. and the U. S. S. R. "It would be a crime before mankind," he said, "if the certain relaxation which has appeared in the international atmosphere should be replaced by a new intensification of the tension." Unfortunately the news must lead to greater tension unless it is seized upon as a means of breaking the ice of the cold war and initiating top level talks for a settlement.

If Churchill is well enough, the Russian announcement may give him the leverage he needs for another try at negotiations. The public is so punch-drunk on large numbers and mass destruction that one despairs of awakening some realization of what H-bomb warfare would mean. Thirring wrote, "God protect the country over which a six-ton bomb of lithium hydride will ever explode." In the April, 1950, issue

of *Scientific American*, Dr. Hans A. Bethe, who was chief of the theoretical physics laboratory at Los Alamos, warned "By the blast effect alone a single bomb could obliterate almost all of Greater New York or Moscow or London." In the July, 1953 issue of *Foreign Affairs*, J. Robert Oppenheimer explained, "We may anticipate a state of affairs in which two Great Powers will each be in a position to put an end to the civilization and life of the other . . . We may be likened to two scorpions in a bottle, each capable of killing the other, but only at the risk of his own life."

Though the words may sound like a soap slogan, it is literally true that whether the Russians or ourselves have the H-bomb now or will have it tomorrow, the issue simply and literally for millions of us on this planet is a choice between co-existence or non-existence. There is no safety in an arms race, especially an H-bomb race. "Suppose," Harold C. Urey writes, "that two countries have the hydrogen bomb. Is it not believable that sooner or later an incident may occur which would precipitate the use of bombs? . . . The probability that a war will start is increased if two groups each believe they can win that war. . . . An exact balance of power is very difficult to attain. This is what we know in physical science as a situation of unstable equilibrium; one like balancing an egg on its end. The slightest push topples the egg in one direction or another."

Gordon Dean, in his final press conference here on June 25 when retiring as chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission, tried to get across some of the suicidal potentialities in the present situation. "We have said many times," he declared, "that we are ahead of the Russians, but that is not enough. It does us no good to reach the point where we would be able to wipe out an enemy 20 times over if he reaches the point where he can wipe us out just once." The statement provoked these alarmingly cryptic questions and answers:

"The PRESS: . . . You are not suggesting that the Russians have reached the point where they can wipe us out ?

"Mr. DEAN: I am not suggesting because I can't answer the thing I would like to see publicly discussed. Today I can't.

"The PRESS: You are not saying they can or they can't?

"Mr. DEAN: I am not saying they can or they can't. . . .

"The PRESS: Mr. Dean, do you think the public's attitude toward defense would change if they knew these various things about the Russian's atomic bombs?

"Mr. DEAN: Yes, I think they would be much more sober about what the real danger may be in the next few years."

Total Diplomacy and Total Destruction

The Russian H-bomb announcement is important because it may open a door the Truman Administration kept tightly shut against public discussion of the super-weapon. The H-bomb is a striking example of the way atomic secrecy has served to ensure control of national policy by a handful of military and political leaders.

In an age which boasts of world wide communications, the Truman Administration was able to keep the H-bomb a secret in this country though its theory had been fully discussed in a book published in Vienna after the war. It was only when a Senator indiscreetly mentioned the super bomb on the air in the Fall of 1949 that it became known to the American public.

The remarks of Senator Johnson of Colorado opened a promising debate in foreign policy. David Lilienthal appealed to Truman to negotiate with Moscow before embarking on an H-bomb race. The late Senator Mc Mahon and Senator Tydings began a campaign for disarmament, co-existence and a 50-year program for world development. Discussion was cut short (1) by Truman's decision in January, 1950, to proceed with production of the bomb, (2) by Acheson's campaign for "total diplomacy," and (3) by Mc Carthy's debut on the national scene with a sensational attack on the State Department in February, 1950. This diverted the energies of Tydings and Mc Mahon and distracted attention from the H-bomb.

Recently there have been overtures by Gordon Dean and Robert J. Oppenheimer for a reopening of public discussion. The drive for private control of the atom has had the good effect of stimulating a campaign for greater release of information to the public. Unless the grip of secrecy is loosened, the industry can hardly be handed over to private ownership. The White House has shown its sympathy. There has been pressure from scientists and others concerned with civil defense and worried by public indifference.

A major obstacle to the release of more information is that public knowledge of the danger would make impossible the maintenance of that rigid foreign policy which Acheson called "total diplomacy." It is total in the sense that it demands total acquiescence at home in a policy of totally avoiding any negotiations which might relax tension.

There is unfortunately no sign that the present Administration is prepared to abandon total diplomacy. Though the resistance in Congress to any increase in the debt ceiling showed the strength of business forces which want economy in government, the same men often demand lower taxes at home and more costly commitments abroad. The truce in Korea is regarded by Dulles and the Pentagon merely as an occasion for returning to the policy of the arms race and more bases. The strategy is to "sit tight" in Korea, walking out of the political conference after 90 days to avoid withdrawal of American troops and the political headaches of unification.

The "sit tight" strategy was made clear by Dulles at his last press conference before leaving for Korea. When asked what hope he had for the unification of Korea without making "undue concessions" to Red China, the Secretary replied, "I have not only the hope, but I have the faith and belief

that it is possible to detach satellite areas . . . I think some of the things that are going on in the satellite area of Europe—in the Soviet sector of Berlin and in the Soviet zone of Germany and Czechoslovakia—all indicate that there can be an attraction of these areas for the Western world so strong that it will not seem worthwhile for the Soviet masters to keep them under their rule." If North Korea and Eastern Germany can be "detached" by continuing the cold war, there is no need to negotiate for the unification of either country.

But centrifugal forces are set in motion on both sides by this kind of a policy. Capitalist Japan cannot afford to give up the China trade permanently. Adenauer—to Washington's dismay—has been talking of offering Moscow a "non-aggression" pact in return for a unified Germany. The burden of the arms race is reviving Popular Frontism in both Italy and France.

The most important political development in Italy has gone almost unnoticed in the American press. The right wing Socialist, Saragat, continues to urge that the Left wing Socialist, Nenni, be brought into the government, though Nenni is allied with the Communists. In France the general strike in which Socialist, Catholic and Communist unions joined forces was a portent. A "sit tight" policy can maintain the pump-priming benefits of rearmament here but the other non-Communist countries are too poor to stand the pace. Western Europe, if allowed freedom, will move further toward socialism. Its economic problems are insoluble under the kind of decadent capitalism to be seen in Italy and France.

The latest bulletin of the U.N. Economic Commission for Europe shows severe crisis conditions in Czechoslovakia and Eastern Germany, but it also shows a slowdown in West European economic growth. The figures indicate continued expansion elsewhere in the Soviet zone and there is no reason to believe that East Germans and Czechs cannot be held by force if necessary. "From the most skeptical studies" of Soviet economic statistics, says a writer in the July, 1953 *Foreign Affairs*, "the fact of a superior rate of growth does emerge." The article is called "The Soviet Economy Outpaces The West". It should be required reading for those who assume that a few riots in East Germany may shake the Soviet dictatorship.

Unless America's allies and our own German and Japanese satellites press hard for a settlement, the danger is that the Soviet H-bomb announcement will merely intensify total diplomacy and let it drift toward a war of total destruction. The American military may easily seize on the possibility of a Soviet H-bomb to exploit public panic for greater arms expenditures, and the swift development of a garrison state regime.

Now is the time to press for peace talks. H-bombs cannot be made in hall closets. The enormous plants required lend themselves to enforcement by inspection. As for international public ownership of atomic facilities, the U. S. Congress would be the first to balk if the Russians ever agreed to it. Above all solution depends not so much on any treaties or enforcement devices but on a different atmosphere. So busy are the spreaders of hate that one almost despairs of achieving it.

I. F. Stone's Weekly

• Editor and Publisher, I. F. STONE

Published weekly except the last two weeks of August at Room 205, 301 E. Capitol St., S.E., Washington 3, D. C. Subscription rates: Domestic, \$5 a year; Canada, Mexico and elsewhere in the Western Hemisphere, \$6; England and Continental Europe, \$10 by 1st class mail, \$15 by air; for Israel, Asia, Australia and Africa, \$10 by first class mail, \$20 by air mail. Single copy, 15 cents. Tel.: LI 4-7087. Entered as Second Class mail matter, Post Office, Washington, D. C.

August 15, 1953 Vol. I, No. 30

COMMENT

Vacation

The Weekly is published 50 weeks a year. It will not be published the last two weeks in August. Our next issue will be that of September 5.

J. B. Matthews 20 Years Ago

A correspondent sends us this tid-bit from a book published in 1935 called *Partners in Plunder*.

"The social significance of the church in a business society cannot be gauged by the brave utterances of a few individual clergymen. . . . The moral codes of the church are pervaded with emphases that are wholly congenial to the defense of business practices and interests. . . . Frightening phrases are a specialty of the pulpit, phrases which, in the interests of an economy of scarcity, serve to frighten the impressionable away from collectivism. . . . The leadership of the present-day Church, at least in Protestant communions, is definitely committed to a philosophy of liberalism. . . . The liberal approach to social questions is eminently suited to the purposes of business reaction."

The book was by Matthews and Shallcross and the Matthews was J. B.

Voltaire as Well as Marx

Under cover of the fight against Communism, clerical forces are carrying on a struggle against liberalism and rationalism. Fordham University has a Russian Institute. One of its members, the Rev. Andrei Ourossoff, S.J., has been on a speaking tour of the United States and Canada. The full text of one of his lectures may be found inserted in the Congressional Record of August 4.

An excerpt will show that this Jesuit with the Russian name attacks the whole tradition of free thought and scientific inquiry. "The most evil side of Marxism, the materialist atheism," he tells his audiences, "was a heritage of the long and steady development taking place in the thinking and philosophies which had grown up through the centuries in the West."

Father Ourossoff declares "Marxism is the result of the thoughts of men like Voltaire, the French encyclopaedist, social dreamers like Jean-Jacques Rous-

seau, the German philosophers of the last century and many other so-called outstanding European thinkers."

Father Ourossoff is full of contempt for the West and its traditions. At one point he glorifies Communist virtues and in an unfavorable comparison says, "All these qualities have always been wanting in the West because there is no faith." Apparently faith in freedom, faith in reason, faith in scientific inquiry, faith in the common man and faith in truth—the great faiths of the Western tradition—count for nothing.

How-Crazy-Can-You-Get Dept.

We noticed with pleased surprise that the day Congress adjourned, Jenner (R. Ind.) made a speech on the Senate floor in which he welcomed the truce in Korea and said, "every legitimate goal which can be achieved by war can be achieved better by diplomacy."

We were startled, however, to see just what Jenner expects diplomacy to accomplish. He thinks "all American policy must start from a firm decision to re-establish the legitimate anti-Communist government on the China mainland" with an army, navy and air force well enough equipped "to open a second front on the mainland of Asia." He wants Korea "united to the Yalu," with armed forces "equipped to hold their share of the line against Russia's advance in Asia." He also proposes "a Japan fully armed and equipped to hold its share of the line," and "a united Germany, able to defend its share of the line in the West."

Suppose that the Russians do not fall in with this kind of diplomacy? "We will move to expel Russia from the UN," Jenner said. If the UN does not agree? "We will interpret a vote against us, or a refusal to vote, as a vote for our withdrawal from the UN."

While preparing to muster Nationalist Chinese, Koreans, Japanese and Germans in martial array, Jenner made it clear that he wanted no more Koreans.

"We want no American forces sent to Southeast Asia," he told the Senate, "to finish the Korean war under new and more terrible conditions. We want no carefully contrived emergencies by which we shall be forced to consent in haste to the sending of troops to Vietnam or Thailand."

(We hope the Senator was not thinking of our new Ambassador to Thailand—General William J. Donovan of the OSS when he spoke of contrived emergencies in that area).

This did not end the toll of what Jenner expects "diplomacy" to accomplish. While clearing China and North Korea of Communists and rearming the Germans and Japanese, Jenner wants the budget balanced and taxes cut.

Exit "Free Enterprise"

Air transport is now big business. In terms of passenger revenues last year, the country's biggest common carrier was American Airlines, which ranked ahead of our largest railroad, the Pennsylvania.

Since the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, the volume of air travel has in-

creased twenty-fold. Yet the Senate Select Committee on Small Business discloses that in this period the Civil Aeronautics Board has refused to certify a single new air carrier on the trunk routes. The number of companies permitted to operate has actually declined "from 18 when the act was under consideration to a probable 12 by the end of 1953."

The report made public by Senator Thye (R. Minn.), chairman of the committee, says air transport was "an infant industry" when Congress gave the CAB "the right to protect the then existing companies from competition until such time as they became strong" but did not intend "to bar all future entry into air transportation." The report reveals the monopoly conditions regulation has fostered and protests the CAB's hostility to the so-called "non-sked" airlines, which pinoeered low cost air coach travel.

The Senate Small Business Committee report said the issue "involves the right of entry of new businesses into an industry. Freedom of opportunity has always been a basic American economic doctrine." The press which usually rises to cheer these cliches was remarkably silent about this report. When regulations serves to buttress monopoly, little is said about "free enterprise."

New Low in Deportation Drive

Hardly a day passes without a press release from the Department of Justice announcing that another deportation action has been begun against some radical, past or present. In last week's batch was the news that Attorney General Brownell had directed the filing of a petition to cancel the naturalization of Sophie Gerson, Brooklyn, N. Y. This is the story behind the news release.

Sophie Gerson is the wife of Simon W. Gerson, one of two Communists acquitted by Federal Judge Edward J. Dimock last September in New York's second Smith Act trial. Gerson, State legislative director of the Communist party, thereupon went on a speaking tour in defense of his fellow defendants. The acquittal and the tour did not add to his popularity in certain government circles.

The first hint of unpleasantness was a note in Howard Rushmore's weekly column for the New York *Journal-American*, saying that Gerson would soon have something to talk about, when someone close to him was deported.

Mrs. Gerson was born in Russia and came to this country at the age of 12. She has two children—a boy, 14, and a girl, 7. She was naturalized in 1945, with a group of women whose husbands were in the armed forces. Gerson was then an infantryman with the U. S. Army.

The Department press release says she was arrested in 1928 in New York, in 1929 at Gastonia, North Carolina, and in 1931 at Paterson, N. J. She was a labor organizer and these were strike arrests. The most "famous" of these strikes, according to the Department of Justice, was the "Gastonia mill strike of 1929". There were no convictions. Now this record of more than two decades ago is being raked up. This is one way to even scores with an accused man after a Judge directs a verdict of acquittal.

JENNINGS PERRY'S PAGE

UN Should Assert Korean Truce as a Triumph

If in his slab-sided glass palace on the East River Dag Hammarskjold still has about him any part of the gift of poetry he reputedly had in the spruce forests of Sweden, he should give, about now, with a brave, prideful ballad on how the UN did so triumph in Korea. How it did repel the aggression, as it contracted to do. How it did stop the fight in the middle. I think he should pull out all the stops and claim the accomplishment, give voice and dignity to the exultation to which the people everywhere are inclined—and are entitled—and pose this hurrah as an antidote to the dyspeptic lament of the joy-killers among us who dreamed only of a victory dictated by MacArthur in Moscow.

Why wait for History to unscramble the facts? There is room and need right away for a bright paean in celebration of the cease-fire of the painfully-achieved substitution of brains for bullets in one argument. The disgruntled "experts" have spokesmen enough. From its plush easy chair the Saturday Evening Post sourly pontificates that "Korea is no triumph, either for UN or U. S." and goes on to despise the "international kibitzer" (the UN) permitted to stand behind this country's chair "and veto the obvious plays." Groans the plush easy chair, "MacArthur had his ears pinned back for naively attempting to win the Korean war, which he, with Stratemeyer and Van Fleet, insists could have been done." At the Pentagon lately, Gen. Mark Clark has darkly hinted that we may yet have to unlimber the atom bomb to do this job up brown. Back in March, predicting the rising of the General's star, Newsweek glowingly noted his ability "to keep his lip buttoned at the right time." Now Gen. Clark, briefing us on what we must be ready to do if the truce is broken, and suggesting that it already may have been sufficiently broken by the other side's failure to return to us as many men as we have listed as missing, further unbuttons to warn us that nothing is to be gotten from these people, really, save by force.

Our UN poet does not have to be nasty about it. His verse has better to do than to recall that the naive attempt to win in Korea by the precious formula of force brought a million Chinese swarming over the Yalu and got us pinned

back to the Pusan perimeter with great losses, and almost into the sea. It should be enough in proper stanazs to point out that any morning since the shooting stopped, while unhappy editors have not left their comfortable couches, divers young men in uniform live to see the sun who would have been "missing" or torn or dead had there not been at last some sort of triumph of mind over MacArthur.

With a little imagery and emphasis a spokesman for the UN should be able to make it clear that, Gen. Clark's forebodings, to the contrary notwithstanding, keeping the atom bomb on the ground will be the finest service the UN can render mankind, just as up to now the fairest justification of its existence that can be chalked up is the part it has had to play in separating the fighting forces in Korea even by two miles. A couplet could be turned, and would be welcomed, on the theme that only those who only respect force themselves monotonously insist that others can understand nothing else.

It is not good for the UN nor for the hopes humanity has in it for those who disparage the truce in Korea, who are incapable of conceiving that the breaking off of a war in full career is incomparably a stouter proof of human rationality than any "final" arbitrament by force and who hasten to assume that the truce must end in a reversion to arms to go unchallenged. To the incontinent fuming of such skeptics, bully boys and second guessers the UN ought vigorously to oppose its own pride and purpose.

Who can guarantee that the truce can be nursed into a glorious peace, or even that peace can be glorious? But who on the other hand can convince this generation that the wagering of untold thousands of lives on the throw of the A-bomb in an effort to prove that what was naively attempted by MacArthur still can be done would not be an act in contempt of sense and of existence? The world has got this reprieve in Korea and should be impressed by it. The UN should vaunt it. And if Dag Hammarskjold can't make that rhyme and sing and excite, then the quiet forests of Sweden have been of no help to us and he is no bard.

I. F. Stone's Weekly
Room 205
301 E. Capitol St., S.E., Washington 3, D. C.
Please enter the following subscription. \$5 for 1 year is enclosed. (See page 3 for foreign rates)
Name
Street
City
Zone
State

I. F. Stone's Weekly
Room 205
301 E. Capitol St., S.E.
Washington 3, D. C.
NEWSPAPER

Entered as
Second Class Mail
Matter
Post Office
Washington, D. C.

I. F. Stone's Weekly

VOL. I, NUMBER 31

SEPTEMBER 5, 1953



WASHINGTON, D. C.

15 CENTS

The J. Edgar Hoover-Mc Carthy Axis

Mc Carthy is America's most controversial figure. J. Edgar Hoover is its most feared. When Hoover praises Mc Carthy, that would seem to be page one news. Remarkably little attention was paid by the press last week to the interview the chief of the G-men gave the San Diego *Evening Tribune* of August 22. *The New York Times* buried the story in a three-paragraph "shirt-tail" to another Mc Carthy controversy on page 11 of its August 24 issue. For some reason the story did not appear in the *Washington Post* and the *Washington Times-Herald* until two days later on August 25. The *Times-Herald*, ultra rightist and virtually a house organ for both Hoover and Mc Carthy, buried the story inside, perhaps because someone felt the G-man had been indiscreet.

One aspect of the indiscretion was touched on by an intrepid reporter at Attorney General Herbert Brownell's press conference here three days later. The Department of Justice is supposed to be—and Brownell insisted that it still is—investigating that Senate report of last January on Mc Carthy's

financial manipulations. The investigating of the Department of Justice is done through—the Federal Bureau of Investigation. The head of the FBI in the San Diego interview called Mc Carthy "earnest and honest." A reporter asked the Attorney General whether he thought it appropriate "for a member of the Justice Department to make a statement evaluating the character of a person whose affairs are under study in the Department."

The Attorney General declined to comment. He said he had not yet seen the full text of Hoover's statement. "I have full confidence and admiration for Mr. Hoover," Brownell added. "I like to stress that whenever possible." Hoover seems to have a similar confidence and admiration for the Senator he is presumably investigating. Both Hoover and Mc Carthy were registered at the same seaside hotel in La Jolla—by coincidence the G-man said—when Hoover was interviewed. It will take a very brave FBI man to turn in anything unfavorable on Mc Carthy after the Hoover statement.

What The G-Man Chief Said of Low Blow Joe

"Mc Carthy is a former Marine," Hoover said. "He was an amateur boxer. He's Irish. Combine those, and you're going to have a vigorous individual, who is not going to be pushed around.

"I am not passing," Hoover continued more cautiously after this bit of positive hero-worship, "on the technique of Mc Carthy's committee, or other Senate committees. That's the Senator's responsibility. But the investigating committees do a valuable job. They have subpoena rights without which some vital investigations could not be accomplished.

"I never knew Senator Mc Carthy," Hoover went on, "until

he came to the Senate. I've come to know him well, officially and personally. I view him as a friend and believe he so views me.

"Certainly, he is a controversial man. He is earnest and he is honest. He has enemies. Whenever you attack subversives of any kind, Communists, Fascists, even the Ku Klux Klan, you are going to be the victim of the most extremely vicious criticism that can be made.

"I know," Hoover said. "But sometimes a knock is a boost. When certain elements cease their attacks on me, I know I'm slipping."

An Advantage Hitler Lacked

This admission of close relations and declaration of friendship may give Mc Carthy an advantage Hitler lacked—the advantage of close liaison and support from the secret police of the government he wants to take over.

Hoover's closet is well stocked with skeletons. Many in the capital fear the stray bones he may rattle. Few who criticize Mc Carthy dare criticize Hoover. Some who criticize Mc Carthy will go easy if they know he has the G-man's backing. The silence of the nation's editorial writers on this San Diego interview is more eloquent than any comment they could make. There was similar silence in July when at Mc Carthy's worst moment (the forced firing of J. B. Matthews) he held a conference with Hoover and hired the head of the New York FBI office, Frank P. Carr, to replace Matthews as Mc Carthy's staff director. I called attention to this in the *Weekly* for July

25 but saw it mentioned nowhere else. The Hoover conference and the Carr appointment helped to bolster Mc Carthy at a bad time.

Why Editors Look The Other Way

A Hoover-Mc Carthy axis must also spike the feeble popguns of those faint-hearted liberals whose anti-Mc Carthy line has been, "let the FBI do it." This is how the FBI does it. The same mish-mash of tenuous guilt-by-association, anonymous gossip and slander on which the Congressional investigators feed so lushly is exactly the same mish-mash the Coplon case turned up in the FBI files.

There is reason to believe that frustrated FBI men have been slipping information of this kind to Congressional witch hunters for a long time, long before Mc Carthy. The New

Nixon's Part in The Fight Against the Lawyers Guild

Dealers often used Congressional inquiries when frustrated; the most famous case was when Standard Oil negotiated a consent decree with Attorney General Francis Biddle after Pearl Harbor in the hope thereby of hiding its past relations with I. G. Farben. Thurman Arnold, then Assistant Attorney General, foiled this by having himself subpoenaed by the Truman investigating committee, through which he told the whole story. The FBI files would be a similar gold mine for Mc Carthy, and Mc Carthy can also be useful to the FBI.

The FBI is very smart publicity-wise. There was a spate of stories last week-end on Communist plots to smear the FBI. A "highly secret Communist party document" to this effect was given to the North American Newspaper Alliance (see *Washington Sunday Star*, August 30, "Communist Party Directs Comrades to Smear FBI"). The *Washington Times-Herald* next day carried a front page banner headline, "U. S. Reds Plot Campaign to Smear FBI." Victor Riesel in last Sunday's *New York Mirror* reported mysteriously that such orders had been sent out in retaliation for the arrest of two Communist Smith Act fugitives, Thompson and Steinberg. So any editor who comments on the Hoover-Mc Carthy alliance and its political implications risks suspicion of links with the Communist underground.

The Strange Case of the National Lawyers Guild

An example of the chores a Congressional investigating committee can do for the FBI is provided by the case of the National Lawyers Guild. One day in January, 1950, Clifford J. Durr, then president of the Guild, sent the press a notice that two days later he would hold a press conference in Washington and release a 40-page report made by a special committee of the Guild "concerning wiretapping, and other illegal and offensive practices carried on by the FBI . . . based upon the careful analysis of some 800 pages of FBI reports introduced in the Coplon case."

The night before the press conference, Congressman Richard Nixon (now Vice-President), then a leading member of the House Un-American Activities Committee telephoned the Associated Press, United Press and International News Service. Nixon said he had just written a letter to Chairman Wood of the House Committee and wanted to release it for immediate publication. Nixon said he hadn't had time to make copies. The letter was dictated to the wire services over the telephone.

The letter provided the morning papers with sensational headlines as a backdrop for the press conference and the release of the report criticizing the FBI. Nixon's letter asked the House Un-American Activities Committee to investigate the Lawyers' Guild as a Communist front. In its report later that year the House Committee said it had "no doubt" that the Guild's attack on the FBI was "part of an overall Communist strategy aimed at weakening our defenses against the international Communist conspiracy." The report recommended that the Guild be placed by the Attorney General on the subversive list and asked the American Bar Association to consider "whether or not membership in the National Lawyers' Guild, a subversive organization, is compatible with admissibility to the American bar."

It has taken three years to achieve the goal. Brownell

capitulated where even Mc Grath and Mc Granery held out. Last week at the annual meeting of the American Bar Association, he announced that he would blacklist the Guild. The ABA's House of Delegates only four years ago voted down a recommendation from its Board of Governors that Guild members be barred from membership in the ABA. This year the delegates applauded Brownell's announcement, and approved without debate a resolution urging the disbarment of all Communist lawyers. In an editorial pointed toward this year's meeting, the August issue of the *American Bar Association Journal* had boasted that men trained in the law "have a special sensitivity, like a musician's sensitivity to disharmony, for anything that threatens liberty." Like so many convention-goers, these members of the bar seem to have left their special sensitivities at home.

"Liberty Under Law"

Neither the Attorney General's address nor the disbarment resolution could easily be reconciled with the theme of this year's Diamond Jubilee meeting of the bar association, which was "Liberty Under Law." Since "it is not unlawful to belong to the Communist party," as the conservative *Washington Star* noted with misgiving in its comment on the resolution last Sunday, "the question really is whether a lawyer should be subjected to the severe penalty of disbarment for doing something that is sanctioned by our law."

The Attorney General disclosed that while he was summoning the Lawyer Guild for a hearing, he had made up his mind in advance.

This matter of allowing a hearing before blacklisting has a long history. Two years ago the U. S. Supreme Court ruled that the Attorney General could not blacklist organizations without some form of notice and hearing. The Department of Justice has been fighting a rear-guard action against that decision (341 U. S. 123) ever since. Last week the government lost another round in the U. S. Circuit Court of Appeals here in the lengthy technical litigation waged to make the Attorney General obey the Supreme Court. In strategic retreat, Brownell has adopted what purports to be a form of notice and hearing. On this the courts have yet to pass. Light was shed on Brownell's new procedure by his speech to the Bar Association. This revealed that he had not served notice of hearing on the accused organization until the very day he announced his unfavorable verdict against it in an address to its old rival, the American Bar Association.

Here is the passage so the reader can judge for himself. "I have conducted the study," Brownell said of his inquiry into the Lawyers Guild, "with great care. I am now prepared to make this determination public. It has been clear that at least since 1946 the leadership of the Guild has been in the hands of card-carrying Communists and fellow travelers . . . I have today served notice to it to show cause why it should not be designated on the Attorney General's list of subversive organizations."

The Attorney General's Occult Powers

The speech showed a mind firmly closed in advance to any evidence which might be produced in favor of the

To Disbar Radical Lawyers Is Totalitarian Logic

accused. The National Lawyers Guild, a product of a New Deal era revolt against the stuffiness and reactionary outlook of the ABA, has been a Popular Front but not a straight party line organization. It has many non Communists among its members. Their influence has been felt, from the Guild's condemnation of the attack on Finland in 1939 through its defense of Yugoslav lawyers after the Tito break down to its 1950 resolution supporting "the action of the United Nations in opposing the aggression of North Korea against South Korea."

The Attorney General already has at hand a rationalization with which to dismiss such evidence. "On every major issue," he told the bar association, the Guild "has steadfastly followed the Party line . . . *excepting only those issues so notorious that their espousal would too clearly demonstrate the Communist control.*" Such occult standards are a danger to any individual or organization on the Left, since differences with the Communists may thus be dismissed as mere camouflage.

Mr. Brownell's new regulations match this mentality. The hearing board or officer is authorized "to receive as evidence on behalf of the Attorney General information or documentary material, in summary form or otherwise, without requiring disclosure of classified security information or the identity of confidential informants." Witnesses "shall be subject to cross-examination, provided that no witness on behalf of the government shall be required to disclose classified security information or the identity of confidential informants." As in the loyalty procedures of the past, the nature of the evidence and the source of the accusations may be kept secret. This is not a hearing in any real sense of the word.

Nobody Discusses The Real Issues

The free atmosphere America knew in the past has become so corrupted that the real issues are hardly discussed anymore. One is whether the Attorney General has any right to proscribe whole organizations as "subversive," a standard still undefined and incapable of definition. Another is whether freedom can be preserved in America if Communists are made a special class outside the law—in the resultant hunt to determine who is a Communist everybody is pushed toward conformity for safety's sake. A third is whether the right to counsel can be preserved for radicals in political prosecutions if lawyers suspected of Communism are in danger of disbarment. Already in an atmosphere where clients are judged by their lawyers and lawyers by their clients it is becoming very difficult for accused radicals to find counsel.

America is rapidly moving back toward a situation Anglo-American law has not known for three centuries. Until the English Revolution of 1688, defense counsel was not allowed persons accused of "treason"—then as loose a term as "subversion" and "disloyalty" are today. Ever since Attorney General, now Supreme Court Justice, Tom Clark in 1949 urged disbarment of lawyers defending Communists, the Department of Justice has sought to destroy the right to counsel in radical cases. Even as it is, a lawyer who takes a radical case, even at the direction of a court, is in danger of losing much of his private practice. This is the application of lynch attitudes.

The drive to disbar radical lawyers illustrates the tendency of the "loyalty" orbit to be widened by one special excuse after another. It began on the plea of a need to protect official secrets, widened out to cover every Federal employe however unimportant, and then was extended to defense plants, docks and the maritime industry. Teachers, radio commentators, librarians, book publishers and newspapermen have all been affected since on the ground that they dealt with ideas and therefore must be policed against "dangerous thoughts" Japanese style. The rationalization in the case of lawyers is that they are "officers of the court."

As applied to the disbarment of radical lawyers, this recalls totalitarian practice. The United Nations report on forced labor in discussing the Soviet Union quotes Vishinsky as saying that "The first requirement of a defending counsel is a high sense of political responsibility . . . an ability to defend his point of view and give battle for his beliefs, not in the interests of his client but in the interests of socialist construction and the interests of our state." The UN report comments that such a conception of defense counsel and the restrictions it places on the defense "considerably increase the risk that the penal system and the system of corrective labor will be used for the oppression of those who are opposed to the regime." The same comment may well apply here soon.

The Witch Hunt and Peace

The stepped up activity of the witch hunters, the Attorney General's capitulation, the emerging Hoover-Mc Carthy axis, the Jenner spy scare report (which we hope to discuss in detail later), are of international as well as domestic concern. Western Europe must realize that the strategy is to intensify an atmosphere in which it becomes more difficult than ever for the Eisenhower Administration to make a firm peace in the Far East.

The White House, like the rank and file of both parties, does not want a resumption of the fighting. But it is as if Eisenhower had exhausted his meager powers of leadership in achieving a precarious truce. The enemies of peace—the China Lobby Senators, the military bureaucracy, the aviation lobby, the anti-Communist fanatics—are working hard to make it difficult to avoid a renewal of the war if Rhee—as he plans—starts it up again. Increased repression at home is part of their strategy.

I. F. Stone's Weekly

• Editor and Publisher, I. F. STONE

Published weekly except the last two weeks of August at Room 205, 301 E. Capitol St., S.E., Washington 3, D. C. Subscription rates: Domestic, \$5 a year; Canada, Mexico and elsewhere in the Western Hemisphere, \$6; England and Continental Europe, \$10 by 1st class mail, \$15 by air; for Israel, Asia, Australia and Africa, \$10 by first class mail, \$20 by air mail. Single copy, 15 cents. Tel.: LI 4-7087. Entered as Second Class mail matter, Post Office, Washington, D. C.

September 5, 1953



Vol. I, No. 31

JENNINGS PERRY'S PAGE

If We Get Rid of the Veto We Can Let China In

I find myself always trying hard to believe that men in high places who potter around with the fate of our world do have an inkling of what makes sense, since it's the only world we've got. I mean John Foster Dulles, as much as anyone. The more I turn over what he had to say to the lawyers at Boston about routing the veto out of the UN security council the more I like the possibility that what he really was planting was a gimmick to get us off the hook with regard to China.

Most of the press here and abroad have gone along with the likely view that our lanky Secretary of State, with his camel's habit of letting down one corner of his mouth, intended something beyond the ritualistic cold war shot at Moscow, and that his allusion to the "obsolescence" of the UN charter was prompted mainly by the dog days' news that now everybody but Liechtenstein has the H-bomb. I venture the other inch at the invitation of the circumstances. Making faces at Moscow is, after all, a postprandial commonplace; and as for the problem of the H-bomb what more is to be said intelligently than that already the H-bomb is about as effectively tied down as is ever can be—by the H-bomb.

Mr. Dulles could not have been assailing the veto seriously as a major stumbling block in the UN's path. We have laid all manner of evil to it; still it is true that only those fine plans we have for ordering the whole world can come to pass on which the great powers, including our own, are in accord. On the other hand, the existence of the magisterial yea or nay in the security council does seriously, in a way we hardly can afford to admit, encumber our own road of escape from the precious quandry of "non-recognition" in which our stubborn and transparent pretenses have cornered us. This problem can use all the ingenuity of which our Mr. Dulles is capable.

In the past, when the adventurous West discovered the ancient East, western wits jested of the people on the other side of the world who walked "with their heads down." Ever since the revolution in China, it has been the people of the West, particularly of the United States, who have walked upside down to keep from seeing the portentous change. Our own deliberate defiance of the natural laws has fooled nobody and has placed us in an impossible posture of ridiculousness.

The jests now are toward us. The make believe has, nevertheless, so involved our western "face" that, though obviously we must straighten up sometime (or make ourselves content with the role of chief bubblehead among the nations), the return to national behavior presents aggravating difficulties.

Perhaps only a good trick can serve our need and just perhaps Mr. Dulles has one knocking around upstairs. If the UN charter should be revised to catch up with the click of the Geiger counters, leaving out the infamous veto, the U. S. could see its way clear to letting a delegate of the Chinese nation into the seats at the UN reserved for China, at our insistence, in the beginning; in the assembly and in the security council—why not?

In the assembly China would have one vote, like Cuba, like all the rest; she could be handled there. In a security council without the veto she could recommend, like each of the other four Great Powers, and no harm done. General Chiang would be pensioned off quietly, given Formosa for his China if that could be worked out; all the powers would be in the UN where they could speak to each other directly and without embarrassment, if only to hiss, and reality would be restored.

The rules would have to be changed, of course, as Mr. Dulles proposes; and some undoubtedly would recall that the rules had been drawn in the first place to please the United States, that we had wanted China in a permanent seat on the council in order that we would have at least three votes that we could rely on vis-a-vis the Russian corner. But would it not all be for the best? To kick China off of the council just because of American chagrin at the change of government in China would be too crude; but all of the other members should be able charitably to perceive that removal of the "obsolete" veto would also remove the main fear which all along has accounted for our absurd persistence in refusing to agree that China, under a new regime, still has corporeal being and actual visibility.

Even to help us get our head out of the sand the revision of the UN charter cannot be undertaken before 1955; but we ought to be able to imagine Mr. Dulles looking ahead at least that far. And a sympathetic world, truly aware of our plight, should be willing to abet our trick without letting on.

**Help Keep Dissent Alive In America
By Subscribing**

I. F. Stone's Weekly
301 E. Capitol St., S.E., Washington 3, D. C.

Please enter the following subscription. \$5 for 1 year is enclosed. (See page 3 for foreign rates)

Name

Street

City Zone State

9-5-53

I. F. Stone's Weekly

Room 205
301 E. Capitol St., S.E.,
Washington 3, D. C.

NEWSPAPER

Entered as
Second Class Mail
Matter
Post Office
Washington, D. C.

I. F. Stone's Weekly

VOL. I, NUMBER 32

SEPTEMBER 12, 1953



WASHINGTON, D. C.

15 CENTS

The Jenner Report and The Panicky Liberals

The effect of the Jenner committee report on *Interlocking Subversion in Government Departments* is to represent the New Deal and the Fair Deal as a vast Communist conspiracy.

"They" were everywhere. "When the principal concern of Government was economic recovery," the report says, "they were in the Agricultural Adjustment Administration, the Works Progress Administration, the National Recovery Administration . . . During the war, they joined such wartime agencies as the Board of Economic Warfare . . . Toward the end of the war they were operating in the foreign policy field . . . They colonized key committees of Congress. They helped write laws, conduct Congressional hearings, and write Congressional reports. They advised Cabinet members . . . They staffed interdepartmental committees which prepared basic American and world policy. They travelled to every continent as emissaries and representatives of the American people. They attended virtually every international conference where statesmen met to shape the future."

The Eisenhower Administration is also suspect. "They" are still around. The report says, "The Soviet international organization has carried on a successful and important penetration of the United States government and this penetration has not been fully exposed." Though the Republicans are in power, "policies and programs laid down by members of this Soviet conspiracy are still in effect within our government and constitute a continuing hazard to our national security."

The reverberations may already be heard in the rightist press. "There are at least 10,000 Communists or fellow travellers, many in sensitive spots, on the Federal payroll at this moment," Lee Mortimer breathlessly announced in his Hearst newspaper column, *New York Confidential*, last week. "Ike, what are you going to do about it?"

Wall Street Suspect, Too

One of Eisenhower's closest advisers, John J. Mc Cloy, is deftly sideswiped by the report. It digs up a War Department directive of 1944 and some Mc Cloy testimony of 1945 to show "Army tolerance of Communists." Mc Cloy was then Assistant Secretary of War, and the testimony may be intended to embarrass him, for it shows a calmly judicial view of the Red Menace. The effect is to create distrust of Republicans as well as Democrats, for the War Department then was under Stimson and Patterson, both Republicans.

The tide of slander here begins to lap at one of Wall Street's most respectable doorsteps. Mc Cloy, a corporation lawyer by profession, conservative and Republican, is now chairman of the board of Chase National Bank. He has been mentioned as possible successor to John Foster Dulles

as Secretary of State. Obviously the witch hunters are also gunning for the civilized wing of the Republican party. This is a good point at which to recall that the chairman of the committee which released this report is the same Senator Jenner who smeared General Marshall.

Where Was The FBI?

The most serious charge made in this report is that "Thousands of diplomatic, military, scientific and economic secrets of the United States have been stolen by Soviet agents in our government and other persons closely connected with the Communists." If this is true, then the various secret police agencies of this government, notably the FBI, were criminally inefficient.

A footnote on page 25, says, "The sub-committee learned during this series of hearings that the Federal Bureau of Investigation had received derogatory security information and had conducted investigations during 1941 and 1942 on Alger Hiss, Harry Dexter White, Harry Magdoff, Maurice Halperin, and Harold Glasser." War-time statutes and regulations were in effect. The FBI was tapping wires by special permission of the Attorney General in such cases. Mail was covered.

The "derogatory security information" if true, represented valuable "tips" to a secret police. Many means of surveillance were at its disposal. The report says, "There is ample evidence" that the FBI learned "the underlying facts of the Communist conspiracy" and informed administrative agencies. "It is the function of the Federal Bureau of Investigation," the report goes on, "to uncover and compile security information and make it available, without evaluation and without recommendation, to the proper executive agencies. The FBI cannot expose and cannot force action once it has reported the results of its investigation."

Were The Attorneys General at Fault?

This implies that the FBI uncovered evidence of wrongdoing but that the Department of Justice declined to take action. The main responsibility would rest on the Attorneys General of this period, first Jackson and then Biddle. If all this miasma of suspicion were really to be conscientiously investigated by a body with powers of subpoena, one of its earliest moves would be to determine (1) just what the FBI found and (2) if it found evidence of crime, why no action was taken by the Department of Justice.

I do not believe that men of the calibre of Jackson and Biddle would have ignored, or that any Attorney General would dare ignore, evidence that secret government documents were being stolen by officials and transmitted to a foreign power.

The "derogatory information" to be encountered in loyalty cases has usually been of quite a different character. Radical views, associations and affiliations are not proof of crime. The report says, for example, "In the case of this subcommittee's inquiry into American citizens at the United Nations, the Federal Bureau of Investigation, in virtually all the 26 cases, had transmitted derogatory information to the proper authorities in the State Department years earlier. These people had also appeared before a Federal grand jury in New York which had this derogatory evidence. Yet, it was not until the Internal Security subcommittee brought this information forth in its public hearings in the fall of 1952, that any action was taken to remove these obvious security risks from their positions of trust and influence."

Why Didn't The Grand Jury Indict?

This is worth careful examination. The subcommittee itself merely speaks of these people as "security risks." It does not claim the "derogatory information" went beyond casting doubt on their political reliability. The reference to the grand jury is revealing. The statute of limitations on espionage is 10 years, not three as in the case of ordinary crimes. The atmosphere was far different from that which existed earlier. The grand jury had this "derogatory information" but did not indict.

Chambers first talked in 1939, Elizabeth Bentley in 1945. The persons they mentioned were subject to months and years of surveillance. The surprising thing is that after all these years the subcommittee has no new evidence to offer and rests its case against these and other persons primarily upon their invocation of the Fifth amendment. Some may be guilty of espionage. Some may only be guilty of Communist associations. Some may only be guilty of concluding that in this atmosphere silent discretion was the better part of valor. It is a pity we cannot hire ourselves a Royal Commission and let it dispassionately separate fact from crypto-Fascist fancy.

Retroactive Political Memory

The situation is confused by indications that testimony has been influenced by retroactive political considerations. "In its report on the Institute of Pacific Relations," the Jenner subcommittee says it "showed how a group of these individuals influenced the State Department with disastrous results to American far eastern policy. In the present inquiry we found other nests in the Federal Economic Administration, the Board of Economic Warfare, and those sections of the Treasury which formed American postwar foreign economic policy, particularly with regard to Germany."

The chief targets here, of course, are the so-called Morgenthau plan for Germany and the late Harry Dexter White, who was Morgenthau's Under Secretary. The report says Miss Bentley "gave the subcommittee an extraordinarily revealing glimpse of how White's hands played with the inner levers of American policy." Here is the testimony, as given in the report:

Miss BENTLEY. No; the only Morgenthau plan I knew anything about was the German one.

Senator EASTLAND. Did you know who drew that plan?

Miss BENTLEY. Due to Mr. White's influence, to push the devastation of Germany because that was what the Russians wanted.

Senator FERGUSON. That was what the Communists wanted?

Miss BENTLEY. Definitely Moscow wanted them completely razed because then they would be of no help to the allies . . .

Senator EASTLAND. What you say is that it was a Communist plot to destroy Germany and weaken her to where she could not help us?

Miss BENTLEY. That is correct. She could no longer be a barrier that would protect the Western World.

This is certainly reading back into events a picture that was not there at the time. Except for Goebbels, who during the war pictured the Germans as "a barrier that would protect the Western World?" The "Morgenthau Plan" began to be developed on the Western—not the Russian—side as early as the Quebec Conference as a means of preventing the Germans from making war again. The subcommittee report implies that sound policy would have been a negotiated peace with the Germans and an alliance against Russia. This is just what Hitler wanted after Stalingrad.

Half-Truth and Whole Lie

It will be a long time before we can disentangle half-truth and whole lie in the witch hunt. It will also be a long time before we know the full extent of the sinister forces pumping up the Communist bogey beyond all proportions to serve their own purposes. The New Deal was a kind of Popular Front, in which Communists played their part. There were Communists and Communist party-liners in Washington, some in important jobs. Their position, their numbers and their influence are being exaggerated beyond all reason. But the liberal press or what remains of it is too panic-stricken to discuss the report. To disparage Communist influence and power is dangerous, as it was dangerous in an earlier Inquisition to doubt the power and cleverness of the Devil.

This Popular Front, far from overturning the government by force and violence, brought America out of the tailspin of a great depression, made democracy work, proved that social reform was possible by peaceful means—and did so at a time when other countries were turning to dictatorship of right or left. It gave the workers and farmers of America new faith in their country and their society. It taught radicals who came to Washington a new respect for democratic processes as it taught not a few big business men a new respect for the meaning of free government. The "security risk" of having a few Communists or Communist sympathizers in the government was far less than the security risk we would have taken if the American people in 1932 had taken the other road—the road of repression and reaction onto which we are being pushed today.

The purpose of the Jenner report is to defame the memory of a great period in American history; to make Eisenhower a prisoner of the China Lobby; and to intensify that mood of paranoid suspicion, mutual distrust and growing panic so necessary as prelude to Fascism.

I. F. Stone's Weekly

• Editor and Publisher, I. F. STONE

Published weekly except the last two weeks of August at Room 205, 301 E. Capitol St., S.E., Washington 3, D. C. Subscription rates: Domestic, \$5 a year; Canada, Mexico and elsewhere in the Western Hemisphere, \$6; England and Continental Europe, \$10 by 1st class mail, \$15 by air; for Israel, Asia, Australia and Africa, \$10 by first class mail, \$20 by air mail. Single copy, 15 cents. Tel.: LI 4-7087. Entered as Second Class mail matter, Post Office, Washington, D. C.

September 12, 1953



Vol. I, No. 32

COMMENT

Labor Day

This issue had to go to be prepared almost a week earlier than usual because of Labor Day and we must leave for later comment the Dulles speech to the American Legion, which makes a successful Korean political conference even less likely than before, and UN Secretary General Dag Hammarskjöld's time-serving action in finding it "inadvisable" to obey the Administrative Tribunal order for the reinstatement of four UN employees who invoked the Fifth Amendment. This breaks the new Secretary General's moral backbone at the very outset of his career.

New Kind of Army Maneuvers

It should be comforting to the Russians to know that we not only have enough bombs to blow them to smithereens, but are already training military government occupation teams to pick up the pieces. *The Washington Post* the other day ran a story from Fort Meade, Md., which deserves wider attention. It was headed modestly, "Reservists Train for Political Control of Lands Under Reds."

Some 700 civilian reservists underwent 15 days of military government training at Fort Meade, "wrestling with the problem of establishing a democratic government in 'Country X', hypothetically liberated after years of Soviet domination." This should be quite a wrestle, though "the great bulk of the population is assumed to be friendly toward the United States", no doubt because of the friendly feelings created by fission and fusion bombing.

The exercise was set up and directed by a Colonel Charles H. Kraus, "who in civilian life is a professor of political science in the Foreign Service School at Georgetown University." Another Old Russia Hand helping to direct the liberation maneuvers is Col. Lloyd E. Kelly, who recently retired as deputy chief of the Metropolitan Police Department in Washington.

The military game assumes that these liberation teams are accompanied by members of a government-in-exile, who set up a provisional government until polling booths can be set up. The reservists rise at 5:55 a.m. and "All day long," said the *Washington Post* account, "they issue directives to the residents of 'Country X' or confer with fellow reservists

who are acting as members of the civilian government of the country."

Sounds like a cinch. We wonder how Napoleon and Hitler could have slipped up on so simple a military problem.

Understatement-of-the-Week

Faithful readers of the *Weekly* may recall "The Good Old Days Are Back—in FTC at Least" in our No. 12, which dealt with the replacement of crusading ex-newspaperman John Carson by *anti* anti-trust lawyer Everett F. Howrey at the Federal Trade Commission. Howrey as chairman of the FTC has now ousted three of the four economists who wrote that report suggesting that an international oil cartel existed. The comment of retiring FTC Commissioner Stephen J. Spingarn, "This seems like an awful coincidence to me."

Shades of Pretty Adolph!

The German Party, ultra right and anti denazification, drew an audience of only four people to its election rally in a working class suburb of Frankfurt last week. The organizers said they had been secretly told "the Reds" (meaning the Social Democrats principally) had warned the population against coming. "Imagine," said Dr. Heinz Nagel, "that there should be so little tolerance in Germany for other people's views!"

Hat's Off

To that other radical paper, *The Wall Street Journal*, for its leading editorial of August 27 opposing the McCarran bill to compel the testimony of witnesses invoking the Fifth Amendment. The bill need only pass the House at the next session of Congress and we suggest that readers looking for ammunition get a back copy of the *WSJ*. "A rip in the fabric of freedom," *The Wall Street Journal* concluded, "strengthens all those who would destroy freedom. We must contend with Communism now; at some future time our concern could be a despotic-tending State that would use compulsory testimony to its good advantage. And a protection to the individual once removed is never easily reinstated."

Journalistic Footnote

Left-of-centre we seemed to have the field to ourselves last week in telling the story of J. Edgar Hoover's praise for Mc Carthy and its political implications. *The Nation* and *The New Republic* were mum, as was *Newsweek*, but *Time* also told the story. To fellow publisher, Henry Luce—the Order of the Pebble, First Class.

SAMPLE COPIES

We will be glad to send sample copies of any recent issue free of charge to any of your friends who are not subscribers.

You send us the names. We'll mail them.

I. F. STONE'S WEEKLY

JENNINGS PERRY'S PAGE

Airlifted Bibles Could Aid and Comfort Enemy

Let him who is without worries of his own be first to cast the stone of reproach at the State Department for trying to avert its countenance from and wash its hands of the Bible Blitz project, intended to get Holy Writ across to the Godless Reds by balloon. This page for its part cannot in good conscience so stoop but, rather, charitably suggests that in passing the potato to the Germans the Department has shown a concern for consequences heretofore seldom exercised in the prosecution of the Cold War.

I no more than the State Department, of course, mean to impugn the *motives* of the sponsor of the project, the International Council of Christian Churches. Its aim is to be helpful, to supplement our benefactions in Berlin. Man cannot live by bread alone, for a fact, not even free bread; and no matter what the Eisenhower Bundles may do for the material welfare of the hungry Easterners their diet properly can be rounded only by access to food of the spirit.

Nor does one question the purity of the Council's missionary zeal. On that score its assurance to Pres. Eisenhower, on appealing for his "immediate assistance," that the balloons were not to carry any political propaganda should be conclusive. The Bibles and selected quotations to be airlifted have been faithfully printed in Polish, Russian, Czech and Slovak without expurgation or slanted editorial interpolations. The balloons bear only the trademark of their German manufacturers and, though lifted by hydrogen, would not be expected unpleasantly to remind the benighted people among whom they would drift down of recent apocalyptic explosions on both sides of the Iron Curtain.

Just why, indeed, the Council's spokesmen should feel that the promise not to include political propaganda with the Bibles might recommend the project in Washington is hard to say. But in any sympathetic defense of the State Department's reluctance to intervene with German authorities for permission to get the balloons off of the ground it must be pointed out that the Book itself expounds a social theory which has proved highly incendiary in the past, and that the whole well-meant distribution could seriously backfire. The Devil himself, as is well known, is adept at rooting out arguments to his purposes in the Scriptures; and the

State Department, already under attack for unimaginative laxity in security matters, would be sorely taxed to justify before Sen. McCarthy even a friendly association with this plan to place such powerful ammunition within reach of the unscrupulous heathen who "hope to wreck our life and freedom."

Beyond doubt these people have a facility of imitation and are quite capable of taking and using our good works, from B-29s to nuclear bombs, and even of improving on them, for evil. Letting them have the Bible would be a great risk since we cannot trust them with anything. Our bread could come back disastrously.

For though providentially the winds do blow from west to east in Europe, the winds also blow from Kamchatka to Kansas, from the unjust to the just, as the Japanese lately demonstrated. The hydrogen balloons blow with them—and apparently in Siberia these people also have hydrogen. Suppose we should find our holy books floating back to us, not clean and unslanted as we sent them out but underscored and red-lettered for propaganda—"He hath made of one blood all nations of men" and "Go and sell that thou hast, and give to the poor?"

Or worse: for these people, we have told ourselves over and over again, have their own profane "Bible." Suppose that, slyly trading on the injunction to "do unto others," they fill our air with gift balloons wafting down Karl Marx on our countrysides, our city streets, where anybody, even the children, can read the false doctrines and see what the fuss is about? The police could not hope to suppress all of this matter; the senatorial committees could not possibly purge the libraries fast enough; and the question of true loyalty would have to be extended darkly over the whole of our fair, literate land.

As it is now, the State Department has Mr. Dulles who can recite all the Scripture the Voice of America needs to send across the borders. Mr. Dulles is discreet. He can be trusted never to reveal double-bitted quotations to those who cannot be trusted not to use the other edge. His department simply feels safer, one can understand, not encouraging this flight of uncensored Bibles to the impious.

Help Keep Dissent Alive In America By Subscribing

I. F. Stone's Weekly

301 E. Capitol St., S.E., Washington 3, D. C.

Please enter the following subscription. \$5 for 1 year is enclosed. (See page 3 for foreign rates)

Name

Street

City Zone State

9-12-53

I. F. Stone's Weekly

Room 205

301 E. Capitol St., S.E.,
Washington 3, D. C.

NEWSPAPER

Entered as
Second Class Mail
Matter
Post Office
Washington, D. C.

I. F. Stone's Weekly

VOL. I, NUMBER 33

SEPTEMBER 19, 1953



WASHINGTON, D. C.

15 CENTS

Stevenson Again Offers Leadership for Peace

More striking even than Adlai Stevenson's speech at Chicago was the little noticed hint in his final article for *Look*. There the Democratic leader had the courage to suggest negotiating recognition of Communist China. His words are worth close examination. "In China," Stevenson wrote, ". . . industrialization and increased food production will require goods and machinery from the West. That's why many experts I talked with conclude that China wants peace and trade above all . . . Our allies are hungry for trade with China, too. . . . Some kind of Western policy for China must be worked out, now that the Korean fighting has ceased. Views among the allies are far apart now; but if China wants unrestricted trade, admission to the UN, diplomatic recognition and Formosa, and if we want a unified Korea, peace in Indochina and a separate status for Formosa, there is at least a broad base for negotiation."

The assumption is that we must co-exist with the new China, a daring proposition in the bedlam of American politics. As in the last campaign, Stevenson makes containment a stepping stone to co-existence rather than to "liberation." When interviewed by *Newsweek* on his return, Stevenson said he was convinced that we should "continue to resist Communist expansion" but "must decide whether we are trying to destroy Communism or trying to achieve a peaceful co-existence with it." He said, "the rest of the free world is alarmed by our seeming inflexibility. There's a suspicion that our objective is to exterminate Communism . . . Merely being against Communism is old stuff in Europe and will win few hearts in Asia. They need convincing that we are more interested in settlements by negotiation, in reducing tensions and in stability, than in force and military action." The tone differs not only from Dulles but from Truman and Acheson.

To find a common denominator of leadership for peace in the Democratic party and in the country at this time requires finesse. For many months the only theme of the Democratic opposition in foreign policy has been that Eisenhower was "dismantling" our defenses. No Democrat has challenged Dulles for implying before the American Legion that our bombers will attack China if there is renewed war in Korea or Chinese intervention in Indo-China. Something perilously close to a commitment to World War III has been made without protest from the opposition party or a numbed public opinion. The Indo-Chinese commitment indeed merely implements the original Truman Doctrine, which was intended to be global.

One wing of the Democratic party, with Byrnes, is "liberationist." Another, with Symington, is the support of the Air Lobby. Truman sees eye to eye with Symington on Air Force cuts and is reported by Drew Pearson to have spoken con-

temptuously of the Korean truce as something he could have had months ago if he had been willing to take the terms Eisenhower accepted. Senator Douglas, the main speaker at Monday night's dinner in Chicago, still pursues the Mac Arthurite line and implied that Eisenhower had settled for a "cheap peace in Korea which might give away our security." To conciliate such diverse and belligerent voices, to find formulas for peace which they might be led to accept, is a task which requires political genius.

Stevenson again displayed the art of seeming to agree with these other party voices, yet leading them off in a quite different direction. He, too, is against "unilateral disarmament" and he, too, is for a firm policy in Indo-China. At a time when American diplomacy seems to be a constant exercise in demagoguery, Stevenson uses the ritualistic verbalisms necessary for political respectability. Yet he ends up with such heresies as the right of a large part of the world to be neutral, the need for relaxation of tension and (most breath-taking of all) the proposition that not all the ills of the world are due to Communism. To ask before that audience and in that atmosphere whether China would "yield at the conference table what it fought to prevent on the battlefield" and to answer that this was unlikely took nerve. To go on and say that he hoped that in negotiating we would not be "prisoners of domestic political propaganda" was to make himself the No. 1 enemy of our No. 1 political power, the China Lobby.

It has too quickly been forgotten that Stevenson was the only American political leader last spring to endorse Churchill's call for a new try at negotiation. He stopped off at Chequers to see Sir Winston on his way home. The design he offers for world compromise is much like Churchill's. This is strikingly so in the case of Germany which Stevenson, too, would "win for the West" but with "durable assurances of non-aggression—for Russia as well as for France." (Obvious as the notion may be in the rest of the world, here it was hazardous for Stevenson to suggest that the Russians have legitimate security needs, too.) This formula lacks long range realism—the Germans will never be safely and permanently "Western"—but it offers a basis at least for negotiation.

Stevenson's suggestion that we swap Chinese recognition and trade for a separate status on Formosa has similar defects and similar virtues. The Chinese will never accept a rump regime on Formosa. Even a "UN trusteeship" for the island may be as unpalatable to them as a UN trusteeship over Hawaii would be for us. But at least this breaks the ice and sells the feasibility and desirability of negotiation and co-existence. For this and for Stevenson's protest against "the current wave of conformity and fear here at home" we are grateful.

Adenauer's Victory and the New Berlin-Washington Axis

The logic of the Adenauer victory in Germany is quite simple. It does not pay the Germans to negotiate unification with Moscow as long as there are still benefits to be collected from the West. At the moment "unification" with Washington is worth much more than unification with East Germany. The American alliance offers a means of rearming Germany at American expense. One reason for West Germany's remarkable economic recovery is that it has been the only country in the West with no armed forces to support. Either through the European Defense Community (if ratified) or directly, the Germans will get U. S. aid in rearming. And a rearmed West Germany can make a better deal with the Russians than could an unarmed Germany today.

The Russians are left holding the bag in Eastern Germany. Basic German-Slav antagonisms centuries old make it difficult for the Russians to develop a real base in an occupied East Germany. The German Communists are compromised by their relations with the occupying power. The level of operating efficiency in Germany is much higher than in Russia. The Russians seem to have more difficulty with the workers than with any other class in the zone. Moscow cannot compete with Washington in the handing out of favors. The longer a unification deal is delayed, the higher the German price will be. Adenauer is already saying that a "solution" of the Eastern frontier can only be negotiated with a "free" Poland and talking of a condominium or UN trusteeship over the Oder-Neisse territories. The iron and steel masters of the Ruhr are anxious to "liberate" the Silesian iron and steel resources which lie in the Oder-Neisse territories annexed to Poland. The German goal is a new partition of Poland, recovery of East Prussia.

The Adenauer election has strengthened John Foster Dulles and enabled him to resume the liberationist aims which the Eisenhower Administration had shelved. Always pro-German, Dulles will be freer than before to give a German orientation to the State Department, which has tended for a generation to be pro-British and to a lesser extent pro-French. German leverage is now stronger than that of any country on the Continent. Its traditional power to blackmail East and West has revived. It can always threaten to repeat the maneuvers of Rapallo and the Nazi-Soviet pact if Washington does not dance to its tune; in this respect Adenauer becomes a European Syngman Rhee but on an incomparably bigger scale.

"If this is a triumph for American democracy," one newspaper said of the Adenauer victory, "it is a strange one indeed, for if Germany has elected to tie its future to America, America is by the same circumstance, tied more closely to Germany's future. The Germans have voted themselves a strong claim upon American military and economic support . . . a more intimate and direct involvement in the most explosive of Europe's many explosive problems, the problem of German unification and rearmament." The paper went on to warn that "the exigencies of politics may lead the Russians, if not him, to force the issue . . . the American people had better consider carefully before the event, for if they wait until the ultimatums have been delivered, it will be too late." These dour reflections on the Adenauer victory were the Chicago Tribune's; it wasted no space on the poppycock in most of

the American press about Germany having been saved for the "free world."

Adenauer is an authoritarian old man, exactly the kind of father image to whom the Germans respond. He has kept the reins of power in his own hands to a ludicrous extent; unlike Hitler, he has neither a Goering nor a Goebbels nor a Ribbentrop. The "freedom" he represents is the freedom of German big business to rule Germany its own way; the post-election ultimatum to the trade unions, and the big business demand that he sell government owned industrial properties are indicative. A tight oligarchy representing the Ruhr-Rhineland industrialists and the Catholic Church rule West Germany through Adenauer. The Churches outdid themselves in a Mc Carthy style pre-election campaign against the Social Democrats, and the outcome is a signal for more "free enterprise" Germany style. This is the old cartel system in a new package. The anti Communist vote reflected hatred for the Russians, but the decline in the neo-Nazi vote does not mean "democracy" is safe in Germany. The Germans will not turn further right until that serves their purpose. This is the time for another Bruening; a new Hitler would be premature.

Will the Russians step in to prevent the rearmament of Germany? All we know of Russian history and the mood of its people leads one to doubt it. "Preventative" war is as far from the Russian pattern as from the American. Moscow gave way before Hitler until attacked and will give way again to German pressure. The post Stalin changes reflect vast popular discontent within the Soviet Union, and a determination to appease this by slowing down the pace of forced industrialization and military preparation. The Russians will not go to war to prevent the Germans from rearming, but neither will they be mollified by any maneuver as phony as Adenauer's pre-election talk of a new "security" pact with which to sugarcoat German rearmament as part of the Western bloc. German non-aggression pacts are traditionally worthless, and the Russians answer is more likely to be an attempted return to the alternative tactic of the Franco-Russian alliance.

This, however, no longer seems possible. France is tied to the dollar, and the Indo-Chinese war has made her a captive of current American policy. As seen from this point of view, a settlement of the Indo-Chinese war would run counter to Dulles's purposes in Europe as much as in Asia. Once the Indo-Chinese war is ended, France would resume greater freedom of action on the Continent. This would run counter to German interests, and to the aims of the "liberationists". A new Franco-Russian pact, supplemented again by a new Franco-Polish pact, would be a fundamental obstacle to Dulles's dream of a new counter revolutionary crusade.

At the moment any such reorientation of European politics is out of the question. Washington holds by far the better cards than Moscow in Europe. In Europe, unlike Asia, there are no neutral powers. In the Soviet zone of Eastern Europe the revolution is a more or less imposed and artificial product rather than a grass roots affair as in China. And the Germans are in no hurry to deal with Moscow so long as through the camouflage of a "united Europe" they can dominate their Western neighbors.

I. F. Stone's Weekly

• Editor and Publisher, I. F. STONE

Published weekly except the last two weeks of August at Room 205, 301 E. Capitol St., S.E., Washington 3, D. C. Subscription rates: Domestic, \$5 a year; Canada, Mexico and elsewhere in the Western Hemisphere, \$6; England and Continental Europe, \$10 by 1st class mail, \$15 by air; for Israel, Asia, Australia and Africa, \$10 by first class mail, \$20 by air mail. Single copy, 15 cents. Tel.: LI 4-7087. Entered as Second Class mail matter, Post Office, Washington, D. C.

September 19, 1953



Vol. I, No. 33

COMMENT

White-Washing Mc Carthy

In an interview at San Diego on August 21 (see the *Weekly* of September 5), J. Edgar Hoover declared his friendship and admiration for Mc Carthy, and called the Senator an "honest" man. Two weeks later the Department of Justice, perhaps testing the temper of public opinion, let it be known that a "lower echelon" of lawyers had found no basis for indicting Mc Carthy after a seven month study of the Senate privileges and elections subcommittee report on his financial operations. The Senate report showed that Mc Carthy and his administrative assistant banked \$268,000 from 1948 to 1952 and that almost \$105,000 of these deposits had "not been identified as to source."

The first task of any inquiry would be to try and determine whence, how and why such huge sums flowed into the accounts of the Senator and his assistant and alter ego. If the FBI had investigated and found no impropriety, one would expect the fact to be announced. But there is no indication in any of the news stories that there has been any investigation at all. On the contrary they give the distinct impression that all that happened is that Department of Justice lawyers took the facts as presented by the Senate report and on that minimum basis determined whether there was any ground for prosecution. Part of their conclusion is merely that no charges can be brought unless persons who paid sums to the Senator were to complain that they had been defrauded. This sort of technical legal analysis is a very far cry from a real investigation.

But how have a real investigation when the head of the Federal Bureau of Investigation calls Mc Carthy a friend and terms him "honest?" On this the silence even of the anti Mc Carthy press is thunderously eloquent. The combination of Mc Carthy and Hoover really has them scared.

Narrow Escape: Durkin Resigns

Martin Durkin's resignation represents a narrow escape. For the sake of a few concessions on the Taft-Hartley Act, the Eisenhower Administration might have split the labor movement politically, attaching the craft unions to the G.O.P. Many of these union have traditionally been Republican anyway. The Durkin resignation and the decision to stand pat on Taft-Hartley at last puts labor into opposition.

When one sees how dependent the organized labor movement in this country has been on political favoritism, how closely linked especially on the municipal level with corrupt

political machines, how ready to jump on the bandwagon of war and war preparations, how uninterested generally in anything but its own immediate bread and butter problems, one shudders to think of what a shrewd and demagogic rightist regime could do to create a contented and subservient American Labor Front.

The problem of the American intellectual is the preservation of peace and freedom. The labor movement is not overly concerned with either. On the contrary, it remembers two World Wars as periods of great progress. Under Wilson as under Roosevelt, labor made big gains as a reward for cooperation. Under Truman, it found no fault with the cold war or the Korean war as long as these provided the economic basis for full employment. Such a movement could easily be enlisted in an American Fascism, so long as labor was assured its share of the spoils.

This Administration, however, is neither Fascist nor a militarist regime, but a government of conservative business men. It is busy placating and appeasing a powerful crypto-Fascist wing, but its own objectives are those of the cautious banker, not the adventurer. One objective in the current deflationary policy is to weaken the labor movement and end the spiral of wage increases. In that framework, a Durkin is an impediment and the Taft-Hartley Act a valuable instrument.

ACLU and The O'Connor Case

There are times when news still seems to travel slowly. On June 11 Einstein urged American intellectuals to defy the witch hunt and refuse to answer Congressional inquisitors. On July 14 Harvey O'Connor refused to answer questions when subpoenaed by Mc Carthy in his "book burning" investigation. On July 23 the Senate voted to cite O'Connor for contempt. O'Connor was the first intellectual to take "the Einstein pledge." For the first time since the Hollywood Ten, a witness did not invoke the Fifth amendment but took his stand on the First. The Supreme Court declined to hear the Hollywood Ten and has never passed on the constitutional point. It might do so in O'Connor's case.

Against that background it was a little weird to find in our mail under date of September 8 a letter from Louis Joughlin, research director of the American Civil Liberties Union, saying "This office would like to study that issue of the *Weekly* which contains the full text of a statement by Harvey O'Connor concerning academic freedom. I should be grateful if you would send me a copy." We sent him a copy of our issue No. 27, dated July 25, which carried the full text of the O'Connor testimony before the Mc Carthy committee. We are at a loss to explain just what led the ACLU's research office to think that O'Connor's statement had something to do with academic freedom or just why two months later it still was unaware of the news that a man at last had bitten a dog. Now that the ACLU knows, we are waiting to see what it will do.

News Note

Professor Thomas I. Emerson of Yale Law School will be given a testimonial luncheon by the Emergency Civil Liberties Committee at the Fifth Avenue Hotel in New York on Monday, September 21. He is leaving for six months of study abroad.

JENNINGS PERRY'S PAGE

Can Demos Rise to Nothing to Fear but Fear Again?

Just how much new harmony in Democratic ranks was found or generated at Mr. Mitchell's well-publicized Chicago picnic for paying guests time will tell: the party's way-down South wing apparently intends to continue its long pout about the so-called loyalty pledge and a few dedicated members of the party's dwindling band of liberals obstinately cling to the view that bolters should not be given the right hand of fellowship without some sort of slap on the wrist. As of now, however, the one September song sung in sweet unison by all who lay claim to the Democratic name—those who were "detained by previous engagements" as well as those actually in attendance at the rally—projects the theme of a Democratic come-back in the congressional elections of 1954.

The note of confidence in this prophetic chorus probably is justified. It has not taken many months of Republican administration to arouse a lively nostalgia in several population groups of great voting strength. The farmers particularly are unhappy. Labor is apprehensive. And the always harried white-collar level, distressed on the one hand by an undiminished cost of living and on the other by the failure of the Republicans, in their turn, to end deficit financing, sadly suspects that—so soon again—it is time for a change.

But if the trend is toward a Democratic restoration in Congress, if the American people shall be ready for that next year, can it be assumed, from anything the opposition party up to now has had to offer, that the Democrats will be ready with vigorous and inspiring leadership? At Chicago, speaker after speaker skinned the "reactionaries" for plotting and trying to "turn the clock back" in internal affairs for "chipping away" at the Democratic agricultural program, for "getting ready" to hand over the natural resources of the commonwealth to the boodlers, for a "hard money" policy that clips the coins in every citizen's pocket. As certainly was to have been expected at such a convocation the Republicans caught the devil. The question remains of whether the opposition party hopes to win an election or merely to pick one up, whether it has any ideas at all that the popular nostalgia on which it is trading is not so much for Democratic programs "tried and true" as for imaginative and heart-quickenng courses of government the people have not had proposed to them of late

by the leaders of either party.

There is much to suggest that the Democrats have no more in mind than to take over where they left off: to return the legislative processes, indeed, to "experienced hands" but to permit the all-important attitudes of this nation's government toward the rest of the world to rock along in the same, deepening rut. In any case, Mr. Eisenhower would continue to reside in the White House; as if preparing for their prospective resurgence in Congress to disturb as little as possible the ritual of the Cold War, the Democratic spokesmen have missed no opportunity of pointing out that the President has had to rely at every crucial point "on Democratic votes." And though the familiar complaint that bipartnership in foreign policy is "dead" now is heard in Democratic accents, the fact remains that Mr. Eisenhower himself, by his very reluctance "to lead," has placed himself in the position of titular "head of government" in the pattern rather of European republics than of our own, ready to "form a government" congenial to any party in representative elections come to power.

It is difficult to suppose that Mr. Stevenson, his man Mr. Mitchell or any other Democratic spokesman does not realize that the one solid basis of Mr. Eisenhower's enduring "popularity" is the ability of his supporters to claim that "he has made good his promise to end the war in Korea." The fact should mean something to the party now out of power but bubbling with expectation of "taking over Congress" in the off-year. It should mean that the Democrats, when they go to the people, will stand on something better, more in consonance with the universal disgust with splenetic accusations and ominous "or elses," than a mere resumption of the blind, brittle "toughness" of the Truman-Acheson days.

Twenty years ago, the people's dread of a staggering economy gave the Democrats the chance to institute remedial measures the Republican administration has not been able to attack with impunity. Fear now has another, a deadlier complexion. If the Democrats have no answer for the malaise of these times, but count on coming back solely on the strength of favor won by accomplishments long past, they shall hardly deserve the nod of a nation looking above all for a bold leadership for peace.

Help Keep Dissent Alive In America
By Subscribing

I. F. Stone's Weekly
301 E. Capitol St., S.E., Washington 3, D. C.

Please enter the following subscription. \$5 for 1 year is enclosed. (See page 3 for foreign rates)

Name

Street

City Zone State

9-19-53

I. F. Stone's Weekly
Room 205
301 E. Capitol St., S.E.,
Washington 3, D. C.

Entered as
Second Class Mail
Matter
Post Office
Washington, D. C.

NEWSPAPER

I. F. Stone's Weekly

VOL I, NUMBER 34

SEPTEMBER 26, 1953



WASHINGTON, D. C.

15 CENTS

Answering The Russian H-Bomb With An American Sales Tax?

"Operation Candor" The Same Old Pentagon Claptrap

Operation Candor, long awaited and highly advertised, seems to have begun in Boston this week. But judging by the Eisenhower speech it is merely to be reversion to government by alarm. Hope that desire for fiscal sanity might lead the Republicans toward peace died with the passage in which the President finally touched on the problem of the H-bomb. Here was the same mindless rhetoric with which the military in every age have been accustomed to inflame public opinion and inflate public expense.

The "enemies of freedom"—the other side is always the enemy of freedom—are now equipped "with the most terrible weapons of destruction." And what is to be our answer? The answer of the armament salesman, the answer which must be as old as the first flint-tipped spear. We can meet them, Eisenhower said, "with only one answer: there is no sacrifice—no labor, no tax, no service—too hard for us to bear" in the "defense of our freedom." This reopens the Treasury doors to the Pentagon and marks the victory of the military over the bankers. The brief honeymoon with economy is over. Never was candor less candid than in these windy phrases but the truth peeps out, particularly in the "no tax" reference. Apparently our answer to the Russian H-bomb is to be an American sales tax.

We are summoned to defend a freedom which is vanishing. What the President left unsaid is the testimony of our servitude. The enemies of freedom are equipped "with the most terrible weapons of destruction." What weapons? Have they the H-bomb? Or perhaps the newly feared C-bomb? Are they ahead of us or behind us? Have we more than they or less of the new weapons? Is there any real defense against them? How effective would the best defense be? How much would it cost? What did Project Lincoln report? What did the Kelly Report say? What was in Project East River?

We are as much in the dark as those who live under a dictatorship. A small group of men alone knows the facts. A small group makes the decisions. And—from on high—we are given the answer. "We can meet them with only one answer," Eisenhower announces. "No sacrifices—no labor, no tax, no service" is to be "too hard for us to bear." Ours not to reason why. Is this free government or an atomic Charge of the Light Brigade?

Is there no chance of agreeing on some form of atomic control? After all, bombs of this kind cannot be manufactured in a washtub. If we have instruments which tell us that a bomb has been exploded behind the Iron Curtain, can it be said that inspection and enforcement are impossible?

Would it not be better to try and make peace before em-

barking on a stepped up arms race in fission and fusion weapons? Can this lead to anything but the most terrible war of all history? The questions are left unanswered. Few voices will even raise them in a docile press dispensing a uniform pap. The decisions have been made. Eisenhower says there is "only one answer." This is the Pentagon's answer, the translation of the world's most difficult problems by the small boy mind. If the Russians shoot us dead once, we must be prepared to shoot them dead twice.

If Operation Candor were really to be candid, it would tell quite a different story. There is no complete defense against any weapon. When that weapon is as destructive as the new bombs, great cities can be destroyed if only a few attackers slip past the most elaborate and costly defenses, as they inevitably will. Only a few days before the President spoke, the Secretary of the Navy at Quantico, Virginia, said "the realistic question of total mutual destruction" may deter nations from using the new bombs. Why then go on piling up more A and H bombs if they may not be used? The effect is to increase fear and tension without increasing usable military power.

Remember the predictions of how much money would ultimately be saved when the new bombs made conventional weapons and armies unnecessary? Now the Secretary of the Navy says the increasing power of the new bombs "suggests that the need for improvement of the more conventional forms of warfare may well become greater rather than less, as we approach absoluteness in mass destruction." The more money we spend on atomic development, the bigger and better must be our conventional army, navy and air forces. The prospect for the military is rosy, for this way the sky is the limit on expenditure and on military power over our economy. "Freedom" is to be defended by creating a garrison State in America. The world is to be torn apart between two fearful giants, neither of which believes in telling its own people more than an elite at the top thinks good for them.

This speech will serve a useful purpose if it arouses the world between the two giants to a full realization of how bankrupt is American leadership, how suicidal is the direction in which it is leading. To see such vast power guided by such small minds one must go back to the age of dinosaurs. There is no protection against the new weapons of destruction except peace, and no way to have peace except by co-existence. Russia and America can live in the same world together. But neither can destroy the other without also destroying itself. This is what "Candor" would report if it were not another of those spurious and hateful military operations, another excursion in spreading poison and panic.

The Real Proportions of That Red Herring

The Answer to *Look's*, "What Are They Hiding?"

Perhaps to counter balance its often relatively liberal line, *Look's* current issue features a shocker "What Are They Hiding?" A staff member, Fletcher Knebel, was assigned to tally up the record of Congressional witnesses who have invoked the Fifth Amendment's privilege against self-incrimination. He covered "the millions of words of testimony" taken since 1948 by the House Un-American, Senate Internal Security and McCarthy committees, and comes up with the first count of its kind.

"Behind the scorching national controversy over the treatment of witnesses," *Look* begins dramatically, ". . . lie some stark facts." The facts, however, when stripped of alarmist rhetoric, turn out to be rather puny than stark.

A sample is the main finding. "Persons who have refused to affirm or deny membership in the Soviet-controlled Communist party," *Look* reports, "held key posts in 71 bureaus, agencies and departments of the Federal government from 1933 to 1952."

The phrasing is hopped-up to catch the unwary. There is poetic license in the reference to 71 "bureaus, agencies and departments." A careful reading shows that what Knebel is really reporting is that 71 former Federal office-holders invoked their privilege.

This is worth that second look few *Look* readers will give it. The years covered are 1933 to 1952. That is 20 years. Federal employment averaged some 2,000,000 a year during that period. There are no figures on turnover available. But obviously several times 2,000,000 persons were on the Federal payroll in those 20 years. Yet three committees of Congress in five years have been able to turn up only 71 past or present Federal jobholders who declined to say whether they were Communists.

Even if we assume for the moment—as *Look* leaves its readers to assume—that all 71 are or were Communists, that is an amazingly small number.

In those two decades, the Communists three times ran a candidate of their own for President. In 1932—their best year—they polled roughly one-fourth of one percent of the total vote. In 1936 their percentage fell to one-fifth of one percent and in 1940 to one-tenth of one percent.

If the proportion of Communists on the Federal payroll had been about the same as their proportion to the total electorate, there would have been 5,000 Communists employed by the government in 1932, 4,000 in 1936 and 2,000 in 1940.

In the same inflated style was *Look's* finding, "No less than 113 persons who invoked the Fifth amendment served in some unit of the armed forces." A headline based on this says "Fifth amendment pleaders . . . even penetrated . . . the armed forces."

There were more than 10,000,000 men in the armed forces. If the ratio of Communists in the armed forces during the last war was the same as their ratio to voters the year before Pearl Harbor, then there must have been about 10,000 Communists in the armed forces. To say that they "penetrated" the armed forces is melodramatic and misleading. The armed forces were drafted. Communists were not exempt.

"Perhaps the most spectacular infiltration of a war agency," *Look* says, was in the OSS. "Spectacular" seems an odd adjective when one goes on to read that there were "no less than ten people working for OSS who later invoked the Fifth amendment." If there were only ten Communists among the thousands employed by the OSS that was not much of an "infiltration."

Just what this "infiltration" did or was intended to do is not explained. Some of the men *Look* mentions in this connection carried out dangerous assignments for the U. S. Army. *Look* says one was "parachuted into the Balkans." Another was "parachuted behind German lines in France to

operate radio installations for the French underground." *Look* does not say they betrayed their trust. It does not allege that they did anything wrong.

The most interesting figure of all turned up by the *Look* survey has to do with the question of espionage. The Congressional investigating committees have done their best for years to picture the New Deal and the Fair Deal as honey-combed with Soviet spies. *Look* provides an anti-climactic figure on this.

Look first adds the 113 members of the armed forces to the 71 Federal jobholders (the two figures overlap since some men figure in both categories) and comes up with a grand total of 175 "former Federal employees or members of the armed forces" who invoked the Fifth amendment.

Then *Look* reports, "At least 14 of these persons have declined to state whether they engaged in espionage against the United States."

It is surprising to learn that in all these hearings the most *Look* could find were "at least 14" who invoked the Fifth amendment when asked about espionage. *Look*, of course, leaves the reader to assume that this was the same as an admission.

Look does not tell its readers that in the eyes of the law—for reasons which are the fruit of long and bitter experience—invocation of the Fifth does not create an inference of guilt. It does not explain that there are circumstances in which an innocent man may "incriminate" himself by his own testimony. It does not recognize that a lawyer may sensibly advise a man with a radical past these days that it is safest to answer no questions at all which might possibly entangle him in some kind of prosecution.

Some of those named in the *Look* article undoubtedly are or were Communists. Some are not. Most of them have been put through the hoops—and the headlines—over and over again. The striking thing is that after so many investigations there are so few allegations of wrong-doing.

There are some striking cases in which there are serious allegations. But whether the allegations can be taken seriously is another matter. One man named in *Look* is alleged to have handed over atomic secrets. He has been hounded ever since the House Un-American Activities Committee made this charge in a special report on the eve of the 1948 elections. *Look* does not tell its readers that the Department of Justice said of these allegations in a formal statement at the time, "There is absolutely no competent proof here. . . . It is patently absurd and unbelievable that the Department of Justice in cases of this character would fail to institute prosecution, were the requisite evidence available."

The campaign to portray New Deal and Fair Deal as subversive plots has reached Orwellian proportions. It blares from every radio and is repeated in the pages of every popular magazine.

This much is true. Had Hoover been elected in 1932, there would have been few Communists or Socialists or radicals of any kind in the government. But a great deal would never have been accomplished. For the nature of that accomplishment—whether it "subverted" America or made it more stable—we summon a witness, Eisenhower's Secretary of Agriculture, Ezra Taft Benson.

What did Benson tell worried farmers at Eau Claire, Wisconsin, last Saturday? "Look forward with confidence," Benson said. "You are not looking down into the abyss of the thirties. We are in the fifties and have tools . . . to build a sound economy."

These are the mechanisms the New Dealers fashioned, the wage and price supports the Republicans opposed as communist. The hounded radicals of today are the same men who helped create those tools.

I. F. Stone's Weekly

• Editor and Publisher, I. F. STONE

Published weekly except the last two weeks of August at Room 205, 301 E. Capitol St., S.E., Washington 3, D. C. Subscription rates: Domestic, \$5 a year; Canada, Mexico and elsewhere in the Western Hemisphere, \$6; England and Continental Europe, \$10 by 1st class mail, \$15 by air; for Israel, Asia, Australia and Africa, \$10 by first class mail, \$20 by air mail. Single copy, 15 cents. Tel.: LI 4-7087. Entered as Second Class mail matter, Post Office, Washington, D. C.

September 26, 1953



Vol. I, No. 34

Quid Pro Quo

If Beria shows up in Washington, we are prepared to expedite J. Edgar Hoover's escape to Moscow.

Witty Fellow, Dulles

John Foster Dulles is developing unsuspected gifts as a wit. We recommend two passages in his opening address to the UN General Assembly. "The United States," he said at one point, with an almost audible chuckle, "does not want to see Russia encircled by hostile peoples." No doubt when our bases around the periphery of the Soviet zone are opened to international inspection it will be found that they are really social centers, with emplacements for samovars and large bins of *pirochki*, ready for Russian visitors.

We can almost hear Goering guffaw in his grave over another of our favorite passages in that speech. Dulles told the UN the Russian people had "not forgotten what their nation suffered from Hitlerite Germany during the second World War. They expect and they are entitled to, assurance against a repetition of such events." Dulles said, "That is, indeed, the large purpose of the European Defense Community."

Now that the Russians know we are rearming Germany in order to protect them from aggression, the least they could do would be to rebuild the Japanese Navy in order to protect us from another Pearl Harbor.

The A. F. of L.'s German Policy

In the dismay over Adenauer's victory, it is as well to remember that the German Social Democrats are today at least as arrogantly nationalistic as the German right. Their kind of thinking is reflected in the recommendations made by the executive council of the A. F. of L. at St. Louis this week on German policy. The A. F. of L., which has close relations with German Social Democracy, takes the "liberation" of the Eastern zone for granted and asks for more. It declares that the Russians can only demonstrate their sincerity by giving up East Prussia and forcing Poland to relinquish the Oder-Neisse territories. The A. F. of L. would, however, give "due consideration . . . to the national interests of the Polish people." It would have Russia compensate Poland by restoring territories annexed in the last war. And just to show its impartiality, the executive council adds that the Western powers cannot ask the Russians and Poles to make these concessions—without also arranging for France to give up the Saar.

The A. F. of L. and Chiang Kai-shek

The A. F. of L.'s foreign policy recommendations make John Foster Dulles look like an appeaser. The A. F. of L. finds "the widespread dissatisfaction" with the Korean truce terms "understandable" and is opposed to any settlement on the basis of partition. It is opposed to recognition of the Chinese Communist regime or its admission to the UN under any circumstances, though it recognizes sadly that "in the

present state of civilization, such recognition cannot be limited to states with high moral standards." It criticizes Churchill for suggesting that Russia may have security problems, too, and finds it "most regrettable that, since talk of negotiations with Moscow has been in the air, the western powers have already made heavy reductions in their arms budgets." It says the Russians have been "stepping up aggressive military preparations—especially in the polar regions." The executive council does not propose to abandon the Eskimo, either, without a fight.

The Pentagon and the Public Mind

The armed services are spending more than \$10,000,000 a year on "public relations." Mac Arthur had 175 military and civilian "publicity personnel." The Chief of Staff has 157. The National Council Against Conscription (1013 Eighteenth Street, N. W., Washington 6, D. C.) has just published a 60-page pamphlet study, "Press Agents of the Pentagon" by John M. Swomley, Jr. (35 cents a copy) which we recommend as essential reading for all who would understand the way in which the Pentagon molds the public mind.

The pamphlet explains the methods by which opinion is formed. These range from the special "confidential" orientation meetings to which business, farm and labor leaders are invited down to the comic strips. "Much of Joe Palooka's comic strip when he was in uniform," Swomley reports, "was inspired by long conferences at the Pentagon. This was at the height of the UMT campaign when the Army wanted to sell children as well as parents on the idea that the Army was the place to build men like Joe Palooka—healthy, strong—who don't drink, smoke, swear or have other bad habits."

One the main purposes of the Pentagon in its "public relations" is to condition the public mind for war. The pamphlet quotes A. S. Alexander, then Under Secretary of the Army, as saying, "The American people are better psychologically prepared for war if it comes than ever before in peacetime." The Council says in conclusion that the difficulties of achieving a peaceful and disarmed world "should not be magnified by a military propaganda machine whose chief results are the creation of a militaristic public opinion and the maintenance of the vested interest of a military autocracy."

Whispers Around The Capital

Warren's reputation as a liberal and his opposition to loyalty oaths in California have been a major behind the scenes obstacle to the Supreme Court appointment he wants . . . In Indo-China, as in Korea, the satellites are more intransigent than the big powers. While Moscow and Peking both are anxious to settle the Indo-Chinese war, Ho Chi-minh has grown more militant. On the other side, the French military, strengthened by the promise of more American aid, are in no mood for negotiations . . . Dulles favors a Pacific Pact like the Atlantic Pact and has been building up Congressional support for it but was unable to sell the idea to Australia and New Zealand at the Anzus meeting here. They shy away from a pact which would commit them to the support of Chiang Kai-shek against Communist China . . . The labor movement, after the deaths of Philip Murray and William Green, like Russia after Stalin, is in flux, and surprises are as possible in the A. F. of L. and the C. I. O. as in Moscow . . . The rapidly improving relations between Tito and the Cominform bloc have given the Yugoslav leader new leverage in the dispute over Trieste. Serbia historically oscillated between East and West, and the pattern may be expected to repeat itself . . . Federal Judge Luther Youngdahl, once Republican Governor of Minnesota, the Judge who handed down the recent Lattimore decision, did not add to his popularity with the G-men and the crypto-Fascists of Washington by making a speech at the eight annual National Conference on Citizenship in which he said, "hatred of Communism is not enough to make for good citizenship." . . .

JENNINGS PERRY'S PAGE

Adlai's 'Three Worlds' Based on Look at Half

Everyone will have perceived, I think, that travel has broadened our Mr. Adlai Stevenson. His disquisitions since returning have been unimpassioned, his advice temperate. Striving honestly to see us as others see us, he has brought back the distinct impression that our self-righteousness no longer is salable. He suggests that our diplomacy has about worn out the language of abuse. Somewhere along the way, perhaps in the zone of Winston Churchill's emanations, he has contracted the wholesome idea that live and let live, after all, makes sense.

The question rises now of what to do with our Mr. Stevenson this winter and next year till the elections: settle him quietly in his Chicago apartment to "make a living" or trot him out only from time to time to regale the gatherings of Democrats? A better use of him, it seems to me, would be to turn him around, while his recollections of Syngman Rhee, the emperor of Japan, Pope Pius and Queen Elizabeth still are fresh, and start him off on another around-the-world-in-six-months tour, this time on a different tack.

Thus we should be able to keep on broadening our statesman in experience and understanding. We should be able to anticipate even finer reports. For though Mr. Stevenson has viewed conditions and sampled thinking in a great many lands, in order to tell us how we stand with our "friends," many and more populous lands—those whose existence really disturbs us—were left unexplored. How it is with these is an information he can impart with no more authority than any other passer-by—a mishmash of rumors collected at the borders, of droppings caught under the eaves. It is reasonable to assume that a man of Mr. Stevenson's open mind and ready assimilation could learn as much by traveling in these terras incognitas as he has on a track that is fairly well beaten, and that another time he would return to us an even more rounded man.

If we should seriously consider a course of living and letting in the future, our project unquestionably would require a sum of fact in addition to the store we now think we possess. Our charts may be outmoded. Who would have suspected, for example, that in his circumnavigation Mr. Stevenson would have found Three Worlds where but a few years ago Wendell

Wilkie saw but One? And is it not at least possible that, if Mr. Stevenson should pursue his studies in all the far corners, instead of merely in selected ones, he in turn would discover that humanity is indeed whole?

It is handsome for a man who has aspired to be President of the United States, and who yet may be, to have first hand knowledge of places like South Korea and Formosa and Turkey and Greece. But our book on such places already is relatively well scriven and annotated: our military and economic experts have poured over them at will. The statesman who could be of real value to us would be one who would have first hand knowledge not only of friendly lands and peoples but of the vast reaches and populations lumped into one—the hostile and hidden one—of Mr. Stevenson's three worlds. If it should appear that these lands are not too different from our own—subject to droughts, to depletion, to conservation and improvement—and that these peoples at bottom harbor impulses of human nature quite as philanthropic as our own, then our adjustment to a policy of co-existence need not be difficult at all.

In any case, it certainly is as important for the American people to be brought up to date on the disposition of the leaders of Russia and China as on the current viewpoint of the Pope and the emperor of Japan. Our relations with the latter are not in doubt. Our problem is to establish an understanding with the former. And whether Mr. Stevenson's greater aim is his own mental satisfaction or to complete his equipment for the high office in Washington, he could not better serve it than by resuming his journey and covering the rest of the field.

Many commentators have complimented Mr. Stevenson on the "judiciousness" of his estimate of the present situation of the world. The evidence, as far as Mr. Stevenson's "on-the-spot" investigation is concerned, cannot be all in. At best, he knows "the half of it." Unless with equal objectivity he personally surveys the hopes and humors of the other half, how can his balances be trusted?

Let him, when he has rested his feet, be off again to the "interesting spots" he has missed. His counsel thereafter will be the more deserving of respect.

Help Keep Dissent Alive In America By Subscribing

I. F. Stone's Weekly

301 E. Capitol St., S.E., Washington 3, D. C.

Please enter the following subscription. \$5 for 1 year is enclosed. (See page 3 for foreign rates)

Name

Street

CityZoneState.....

9-26-53

I. F. Stone's Weekly

Room 205

301 E. Capitol St., S.E.,

Washington 3, D. C.

NEWSPAPER

Entered as Second Class Mail Matter Post Office Washington, D. C.

I. F. Stone's Weekly

VOL. I, NUMBER 35

OCTOBER 3, 1953



WASHINGTON, D. C.

15 CENTS

From Vinson to Warren

The late Chief Justice was a politician with little concern for the doctrine of separation of powers, given to acting as if he were still part of an Administration team and as self-assured as he was narrow in his judgment of men and events. He went on the bench in 1946 at the very beginning of the cold war, and the decisions handed down by the majority of which he was a part dutifully reflected the prejudices of the period.

Vinson and his colleagues of the majority dispensed degenerate doctrine. This was the Court which denied a hearing in the *Hollywood Ten* and *Barsky* cases, permitting Congressional inquisitors to breach the First Amendment and use the public pillory to terrorize the non-conformist. This was the Court which allowed the *Bailey* case to stand, branding a government employe disloyal on secret evidence never fully disclosed to her or her judges; the Court which upheld the Taft-Hartley oath and the Smith Act cases, where that monstrosity "conspiracy to advocate" was validated and the "clear and present danger" rule abandoned.

The common denominator of this new Truman Era constitutional law was the familiar premise of repressive government in all ages and in all its various guises—the notion that the supposed security of the State took precedence over the rights of the individual and the claims of free inquiry. Here Vinson, on the excuse of struggle with "totalitarianism", relapsed comfortably into the legal doctrines of his *bête noir*, Vishinsky. The cosmic joke of the cold war was this import into America of Russia's traditional spy-mania and constant obsessions about conspiracy. The story is really a simple one. A democratic country, trying to lead a world counter-revolution, naturally developed counter-revolutionary constitutional doctrines, revising Madison in the spirit of Metternich. This was the comedy in which Vinson played his determined role.

It would recklessly invite disappointment to believe that the substitution of Earl Warren for Fred Vinson as Chief Justice would bring this ignoble chapter in American law to a close. A community preparing—or being prepared—for war is a community in which basic liberties, though they figure prominently in the blowy rhetoric of the warmongers, are always disregarded. The law is earthbound by its inescapable instruments. Judges, like juries, vary but are subject like the rest of us to the emotions which affect the human herd. Until the climate of opinion changes, the law as interpreted by the Court under Warren is unlikely to differ sharply from the law as dispensed under Vinson.

But having said this as hedge against the notorious lottery of judicial appointment it would be ungrateful not to recognize the miracle which has saved us from some Republican analogue of Clark or Minton. Within the limits set

by circumstance and opinion, the Court may sway to one side or another. An Arthur Vanderbilt would have intensified the worst trends on the Court. An Attorney General out to curry favor with fanaticism might have persuaded the President to pick a repressionist Chief Justice to preside over a program in which Brownell promises to become another A. Mitchell Palmer.

We do not know for that matter what passed between the Attorney General and the Governor in those private conferences before the appointment was announced. We have no way of knowing whether pledges might have been made by implication. We do know that Warren's position on the loyalty oath at the University of California made him suspect in the eyes of one wing of the party, though the eagerness to push him upstairs and out of the way may have overbalanced anxiety.

It would be naive to suppose that Brownell did not seek some assurance that Warren would not prove an obstacle to the intensified deportation drive and anti-"subversive" campaign on which the new Attorney General is embarking on the weird theory that he can thereby prove Congressional witch hunting unnecessary. But we may comfort ourselves with the knowledge that assurances given before judicial appointment are apt to prove tenuous; they are contracts without an enforcement clause. It still seems a happy accident that produced a Warren in the party of Nixon and Knowland, and determined the award of our highest judicial office as consolation prize to a Republican as respected, humane and liberal as Earl Warren.

There are grounds for hoping that with Warren there will be a moderately liberal 5-4 majority on the new Court. For the Negro, the change from Vinson to Warren is a clear improvement, which should provide a favorable decision in the pending action against Jim Crowism in the schools. But the situation on civil rights in the sense of racial equality reflects the growing political power of the Negro. The situation as to civil liberties is strikingly different; here no sizeable portion of the electorate demands improvement, the victims are as yet part of a tiny minority of radicals and intellectuals.

If world tension mounts again, with renewed stalemate on Korea and Germany, Warren will certainly not be immune to the currents which made Frankfurter and Jackson captive on so many fundamental issues. But given a fair amount of peace, we have some reason to expect from Warren's past that there will now be five Judges prepared to put a rein on the worst excesses of the witch hunt. Even under Vinson, the Court enforced the elementary safeguards of the Fifth amendment. Perhaps under this new lineup there may be some hope for the First.

McCarthy, Lamont and Military Intelligence . . .

Washington

The cast assembled slowly. That swarthy urchin, Roy Cohn, was one of the first to arrive. Mc Carthy's new staff director, Frank Carr, the former head of the New York FBI office, turned out to be a stoutish young man with a non-benevolent moon face, small heavily-lidded eyes, and a pug nose so tiny, it made his profile seem flat; he might have been the model for a toy Piggy-Wiggy bank. Louis Budenz, grayed and more wrinkled, dashed in out of breath, dangling a large brief case, for a quick conference with Cohn, Carr and a big Scandinavian, Karl Baarslag, who had finally proven too much even for the American Legion and is now doing research for Mc Carthy. The reporters had that Monday morning look. The big room was but sparsely filled. The TV machines were up and the bright camera lights on when Mc Carthy made his entrance alone, 15 minutes late. He had his left hand in his pocket and walked with what was meant to be a modest slouch, a self-conscious grin on his face. The gray jailbird complexion, the covert look of a smart fox, were unchanged. In that gravelly voice, bored, impersonal and inexorable, like the detective hero in a soap opera, Mc Carthy called the meeting to order. The scene was a familiar one—the caucus room of the Senate office building, on a Monday morning in late September. The Fall hunting season, Red hunting that is, had begun.

Out for Bigger Game

This season Mc Carthy is out for bigger game, the biggest he has tackled yet. The attack on military intelligence risks a conflict with the Pentagon, far more powerful and cohesive a bureaucracy than the State Department. Back of this attack sophisticated Washington observers see two factors at work. One is the long-time ambition of Mc Carthy's ally, J. Edgar Hoover, to take over all intelligence, to bring the Secret Service, CIA, OSS and the various intelligence branches of the armed services under his control. The Congressional investigating committees and the rightist papers with which Hoover has friendly relations have helped cast suspicion on CIA and OSS before.

The other factor at work is Mc Carthy's ambition to create a kind of dictatorship for himself within the framework of established government, to make himself the recipient of complaints from assorted crackpots and malcontents, to build up a secret ring of informants within the government, to use their reports in unscrupulous smear campaigns, and to make officials more fearful of him than of their own superiors.

Scuttlebutt on Siberia

The outlines of the process were visible in this week's hearing. Mc Carthy has

been getting scuttlebutt from Army intelligence, as he does from other agencies. Of the pamphlet, "Psychological and Cultural Traits of Soviet Siberia" which he has attacked, Mc Carthy said "we had testimony in executive session the other day that a Major Wilson—I think it was a Major Wilson—strongly objected to this, and pointed out this was Soviet propaganda, Communist propaganda, from beginning to end."

Loose charges are taken at face value while official inquiry into them is brushed aside. "He objected so loudly," Mc Carthy said, "that Army Intelligence finally was forced to call a board to pass upon this." The findings are not revealed but "for some strange reason", Mc Carthy went on, the board thought the pamphlet should still be used. There are implied threats of future exposure to make the timid tremble. "I should point out, Mc Carthy warned, "it was a civilian who was selected to head this board, and that civilian also is holding a high position as of today over in the Pentagon." His head may be next.

In the Pentagon, as elsewhere, Mc Carthy is already dealing directly with department heads. The other book to which he objects (among how many hundreds on Russia which military intelligence must use?) is "USSR. A Concise Handbook", edited by Professor Ernest J. Simmons of Columbia. Mc Carthy said this had been used until the beginning of this year "and the new Secretary of the Army said he would immediately check to see whether it is still being used."

Col. R. R. McCormick Dissents

Mc Carthy's attack on military intelligence has alarmed circles friendly to him. For the first time, the Chicago Tribune and Washington Times-Herald, Col. McCormick's twin publications, have published an editorial criticizing Mc Carthy. They disagreed with the Senator about the Siberian pamphlet, said his principal objection seemed to be that the pamphlet "does not assert that all people under the Soviet tyranny are opposed to it." The Mc Cormick organs said it was dangerous in war to embrace "false assumptions about the enemy" and that if there were ever a Russo-American war "it would be an error of the first magnitude to believe that every Russian except the top crust of a couple of million party members was disaffected and would turn on the regime at the first opportunity." Col. McCormick, who has applauded so many Red smears, rose to the defense of Col. R. S. Bratton, who was in charge of preparing the pamphlet, as an officer of good reputation who had tried in vain to awaken the Department to the danger in the 24 hours before Pearl Harbor. Col. McCormick's editorial writer also pointed out—quite like one of us "debunking" a smear on the Left—

that only 100 were printed and 37 circulated and these only to staff officers who can be "expected to have sufficient perspective to abhor the Soviet system."

This effort to reason with Mc Carthy has a refreshing kind of amusement when it comes from the right. But Mc Carthy is no more concerned with the realities and mechanics of military intelligence than with those of the overseas libraries or the Foreign Service. He is interested in hashing up enough exaggeration, falsehood and alarm to serve the purpose of advertising himself and making others fearful of his power. For this purpose, as so often, he has gone back to the same limited witch hunt cast of characters and replayed some of the same old cracked records: a Russian who appeared before the Mc Carran committee and claims once to have been in the Soviet Foreign Service, and Budenz, that well-squeezed lemon out of the Daily Worker and the Communist Party. He found Corliss Lamont in the bibliography of the Siberian pamphlet and he found him and some other assorted liberals of varied hue in the Simmons symposium on Russia.

It was in the course of inflating this wee bogey into a man-sized scare about Army intelligence that Mc Carthy came up against Lamont. Lamont was taken before an executive session on a few hours notice in New York last week. On one side of the room sat 12 mysterious spectators—just like a jury. On the other side in solitary splendor was Louis Budenz. But Lamont failed to be awed. Instead of pleading the Fifth amendment, he challenged Mc Carthy's authority and invited a test by contempt citation, even risking a perjury charge in the process by denying—despite Louis Budenz—that he was a Communist. This was the second time this year Mc Carthy's authority to conduct an inquisition was challenged on First Amendment and other grounds. Corliss Lamont, like Harvey O'Connor, faces trial for contempt.

Their Star Performer

Lamont could also be indicted for perjury if Mc Carthy and the Department of Justice are prepared to take the risk involved in putting their star performer into the witness chair in a court of law, where he would be subject to cross examination and would himself be testifying under penalty of perjury. The hazards become evident if one looks carefully at what Budenz has actually testified about Lamont.

When Budenz was before the Mc Carran committee two years ago in the IPR investigation, Committee Counsel Robert Morris asked Budenz whether he had ever seen Lamont at Communist meetings. This colloquy followed.

MR. BUDENZ. Not at Communist meetings, but I have met him as a Communist.

... Who Was The Perjurer: Budenz or Lamont?

Mr. MORRIS. You have?

Mr. BUDENZ. Yes, and I have discussed with him on several occasions Communist affairs, with him as a Communist. You must understand that while Mr. Lamont, to my knowledge, was a Communist—that is, to my personal knowledge, and in meeting with him as such and conferring with him, that he sometimes had little difficulties with the Communist viewpoint with some criticism, and on several occasions and specifically on one that I can remember, I was called upon by the Communist leaders to give him information that would straighten him out. This was with regard to James Burnham, now of New York, who had evidently made quite an impression on Lamont and whom I assured him was a Trotskyite.

This testimony is tantalizing. Budenz says Lamont was a Communist but he never saw Lamont at Communist meetings. Lamont was a Communist, but he had been impressed by James Burnham, a Trotskyite.

Now your true Communist had the same horror of Trotskyites that Catholics have of atheists. The only people who needed to be "straightened out" on the subject were persons not in the party, friendly to it but not under its orders. The picture is that of an "innocent", a fellow traveller, not a party member. This would explain why Budenz, though he "met him as a Communist" never saw Lamont at Communist party meetings.

However, Budenz's memory, like that of most informers, improves with the years under pressure. When Mc Carthy emerged from the executive session at which Budenz and Lamont testified last week, Mc Carthy had something new. He told the press Budenz had testified that some time between 1942 and 1945 Lamont had told him on the telephone that he was a Communist.

No Kidding?

Budenz was then managing editor of the Daily Worker and one can almost visualize the conversation:

LAMONT: Hello, Louis, this is Corliss.

BUDENZ: Hello, Corliss, how are you?

LAMONT: Fine, thanks. Say, Louis, did you know that I was a Communist?

BUDENZ: Gee, Corliss. No kidding?

Such a conversation would have been—to say the least—unusual, and presumably would have made a great impression on Budenz. Corliss Lamont phones the managing editor of the Daily Worker to announce that he is a Communist! Had he just joined? Or had Budenz doubted that Lamont was a Communist? How did Lamont happen to say this to Budenz? Budenz did not explain. The questions were not asked. But at the public session this week, Budenz discreetly omitted the story of the phone conversation.

This time when Roy Cohn asked Bud-

enz about Lamont, Budenz replied:

"I knew about Corliss Lamont before I joined the Communist party. I knew him personally before I joined the Communist party, but after I joined the Communist party I not only knew him but knew of him, and I met him on several occasions in connection with pro-Communist activities . . ."

Note, "pro-Communist activities." Budenz was then in the party. If Lamont was also in the party, why did they never meet in connection with "Communist" and not just "pro-Communist" activities?

But let us return to Budenz's words: ". . . and he (Lamont) was referred to by Earl Browder as one of the four prides of the party, which included Rockwell Kent, Dr. Harry F. Ward, and the late Dr. Walter Rautenstrauch, because of their always being ready to cooperate with any Communist front or Communist cause." The italics are mine. If Lamont was a Communist, what was strange about his being willing to cooperate? Communists are tightly disciplined. This again is how one speaks of a friend, not a party member.

Budenz went on to say, "That was in a National Committee meeting in the early 40's" and then—one could almost hear the deep breath—Budenz took the plunge: "I knew also that Corliss Lamont was, when I was a member of the Communist party, a member of the Communist party."

How Did Budenz Know?

This was momentous statement, and if true made Lamont a perjurer. Budenz was not asked how he knew. Had Lamont told him? Had he seen his party card? Had he collected his party dues? How did he know that Lamont was a member of the party? The witness had said what the Committee wanted to hear. Cohn passed rapidly on to something else, as if afraid lest any question might disturb this gem of testimony.

Cohn asked Budenz about the late Sir Bernard Pares. But Budenz obviously was uneasy about the Lamont testimony. Budenz broke into the question about Sir Bernard to say that "Mr. Lamont has a record of being on a great number of Communist fronts which, if we could analyze them, would show his devotion to Soviet Russia." But Budenz had just been saying that Lamont was a member of the Communist party. Why bring up his membership in Front organizations? Why analyze these memberships? What need to prove by inference from these memberships that Lamont was devoted to the Soviet Union? If Budenz felt that he was telling the truth when he said Lamont was a party member, there was no need for arguing the point by inference unless Budenz himself felt insecure about his own testimony.

At The Soviet Foreign Office

Mc Carthy's other prize witness at this week's hearing was a man named Igor Bogolepov, who also starred last year before the Mc Carran committee. Bogolepov claimed once to have been in the Soviet Foreign Office and Mc Carthy tried to prove through him (1) that material in the pamphlet on Siberia prepared by Army intelligence was "practically word for word" the same as material in "the Soviet bible," if you can call it that, "The Problems of Leninism," and (2) that the Simmons book was prepared on instruction of the Soviet Foreign Office.

The parallelism if any may be judged from the very first example cited by Bogolepov. He said that on the very first page of the pamphlet, it said "the harsh Soviet government has liquidated or expelled potentially rebellious elements." Just how this statement constitutes Soviet propaganda never did become clear.

The Myth of "Instructions"

Bogolepov's testimony, when carefully examined, as few will be able to examine it, was not much more satisfactory on the question of "instructions." Mc Carthy asked him whether "this man Simmons" was "receiving instructions directly from the Soviet Foreign Office" at the time he edited the handbook on the U.S.S.R. "Well, Senator, in a way, frankly speaking," was the reply, "there was instructions but you must understand that the Communist propagandists were clever enough to talk to the foreign guests whom they wanted to indoctrinate in a way which will not make them just subordinate (sic) his instructions."

Mc Carthy realized this answer of Bogolepov's spoiled the picture evoked by the word "instructions" so he proceeded to coach the witness. "Is it your testimony, Mc Carthy asked, "that Simmons came to the Foreign Office and received instruction from the Soviet Foreign Office, either through London or Moscow?" Nobody had mentioned London before but the witness answered dutifully if vaguely, "Yes, at least in one instance which is personally known to me."

The dates are interesting. Professor Simmons made five trips to Russia in connection with his biographies of Pushkin, Dostoyevsky and Tolstoy—in 1928, 1932, 1935, 1937 and 1947. According to Professor Simmons, he visited the Soviet Foreign Office on only one of these trips, the last, which was made on behalf of the American Council of Learned Societies. The handbook on Russia did appear in 1947 but Professor Simmons put it in press before visiting Russia. Anyway, according to Bogolepov's testimony, he had fled from the Soviet Union five years earlier, in 1942!

JENNINGS PERRY'S PAGE

Public Disdains Threat That Leaves No Hope

When, the other day, the government released its official list of 193 cities the potential enemy probably would try to wipe out first, sure enough my home town Nashville, Tennessee, had made it.

Nobody turned a hair. I looked carefully to see.

The newspapers dutifully rewrote their Civil Defense editorials "in the light of new facts," i.e. that the potential enemy has made an atomic explosion using hydrogen. Everybody again was asked to "cooperate" with the local CD officials, whose names nobody had bothered to remember.

That was all. That is the way it has been for the past three years; indeed, since the end of WW II. Even the fact that our town had been mentioned with the elect—those of such importance that the enemy would head straight for them—was permitted to pass without as much as a murmur of satisfaction.

It was exactly the reaction, or lack of reaction, recounted by deMaupassant in his pleasant little story of Canneville after the disaster of Sedan: the people went on talking of whatever they were talking of before. But surely this was not the effect the announcement by the government should have produced. A whole city is not informed every day on the highest authority that its next moment might be its last. I spoke with my neighbors about it.

The coal broker on my left said with a cheerful grin that he supposed they would have to save the old newspapers to spread over the children; the automobile dealer across the street merely said, "Huh. Hadn't read about it" and went on down to his office in the heart of the "target" city that might not be there when he arrived.

The other cities in my state also tipped the Black Spot were equally as nonchalant. In New York, a few days later, when the sirens warbled for the make-believe double-bomb attack from which the survivors could only retreat to Staten Island, there was, I observed, as much boredom as alacrity in popular participation in the prescribed defense exercises. And all of this has impressed me.

Nashville and other cities of the hinterlands could be skeptical or just lethargic, but no New Yorker's pride would

let him doubt that his matchless metropolis would be the enemy's prime mark. Why is he, why are all of us, I wondered, kicking at the fallen leaves in Bryant Park, so unmoved by the threat of Doomsday? Are we just the bravest in the world, the busiest, the most careless? Can't we bring ourselves to believe there really is an H-bomb or that anybody would be so crude as to drop one?

Perhaps it is Mr. Dulles' "measured revelation" of the fancier trick Science now has up its sleeve that has dulled our ordinary instinct to *sauve qui peut*: perhaps the argument has become senseless, when we are directed to mobilize our efforts to save any one city on what would be "a lifeless planet." Perhaps the threat is too big for our imagination or, conversely, so big in our imagination that anxiety seems a waste of emotion.

The CD officials have that problem of our strange behavior first of all, for if we will not flinch, or have gooseflesh or even willingly rehearse hiding in holes when the finger is pointed directly at us, as in the government's listings of the target cities, what *will* make us move? Will anything? What *is* the matter with us?

There is this possibility, not too far from probability, that nothing is the matter with us but experience; that there is no fate, no danger the new wonder weapons can hold over us, we, all of us who are adult, have not already learned to discount in the course of living. The threat is extermination. But all who have made the hard adjustment to the fact of mortality already have grasped that nettle. The difference here is a threat of extermination of all—all at once; but it is a difference which cannot be really appalling to minds more or less well-accustomed to the idea that one day in any case they must cease.

The statesmen, the scientists and the editorial admonitions have pictured a destruction, if there should be an atomic war, almost too comprehensive. Hope must have more room; an enlargement that now can be achieved only by marshalling human effort not to futile flight but to deeds of accommodation and agreement which would put war completely out of the question.

I. F. Stone's Weekly

• Editor and Publisher, I. F. STONE

Published weekly except the last two weeks of August at Room 205, 301 E. Capitol St., S.E., Washington 3, D. C. Subscription rates: Domestic, \$5 a year; Canada, Mexico and elsewhere in the Western Hemisphere, \$6; England and Continental Europe, \$10 by 1st class mail, \$15 by air; for Israel, Asia, Australia and Africa, \$10 by first class mail, \$20 by air mail. Single copy, 15 cents. Tel.: LI 4-7087. Entered as Second Class mail matter, Post Office, Washington, D. C.

I. F. Stone's Weekly

Room 205

301 E. Capitol St., S.E.,

Washington 3, D. C.

NEWSPAPER

Entered as
Second Class Mail
Matter
Post Office
Washington, D. C.

I. F. Stone's Weekly

VOL. I, NUMBER 36

OCTOBER 10, 1953



WASHINGTON, D. C.

15 CENTS

The Fallacies and Flim-Flam of Non-Aggression

Churchill did not speak of a non-aggression pact in his speech of May 11. He suggested that "the master thought which animated Locarno" might be applied to the relations between Russia and Germany. Locarno was more than a paper promise not to attack. In the 1925 Locarno pact, the British promised "that if Germany attacked France we should stand with the French, and if France attacked Germany we should stand with the Germans."

This implies a new system of mutual guaranties in which the West would obligate itself to aid Germany if she were attacked by Russia and to aid Russia if attacked by Germany. This in turn would entail a Russian obligation to aid Britain and France if the Germans attacked westward. Presumably Adlai Stevenson had a similar idea in mind when on returning from abroad (and a long talk with Churchill) he proposed in his Chicago speech that we "think afresh . . . in terms of a European system of durable assurances of non-aggression—of non-aggression for Russia as well as for France, Germany and the rest of us."

It indicates just how stale the atmosphere has grown that this idea should suddenly seem gratefully fresh and creative, though it was the common currency of diplomatic exchange after World War I and was so disenchantingly devalued by the rise of Hitler before World War II. The system broke down as soon as Germany was ready to try again. The assurances served to lull the predestined victims into a false sense of security; behind the formal facade of shifting agreements from Locarno to the Nazi-Soviet pact, Russia and the West tried to trick each other and ended by tricking themselves.

These longer perspectives are, of course, not quite fair. It is as if one told a man recovering from a heart attack that he might die some day from kidney trouble. Postponement is itself a virtue. The Churchill and Stevenson speeches made the concept of negotiation respectable again. They had the merit of restoring discussion of Russian relations from the bogeyman world of total diplomacy to the discourse of reality, in which it was recognized that Russians, too, were human, with fears as real as our own.

It should not go unobserved that this recognition came at a time when the rapid revival of German power was beginning to alarm Western Europe, when the American alliance was entering on the phase of diminishing returns and when Korea had demonstrated that the military power of the Soviet bloc was too great to risk a World War.

But this promising approach, which Stevenson seems in some sense to have "sold" the rather vague Eisenhower, has degenerated in the hands of Dulles into a swindle. To see the swindle clearly one must go back to the selling point used by Stevenson. The glittering premium with which he sought

to make the sale attractive was that if assurances against aggression were rejected by the Soviets, this would "clear the air", i.e. solidify the Western alliance and speed up agreement on EDC. Unfortunately, as often happens with clever salesmen, the prospect has taken the free premium and left the article it was supposed to sell.

For the "non-aggression" pact offered by Dulles in his press conference last Tuesday and more transparently displayed in all its childish deviltry by Ray Cromley's story in the *Wall Street Journal* next day is not what Churchill and Stevenson have been talking about. Dulles merely proposes to offer the Russians the same old package—a rearmed and united Germany in the Western alliance—but now tied up with a pink ribbon. Moscow is to acquiesce in the rearmament of the German monster in return for a vague promise that the monster will not attack. Dulles—one of the humorists of our time—also offers a demilitarized strip along the borders as additional security! It would be amusing to figure how many seconds of additional warning a 100-mile strip provides in the age of supersonic planes.

Dulles is no well meaning babe in the woods. He defended the Locarno pact in an *Atlantic Monthly* article in 1935 not because it offered some assurance to France against German aggression but because it left the door open in the East to German expansion at the expense of Poland. He hoped for an Axis victory before and works for the revival of a new Axis now. He is prepared to offer any paper promise if it will make our allies think he is ready to negotiate in good faith. But all Dulles offers is another poorly sugar-coated version of the unconditional surrender to American terms at which Truman and Acheson pegged the price of peace. It is still "take it or leave it", though this time we offer a vague pledge of non-aggression to go with it. What would we think such a pledge worth if offered by a Russia with bomber bases in the Western hemisphere as part of a deal in which we acquiesced in the rearmament of a warlike neighbor with the scars of invasion still visible on our soil?

The Russians rejected this long ago, even with Locarno style guarantees. When *Pravda* last May 24 published the official reply to the Churchill speech, it welcomed his initiative but rejected his German solution. "Historical experience shows," the Russians said, "that as long as militarist and revanchist elements are given freedom of action in Germany, as long as no effective measures are taken to secure the development of Germany on peace-loving foundations, German militarism returns fairly quickly, and no formal guarantees or obligations can give confidence to Germany's neighbors. . ." If we were not blinded by ceaselessly inculcated hatred, we would see how true this is.

The Air Force and the Alaska Office Both Deny It

Another Collier's Phoney—Russian Planes Over Canada

Washington

Last Friday *Collier's* took full page ads in many of the country's newspapers for a sensational announcement, "Russian Planes Are Raiding Canadian Skies." This was ballyhooed as a *Collier's* "eye-witness report". "Almost daily," the ad said, "at least one Red reconnaissance plane violates our continental borders." It reported, "Many have penetrated deep into north central Canada." It warned, "Now that Russia has the H-bomb, we're wide open to a knockout punch."

"What's being done about it?" *Collier's* asked dramatically. "To find out, a *Collier's* correspondent flew thousands of miles, visited top secret installations, saw the Red intruders himself."

All He Saw Was A "Distant Gleam"

This turned out to be a bit of an overstatement. The doughty correspondent, William A. Ulman, told how he was playing poker in an Alaskan radar station when it "picked up the blip of an unidentified plane on its radarscope—almost certainly a Russian." An interceptor plane set off in pursuit, with the *Collier's* correspondent on board. "Minutes later," he reported, "we spotted the distant gleam of a Russian reconnaissance plane, speeding back to its Siberian base." That distant gleam on that one occasion was all Ulman claims to have seen.

According to the ad, "many" of these planes have "penetrated deep into North Central Canada." But the "distant gleam" was a long way from Canada. Ulman says he was in a radar station with the waters of Bering Strait "shining dully in the distance" when pursuit of that gleam began. Bering Strait is 2,000 miles from North Central Canada.

The article itself, when read carefully, turns out to contain only one sentence which supports the sensational, "Russian Planes Are Raiding Canadian Skies." An unnamed "General in the Alaskan Air Command" is quoted as saying, "Some have even penetrated deep into north central Canada." The ad converted the "some" into "many" and made it appear that Ulman had himself seen the "Red intruders."

What The Air Force Said

We asked Air Force HQ at the Pentagon whether the article had been cleared for security. The first answer was that it had been submitted, but "we couldn't go along with a lot of the stuff in it." A security officer would say only that the article had been returned to *Collier's* carrying a disclaimer stamp, which said:

"This article has been reviewed for military security by the Office of Public Information, Department of Defense. When publishing this article, no statement should accompany it indicating such review unless the following statement is included therein: 'Review of this article by the Department of Defense does not constitute verification of factual accuracy or opinion.'"

Collier's, of course, made no reference to this disclaimer, but left it to the reader to assume that the article had been "cleared."

The *Collier's* article said, "Almost every day, at least one unidentified airplane, violates our continental borders." An Air Force officer said this did not agree with Air Force information. He said there were such reports "occasionally" but they were reports of unidentified "blips" on radar screens or of vapor trails.

"We have no knowledge here," the Air Force officer said, "that Russian aircraft have actually been seen by us over Alaska; we cannot speak for Canada. There have been vapor trails and blips on radarscopes which have not been inter-

cepted. If people want to assume that these were Russian planes, that's up to them."

The Air Force officer added, "had there been any violations we could prove, you may be sure you would have heard of it. The State Department would have made a formal protest."

The *Collier's* story brought a similar reaction from J. T. Flakne, chief of the Alaskan Division at the Department of the Interior. Flakne said he had lived in Alaska since 1929 and been chief of the Alaskan division for more than eight years. Flakne said he had heard no reports whatsoever of border violations by Russian planes.

The Ulman article says the range of our radar is 80 to 100 miles. He does not mention that Bering Strait at its narrowest point is only 65 miles across. Thus some "blips" observed in that area may be in Siberia. Nor does he mention that radar "blips" are not easily identifiable.

A recent work on "flying saucers" says there are several hundred different things, including atmospheric phenomena, which can cause "blips" on a radar screen. It is difficult enough to identify one of these as a plane, much less as "Russian" and as a "reconnaissance" plane.

At Air Force HQ, it was explained that a radar operator identifies a "blip" as a plane by getting in touch with the pilot by radio telephone and instructing him to make a sharp turn at a certain angle. If the "blip" moves in that way, the radar operator knows it must be that plane.

A "Plug" For Western Electric?

The *Collier's* story seems to have been a "plug" for a "Distant Early Warning Line" project being developed experimentally by Western Electric. At Air Force HQ it was pointed out that the article's appearance was synchronized with a three-page press release from Western Electric.

The article pictured Russian planes pouring through Canada and said if they could "claw their way through to our East Coast" and drop "only nine hydrogen bombs in a line from Boston to Washington, they could blast out of existence a strip 50 miles wide and 450 miles long" containing "one fourth the nation's population and one-third of its wealth." In one fell blow, they "could kill as many as 35,000,000 Americans and destroy the U.S. as a world power."

However, like the wallflower in the halitosis ads, there is some hope for us yet. Letting Western Electric put a "Distant Early Warning Line" straight across northern Canada from Alaska to Greenland would give us six hours warning, allowing all the Strategic Air Command planes to disperse and launch a retaliatory attack. We could destroy "as many as 90 percent of attacking enemy bombers before they could reach their targets—compared with the 30 percent figure cited in 1950 by General Hoyt S. Vandenberg."

The cost? Only \$1,325,000,000 "insignificant when matched against the total defense budget." And what if ten percent of the bombers still get through with those nine bombs? "One of the greatest brains in Arctic radio communications" told the *Collier's* reporter, "Well, what more do you expect to buy in a world like this? We'll warn you—but we can't guarantee you security, too!"

Our Most Lethal Publication

Collier's is rapidly becoming our most lethal publication. Two years ago it gained international notoriety with a bedtime story preview of World War III showing how we could destroy Russia with one big punch. This new sensation shows how Russia could destroy us with one big punch—unless we buy the Western Electric's new warning system. We may, of course, be blown to bits anyway, but in that case why mind the expenditure of another billion? We can't take it with us.

I. F. Stone's Weekly

• Editor and Publisher, I. F. STONE

Published weekly except the last two weeks of August at Room 205, 301 E. Capitol St., S.E., Washington 3, D. C. Subscription rates: Domestic, \$5 a year; Canada, Mexico and elsewhere in the Western Hemisphere, \$6; England and Continental Europe, \$10 by 1st class mail, \$15 by air; for Israel, Asia, Australia and Africa, \$10 by first class mail, \$20 by air mail. Single copy, 15 cents. Tel.: LI 4-7087. Entered as Second Class mail matter, Post Office, Washington, D. C.

October 10, 1953



Vol. I, No. 36

As Seen From the Capitol Dome

A recess appointment for a Chief Justice has its risks. One of the hazards under which the new Chief Justice must operate is that certain contentious issues on which he may pass before Congress reconvenes, notably the school segregation case, might affect the vote on his confirmation . . . The aviation lobby is making a strong drive for another Air Policy Commission which it hopes to use (like the last one) as sounding board for higher Air Force appropriations . . . The only visible opposition to the Spanish accord lies in economy-minded Southern Democratic Senators sensitive to the restrictions placed by the Franco regime on Protestant worship. Though the official announcements figure aid to Franco at \$367,000,000, a logistics expert of NATO privately estimates the cost at \$2,500,000,000. It is this figure which has aroused Senator Russell . . . Now that Mossadegh has been removed, the Iranian problem as seen from the always oil-minded State Department is not so much how to start Iranian oil flowing again as how to keep it from undermining inflated petroleum prices in an oversupplied world market . . . The Church-State quarrel in Poland is not quite as simple as it appears to be in the American press. In Poland, as in Ireland and French Canada, Roman Catholicism has been closely linked with national survival. But the Pope's persistent refusal to establish permanent Polish dioceses in the Oder-Neisse territories has put the Vatican on the German side in a fundamental national issue.

Lee J. Cobb in Death of A Citizen

Scene: 4:30 p.m., June 2, 1953, in room 1117, Hollywood Roosevelt Hotel, Hollywood, California. Characters: Lee J. Cobb, star of "Death of a Salesman", and William A. Wheeler, an investigator for the House Committee on Un-American Activities. Occasion: An executive session to determine Cobb's "loyalty," as made public last week.

MR. WHEELER. Do you believe that the United States Government and committees of Congress have the right—I am not (sic) speaking of the rights as set up by the laws of the United States, but the right to investigate Communists within any environment in the United States?

MR. COBB. Yes, sir; I do. * * *

MR. WHEELER. Do you believe that the Committee on Un-American Activities so-called set up a censorship of scripts in the motion picture industry or of the products to be released by the motion picture industry?

MR. COBB. No, sir; I have seen no instance of it.

Having thus been encouraged to air his opinions freely, as befits the free citizen of a free country, Mr. Cobb was given a passing grade.

Scholarly Moment Before The Jenner Committee

Writers on Marxism are advised not to quote Marx, Engels and Lenin too often. Palmer Weber many years ago had the temerity to pick "Three Uses of the Concept of Matter in Dialectical Materialism" as the subject of his master's thesis in philosophy at the University of Virginia. Part 4 of the Jenner Committee hearings on "Interlocking Subversion in Government Departments" released this week shows how this particular wild oat caught up with him.

When Weber was before the committee, Senator Welker wanted to know why "starting on page 121 of your thesis, you used Engels 40 times and Lenin 40 times and Karl Marx 12 times."

This led to a learned exchange with the Senator. Weber tried to explain that up to page 121 he had been dealing with earlier concepts of matter, while from that point on he was discussing Marxist concepts and had to document his sources. "That is very true," Senator Welker conceded, "which leads me to this question—99 of your references were Communist. Now at the time you wrote that thesis were you a member of the Communist Party?" Weber took refuge in the Fifth Amendment. It is a pity the witness was unable to reply that he was only studying Marxism as a form of penance while preparing for holy orders on a grant from the U.S. Chamber of Commerce.

Our New Press Time

The *Weekly* is now going to press on Thursday and being mailed on Friday. It was formerly sent to press on Tuesday and mailed on Wednesday.

STATEMENT REQUIRED BY THE ACT OF AUGUST 24, 1912, AS AMENDED BY THE ACTS OF MARCH 3, 1935, AND JULY 2, 1946 (Title 39, United States Code, Section 233) SHOWING THE OWNERSHIP, MANAGEMENT AND CIRCULATION OF

I. F. STONE'S WEEKLY published Weekly at Washington, D. C. 1. The names and addresses of the publisher, editor, managing editor, and business managers are: Publisher, Editor, Managing Editor, Business Manager, I. F. Stone, 5618 Nebraska Avenue, Washington, D. C. 2. The owner is: I. F. Stone's Weekly, Inc., 301 E. Capitol Street, Washington, D. C., I. F. Stone, Esther M. Stone, Celia M. Stone, Jeremy J. Stone, C. David Stone, 5618 Nebraska Ave., Washington, D. C. 3. The known bondholders, mortgages, and other security holders owning or holding 1 percent or more of total amount of bonds, mortgages, or other securities are: (If there are none, so state.) None. 4. Paragraphs 2 and 3 include, in cases where the stockholder or security holder appears upon the books of the company as trustee or in any other fiduciary relation, the name of the person or corporation for whom such trustee is acting; also the statements in the two paragraphs show the affiant's full knowledge and belief as to the circumstances and conditions under which stockholders and security holders who do not appear upon the books of the company as trustees, hold stock and securities in a capacity other than that of a bona fide owner. 5. The average number of copies of each issue of this publication sold or distributed, through the mails or otherwise, to paid subscribers during the 12 months preceding the date shown was 8,204. (s) I. F. Stone, publisher. Sworn to and subscribed before me this 6th day of October, 1953. (s) Elizabeth S. Gladman. [Seal] (My commission expires 10/1/58).

OUR ZERO HOUR APPROACHES

Last Fall, after the New York Daily Compass closed down, the task of keeping alive a vestige of militant libertarian journalism in the age of McCarthy and McCarran looked hopeless. But thanks to your help we have discomfited our enemies and surprised our friends: the *Weekly* succeeded. Now comes our zero hour. What breaks most publishing ventures of this kind financially is the expense of obtaining renewals as the first year ends. Every mail solicitation costs several hundred dollars. The rate of renewals—and the number of solicitations necessary to get them—will determine when we can begin to expand in size as we hope to do. Some renewals have already begun to come in, and we thank the thoughtful friends who sent them. You can save us a lot of expense and headache by sending in your renewal now. The price is still \$5, but you can get a two-year renewal for \$9. Or you can renew and send a subscription to a friend as a Xmas gift for the combination price of \$9. please renew today. And don't forget that friend. Just fill out the blank on the reverse side of this page.

With many thanks, I. F. STONE

JENNINGS PERRY'S PAGE

The GOP Dilemma: On the Horns of the Farmer's Cow

I have just done a three day's drive through eight states, from Connecticut to Mississippi, on the traces of, literally in the dust of, a subcommittee of the House Agriculture Committee preparing a report on farm conditions and opinion this year of the Republican Restoration. Though I never quite came up with the group, a trustworthy newspaperman who travelled with it tells me "The Republicans were so blue the Democrats actually hadn't the heart to rib them about it."

What the roving legislators are seeing and hearing anyone can see and hear in the countryside this fall: the barren pastures, the empty mows, the slattern, half-hungry cattle, the repentant muttering of rural patriots who only a year ago voted for Ike, Dick and Prosperity, who now bite down on the name Benson as on grit in their teeth.

Evidently it is not a happy countryside, and just as evidently it is not the administration in Washington which is responsible for the second drouthy year hand-running. But it is a waste of breath, as the committeemen have found out, trying to explain to the farmer either the facts of Nature or the long range wisdom of Republican policies based on the doctrinaire assumption that the farmer is a typically rugged individual resentful, as a matter of independence, of governmental "interference."

With his own logic, bred of experience, the farmer always has known that any administration is to be held accountable for its weather; that its weather is a sort of judgment upon it by a higher authority than Man. Of more recent experience he has been confirmed also in the belief that his own well-being, as the "cornerstone" of the national well-being, is and should be of prime concern to society. True, he has no liking for the term "relief" and spurns the use of it in connection with his own problems. He has learned however to mistrust those who trade upon his dignity, and his self-esteem nowadays requires rather a prompt public attention to the evils that befall him than a buttery compliment to his "traditional self-reliance."

That is why, looking from his lean cattle and exhausted

pasture lands to the winter just ahead, he greets so sourly the assurances of Secretary Humphrey that in these past few Republican months "the cost of living in this country has been stabilized" and the protestations of Agriculture Secretary Benson that the livestock "mess" is the result of "loose and unsound" policies of the preceding Democratic administration. His own costs indeed have been stabilized, at a very high level, while the price of his produce has plummeted. And whether or not the past price of beef is to blame for the number of practically unsalable beeves in his barnlot the farmer cannot help feeling that this explanation of his grief comes with particularly poor grace from a spokesman of the party which for the past twenty years has preached "production, production and more production"—instead of "controls"—as the one means to a healthy economy.

Suppose the American people are ready with their knives and forks to "eat us out of the beef problem." The farmer finds the waiting long and the punishment singular. He sees no other commodity, which he himself must buy to stay in business and to stay alive, whose price has been forced down by "oversupply." It does nothing either for his ego or his sense of fairness to gather that inflation is being licked by depressing the price of beef—alone.

He feels left out and in a measure betrayed. In many instances he has "gone into cattle" not so much for gold as to serve the ends of "conservation," universally urged upon him and reasonable to his own mind, turning from row crop cultivation to upbuilding the soil. His reward is to be left holding the bag.

It hardly is petty of the farmer in this pass to react politically; in any case it is inevitable that he should recall vividly what so recently was dinned into him: that it is time for a change.

The drouth, by doubling the farmer's hurt, has merely doubled the Republican jeopardy in the countryside. This year, the farmer can afford to keep his cow even less than he can afford to let it go to market.

PLEASE RENEW NOW

I. F. Stone's Weekly, 301 E. Capitol, Wash. 3, D. C.
 Please renew (or enter) my sub for the enclosed \$5:

Name _____
 Street _____
 City _____ Zone _____ State _____

Enter this gift sub for \$4 more (money enclosed):

(To) Name _____
 Street _____
 City _____ Zone _____ State _____

10-10-53

I. F. Stone's Weekly
 Room 205
 301 E. Capitol St., S.E.
 Washington 3, D. C.

Entered as
 Second Class Mail
 Matter
 Washington, D. C.
 Post Office

NEWSPAPER

I. F. Stone's Weekly

VOL. I, NUMBER 37

OCTOBER 17, 1953



WASHINGTON, D. C.

15 CENTS

Acheson Declares War on Louis XIV

Mr. Acheson shares a common weakness for sweeping historical parallels. In his address on receiving the Woodrow Wilson Award, he said that five times in the last 400 years a coalition had been necessary "to resist the imposition by a powerful state of its hegemony upon others." He said a coalition "defeated the attempt of Louis XIV to impose absolutism upon Europe, to make subject peoples out of independent peoples." This rather loosely characterizes a victory which ended by handing over the peoples of Italy and the Netherlands to the absolutist Austrian Hapsburgs, leaving Spain and her colonies to the absolutist Bourbons and rewarding the absolutist Hohenzollerns with the Crown of Prussia.

This syncopated version of history might be left to die harmlessly in the newspaper files were it not that the Democrats may be making a come-back in the next election. The former Secretary of State, though too battered ever to hold public office again, exerts a considerable influence within the party and among the pro-cold war intellectuals. He is literate, cultivated, and charming. *The New Republic* reprinted his speech this week, with a dreamy little note by "M. S." (Michael Straight) on its "deeper preception," which reminded one of a bobby-soxer drooling over Frank Sinatra.

The striking characteristic of Mr. Acheson's address is that in it the architect of total diplomacy again shows himself totally incapable of thinking in real terms of foreign policy past or present. In suddenly attacking poor Louis XIV, he treats the War of the Spanish Succession as it would have looked rewritten by a new George Creel whipping up another of those wars to make the world safe for democracy. The coalition led to victory by Marlborough was no crusade. It was not the menace of absolutism but the development of a French Navy and the growth of French commerce under Colbert which brought France into conflict with the commercial empires of England and Holland. The nature of the war is revealed by one of its chief prizes—England obtained thereby a 30-year monopoly on the business of supplying Negro slaves to Spanish America, a privilege previously enjoyed by France.

This is not to suggest that the conflict was purely commercial. France sought the protection of her natural frontiers; Englishman and Dutchman feared for their own. Mr. Acheson is as incapable of seeing the all too human melange of mutual fears and jealousies in the past as he is of seeing them in the present. The ebb and flow in the recurrent wars to right an ever unstable balance of power is invisible to him. Each conflict is a fresh crusade, and always against tyranny. The newest came about, he says, "because the collapse of Germany and Japan removed the powers which stood

astride the borders to which five centuries of expansion had brought the Russian empire."

It is as if Mr. Acheson had already forgotten the last war in his readiness to mobilize for the next one. Germany and Japan "collapsed." A curtain is dropped over the causes of that "collapse." To remember would be inconvenient, for what was a danger before may be a danger again. Mr. Acheson now speaks as if the only problem for several centuries has been Russian expansion, and as if Germany and Japan could only be bulwarks of our defense. It is in the same headlong spirit that he speaks of "the material and moral rebuilding of Germany and Japan" and of "the gallant fight in Indo-China." What is "moral" about the restoration of the Reichswehr generals to respectability and leadership in Germany, and what is "gallant" (especially in a speech invoking 1776) about the long, dreary and futile war against native aspiration in Indo-China?

Mr. Acheson says that if the United States is to exercise the leadership of the "free peoples", it must not always insist on its own point of view as "the sole repository of wisdom and resistance to tyranny." But despite this graceful admonition he himself shows no readiness to see the unfolding scene through British or French eyes—to see that in the old balance of power game Germany already begins to seem more of a threat than Russia, to see that Western Europe staggering under the arms race wonders when it is to reach that "situation of strength" at which negotiation was to begin.

Mr. Acheson in this speech does bring himself queasily to use the horrid word negotiation, but he shows no more disposition than Mr. Dulles to embark seriously upon it. In this sense, American foreign policy remains bipartisan. In this speech, as before in Washington, there is no clue as to American aims or real interests, what we want or would settle for, short of Russia's destruction and subjugation.

There are other conclusions to be drawn from those four hundred years of history Mr. Acheson touches up in so melodramatic a fashion, moving from the grand monarch to Malenkov in one big 3-D production. We are no longer in the age of the musket. The bloody minuet of the balance of power, building up today the enemy of yesterday for war in a new coalition against the ally of day after tomorrow, must destroy civilization itself if carried on with atomic weapons. We must die with the Russians and the Chinese if we cannot live with them. To live we need not submit to them, but neither can we expect them to submit to us. The task of a humane leadership is to condition mankind for live-and-let-live. Mr. Acheson's—for all its liberal trimmings—is the familiar moralistic rhetoric of the warmonger, never more obsolete, never more dangerous.

For the First Time Since Eisler Fleed

Supreme Court to Pass on The Un-American Committee

Washington—The press missed the significance of the Supreme Court order this week agreeing to review the Emspak contempt case. It means that the Court may now for the first time pass upon the constitutionality of the Un-American Activities Committee. The review refused in the *Hollywood Ten* and *Barsky* cases is granted in the appeal of Julius Emspak, secretary-treasurer of the United Electrical Radio and Machine Workers Union. Only once before—in the Eisler case—has the Court agreed to review the powers of the House committee, but Eisler fled before the case was argued.

In the *Emspak* case, certiorari was asked of the Court on six questions and granted on all but one, which has to do with the predominance of Federal employes on the grand jury which returned the contempt indictment. Question No. 5 is "Whether House Resolution 5 [establishing the Un-American Activities Committee], as construed and applied therein, abridged the petitioner's freedom of speech, press and assembly in violation of the First Amendment." Question No. 6 is "Whether the First Amendment protects a witness before a Congressional Committee against the compulsory disclosure of the identity of trade union officials with whom he is associated and of his political views and affiliations."

This is the background of the *Emspak* case: The U.E. official was named as a Communist by Louis Budenz in the first Foley Square Smith Act trial. In October, 1949, Emspak filed a non-Communist oath affidavit under the Taft-Hartley Act. The general counsel of the National Labor Relations Board announced that this was being referred to the Department of Justice for investigation and Emspak was subpoenaed by the House Committee, appearing before it on December 5, 1949. He pleaded his rights under the Fifth and First Amendments in refusing to answer questions about himself and other officials in the Union, but at many points attacked the Committee and evaded any direct answer without explicitly invoking these rights.

A Surprise to Both Sides

The grant of review on the First Amendment question was a surprise both to the government and the defense. The main legal issue was thought to revolve around the government's claim that "at no time during his questioning did he use the simple, familiar language which would have conveyed to the subcommittee and the court that he feared that his answer to a particular question would incriminate him." It was on this issue that the Circuit Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia, sitting *en banc*, split. Three dissenting judges, Fahy, Edgerton and Bazelon, thought a new trial was required to determine whether Emspak "had been clearly advised that his objections had been rejected."

The government's reply to the petition for certiorari did not even argue Question No. 5 and dismissed No. 6 by saying that under the *Douglas* decision upholding the Taft-Hartley non-Communist oath "Congress may constitutionally inquire into the Communist membership of leaders of a particular union who are believed to have access to significant defense information." The Committee, in addition to its general hunting license for the "subversive," had the excuse that it was considering the Wood bill to investigate methods used to screen union officials at defense plants.

The defense pressed hardest on the point the Court declined to hear. It argued that in the current atmosphere, with grand juries under constant FBI surveillance, a grand jury in the District of Columbia was not a free agent in a political case when ten of its twenty members were Federal employes and two others were the wives of government employes. The First Amendment question was raised almost *pro forma* at

the close of the petition, but its words will strike a chord with every American intellectual.

The American Index Expurgatorius

"Surely," the Emspak petition said, "the Court cannot ignore the fact that the obtaining of information for legislative purposes, the power in aid of which the Resolution was passed, has become a hollow pretext for the compilation of a vast *index expurgatorius*, the systematic destruction of political dissent and the subjection of thousands of citizens not merely to ruthless invasions of privacy but to serious sanction without due process of law.

"Congressional committees," the petition continued, "now sit in judgment over the political liberty of the American people—teachers, writers, trade unionists, editors, preachers, doctors and just ordinary Americans. We have reached the stage where a "clearance" from the Committee is often indispensable to one's livelihood, career and good name. The assertion by Congress of these powers to sit in political judgment must be reviewed by this Court."

The unexpected readiness to hear argument on this question means that the Emspak case will be the first in which the Supreme Court will consider the power of a Congressional committee to inquire into matters of opinion and belief protected by the First Amendment. The outcome of the contempt actions threatening Harvey O'Connor and Corliss Lamont for defying McCarthy may be determined by the Emspak case, though there are other questions involved in the former, notably the narrow powers conferred upon the McCarthy committee by its enabling resolution.

Justice at Last for Dr. Barsky?

When the members of the Joint Anti-Fascist Refugee Committee went to jail for contempt of the House Committee, three of them were physicians. The chairman, Dr. Edward K. Barsky, an eminent surgeon who helped the Spanish Loyalists, was suspended from practice for six months as a result. The Court has now agreed to hear an appeal from that suspension.

The case is of crucial interest to all professional workers in danger of disbarment, loss of license or discharge for committing contempt. Cases against the two other doctors on the JAFRC, Drs. Louis Miller and Joseph Auslander, depend on the outcome of the *Barsky* appeal.

New York State law provides suspension or revocation of a doctor's license if convicted of a felony. Contempt of Congress is a misdemeanor. The question on which the Supreme Court has agreed to pass is whether the suspension of Dr. Barsky's medical license violated the due process clause of the Fourteenth Amendment and the constitutional prohibitions against double jeopardy and double punishment when the conviction (1) was not a crime, (2) was unrelated to the practice of medicine and (3) involved "neither moral turpitude nor intellectual unfitness."

Of general interest is the point made by the Committee on Discipline of the Board of Regents which disagreed with the suspension. Citing the *Sinclair* case in the Teapot Dome oil scandal, the Committee on Discipline said that committing contempt was "the traditional method" for testing the powers of an investigating body. It argued that Dr. Barsky could not be punished "on the assumption that facts not shown by evidence to have existed might have been disclosed had the records [of the JAFRC] been produced." The Court declined to accept a brief *amici curiae* presented on Dr. Barsky's behalf by 559 physicians of New York State. If it should hold that contempt does not involve moral turpitude and call for loss of professional standing, the decision will be of great help in other areas affected by the witch hunt.

I. F. Stone's Weekly

• Editor and Publisher, I. F. STONE

Published weekly except the last two weeks of August at Room 205, 301 E. Capitol St., S.E., Washington 3, D. C. Subscription rates: Domestic, \$5 a year; Canada, Mexico and elsewhere in the Western Hemisphere, \$6; England and Continental Europe, \$10 by 1st class mail, \$15 by air; for Israel, Asia, Australia and Africa, \$10 by first class mail, \$20 by air mail. Single copy, 15 cents. Tel.: LI 4-7087. Entered as Second Class mail matter, Post Office, Washington, D. C.

October 17, 1953



Vol I, No. 37

The Man Who Rescued McCarthy

The extent to which the Eisenhower Administration is knuckling under to the McCarthy crowd is indicated by the appointment of Robert E. Lee to the Federal Communications Commission. On Friday, July 31 last, after a heated contest for the position, President Eisenhower had finally approved the appointment of Robert J. Dean, a South Dakota broadcaster sponsored for the FCC post by Senator Francis Case, R., of South Dakota, and approved by the Republican National Committee. But somehow Dean got lost in the shuffle, the White House was led to reconsider and with the backing of McCarthy, William Randolph Hearst, Jr., and John Taber, powerful chairman of the House Appropriations Committee, Lee was picked instead. On taking office, he promptly voted to give Hearst the Milwaukee Channel 10 the publisher had long wanted. McCarthy had been interested in this as an ally of Hearst. The Milwaukee *Journal* has been campaigning against McCarthy and it would be useful to him to have Channel 10 in friendly hands.

It was Lee's handiwork which rescued McCarthy at the very beginning of his career when the Senator was well out on a limb. McCarthy is a gambler. He made his famous Wheeling, W. Va., speech about 205 Communists in the State Department in February, 1950, with nothing to back it up. Then, according to the inside story, he sent ex-FBI man Donald Surine on a frantic search for facts to support the speech. Surine finally returned with a batch of names and a summary of security files prepared in 1947 by Lee for the House Appropriations Committee.

Lee joined the FBI in 1938, became administrative assistant to J. Edgar Hoover in 1941 and in 1946 was loaned by Hoover to the House committee for special investigations. It was with Lee's research work in security files that this Republican controlled committee in the 80th Congress four years before McCarthy began the smear attack on the State Department as a nest of Reds. The work done by Lee fizzled out in the 80th Congress but finally supplied McCarthy with the 57 cases he promised to supply the Senate in February, 1950.

Mrs. Lee and McCarthy's then research assistant, Jean Kerr, now Mrs. McCarthy, were close friends and the former was matron of honor at the wedding. The Tydings report did

not mention Lee but found McCarthy's list identical with his except that where Lee's findings were "conditional or doubtful, Senator McCarthy's language is positive, unequivocal and colored. Where Senator McCarthy changed the facts in the descriptions of the House investigators, he changed them to create worse impressions."

Broadcasting Telecasting Magazine described the new FCC member as "an Irish Catholic with a Confederate name." Personally pleasant and genial, Lee has long been a source of sensational "Red" stories for favored newspaper writers. His principal experience in the industry has been as moderator on the TV Facts Forum, sponsored by Texas Oil Man H. L. Hunt, who may soon put McCarthy on TV. The Hunt program is loaded and rightist, but Lee when interviewed on his appointment said it was "clean as a hound's tooth."

Washington Whispers

One reason for the hasty Dulles trip to London is fear that Britain and France might withdraw troops from Korea if we cannot assure them that we will keep Rhee firmly under control. . . . The British moved so quickly to suspend popular government in Guiana because the U.S. has air bases there and has been making strong representations to London on the Red menace in the colony. . . . The Trieste dispute threatens to become a major factor in the disintegration of "containment." To disappoint the Italians would risk their membership in NATO but to incur Tito's displeasure would disrupt the strategically more important Balkan alliance of Turkey, Greece and Yugoslavia, which firmly holds the key to the Straits. . . . A major oil find is reported in Argentina, which has serious restrictions on development by foreign capital. There is talk in oil circles that Peron has been offered a huge price if he will retire peacefully from power and permit a new regime to take over more friendly to American oil companies. . . . There seems to be no way of knowing whether that Russian explosion was a full-fledged H-bomb or only a "thermonuclear device" like the one we had earlier exploded. . . . Moscow shows less and less eagerness to discuss the German problem, perhaps considering the establishment of a friendly unified Germany impossible and preferring to keep East Germany as part of its "defense in depth."

Urgent Bulletin

Attorney General Brownell's talk to the National Press Club on Wednesday of this week showed that the Eisenhower Administration is going to put full steam behind the McCarran bill to deprive witnesses before Congressional committees of the privilege against self-incrimination. Write for a free copy of our issue of July 18 last which carried the text of the bill and a full analysis. The minor amendment sought by Brownell would give the Attorney General a voice in the spurious immunity procedure provided, but an Attorney General who is working whole-heartedly with the witch hunt bloc in Congress will be no protection for dissenters. Alert your friends and organizations. Study the bill and prepare for some counter action now.

DON'T FORGET ABOUT THAT RENEWAL — AND ADD A GIFT SUB, TOO

Last week's announcement launching our renewal campaign brought a gratifying response but we've still a long steep way to go. Please renew today and send a gift subscription to a friend, by using the blank on the reverse side. If we could reach twice as many people next year, we could swing a heftier oar in a crucial fight. There's many a small town in this country now where the *Weekly* brings the only breath of dissent from the cold war and the witch hunt. Help me reach a bigger audience and build a bigger *Weekly* by renewing your subscription today.

With many thanks, I. F. STONE

JENNINGS PERRY'S PAGE

On TVA Answers to Ike's Perplexities His to Command

When about a week ago Pres. Eisenhower sat down in his White House to talk TVA with Frank Clement, young, debonair, pious Governor of Tennessee, the event—or incident—was noticed generally by the press, to the extent at least of the presidential reaction. Clement had proposed to give the President "the people's side" of TVA: afterward the President said the Governor had brought him certain facts of which he had not been fully aware; he said he did not think the Governor had converted him completely to his point of view. He did not say what facts had been straightened out for him by the interview; he still would not specify the aspects of TVA alarming to him, which previously had prompted his citation of the valley development program as an example of "creeping socialism."

Though apparently persuaded that the easy-speaking young Governor had represented what "the people down there want" and somewhat ashamed of his own adoption of the "creeping" hate-phrase from the epithets of John T. Flynn, the President remained—visibly—uninformed, unsatisfied upon questions touching TVA deep-lodged in his ear or his eye by the devious and unremitting complaint of the program's powerful enemies. It is a quandary such as no fair-minded political leader would care to be left in for long, and I am happy to suggest that the President can round out his information from a reliable, confirmable, official report which his least secretary should be able readily to place in his hands.

This report was made, only a few days before the President's tete-a-tete with Gov. Clement, by TVA Chairman Gordon Clapp in the form of an address before the Kiwanis Club at Memphis and copies of it were filed, as are all TVA papers, in Washington. Barely noticed by the press generally, the chairman's exposition of facts about TVA dealt nevertheless with the very questions about TVA so often seen in the press, and the very same, undoubtedly, persisting in the President's mind.

For instance, as to the matter chiefly moot: whether or not TVA is subsidized by the nation's taxpayers. Mr. Clapp declares for a fact, and with figures, that within 40 years, as

required by law, TVA will return to the U. S. Treasury all of the funds provided by Congress to build the TVA power system. The money is being collected from the consumers of TVA power and: "Our payments under this law are well ahead of schedule."

But: "TVA is subsidized by cheap money." Mr. Clapp declares for a fact and with figures that in the past 20 years the net income from TVA's power operations, belonging entirely to the nation as sole owner, represents a return of more than 4 per cent of the investment of the government in the TVA power system. "This return more than covers the cost of money to the Government."

The 1,300,000 retail consumers of TVA power, distributed to them by 148 locally-owned public agencies, enjoy low-cost electricity—but: "This is because these agencies buy power from TVA at subsidized rates." The truth is, Mr. Clapp asserts, with figures, that the wholesale rate for TVA power is only 1-1/100 of one cent less than the wholesale power rate of private power companies in the same area.

Mr. Clapp further points out, to those "alarmed" by the expansion of TVA, that almost half the generating capacity of the entire TVA system is to serve the demand of government defense plants, principally the plants for developing atomic energy; and that the increasing benefit to the nation from the increasing productivity, purchasing power and tax-paying power of the Valley stays and supports the general prosperity.

Now, the Governor of Tennessee was the President's invited guest and hardly could be pressed to "prove" his representations. But the TVA chairman is an employe of the Government; the President can hold him to account for any act or statement.

There is no reason for the President to continue troubled. He has heard what "the people down there" want and cherish—and certainly regard as no "sin." The medicine for his own qualms is to find out for himself what they have learned to be good.

PLEASE RENEW NOW

I. F. Stone's Weekly, 301 E. Capitol, Wash. 3, D. C.

Please renew (or enter) my sub for the enclosed \$5:

Name _____

Street _____

City _____ Zone _____ State _____

Enter this gift sub for \$4 more (money enclosed):

(To) Name _____

Street _____

City _____ Zone _____ State _____

10-17-53

I. F. Stone's Weekly

Room 205

301 E. Capitol St., S.E.

Washington 3, D. C.

NEWSPAPER

Entered as
Second Class Mail
Matter
Washington, D. C.
Post Office

I. F. Stone's Weekly

VOL. I, NUMBER 38

OCTOBER 24, 1953



WASHINGTON, D. C.

15 CENTS

McCarthy's Hoax and The Real Radar Scandal

The Signal Corps *wbodunit* in which McCarthy is currently starring himself has an old history. Almost two years ago, on January 21, 1952, the late Eugene Cox of Georgia rose on the floor of the House of Representatives to call attention to reports that a spy ring was operating in the Signal Corps research center at Fort Monmouth, N. J. "Fortunately for the safety of the nation," Cox told the House solemnly, "no less than eight investigative agencies of the Army, the Government and the Congress are now inquiring into this affair."

Congressman Cox informed the House that these espionage charges were being investigated by the House Committee on Un-American Activities "with the full cooperation of its ranking Republican member, Congressman Velde", by the McCarran committee, by the FBI, the CIA, the Military District of Washington, the Army Counter-Intelligence Corps and Gen. J. Lawton Collins, then U. S. Army Chief of Staff, "who is receiving the coordinated reports of the military branches."

The result of these investigations was a two-paragraph press release at the Pentagon two months later. This statement said, "The Army has completed a thorough investigation of charges made late in January of this year (1952) by a group composed of 3 Army officers and 6 civilian employees of the Signal Corps Intelligence Agency of alleged subversive conditions in the Agency. This group petitioned Congress to investigate the alleged conditions."

"No evidence," the Army statement continued, "has been uncovered to establish the existence of any subversive elements in the Agency. The 'suspicious actions of certain of their colleagues' charged by the petitioning officers and civilian employes are the result, a spokesman said, of personality clashes and jealousies, in some cases coupled with honest suspicions."

It was to this that the Army referred after a week of the new McCarthy hearings when it issued a release last Friday saying, "The statement made in 1952 that there was no evidence that any documents had been compromised or that files had been tampered with in the Signal Corps Intelligence Agency is still correct. The documents alleged to have been missing at that time were accounted for."

Everybody Out of Step But McCarthy

The circus operated by McCarthy has sought to create the impression that the government is infiltrated by Reds and that no one can be trusted but the Senator from Wisconsin. In this case, he throws suspicion not only on the Army and Central Intelligence but also on the FBI, the Un-American Activities Committee and the McCarran committee. "Open

hearings," the *Chicago Tribune* said in January, 1952, of the committee inquiries, "may be deferred for some time." None were ever held. Either these two older witch hunt committees were satisfied that there was no substance in the Fort Monmouth reports or they, too, are "dupes or worse."

The Fort Monmouth affair was a *Chicago Tribune* sensation. One need only go back and reread the original story as put into the *Congressional Record* by Cox to see how stale and discredited even then was McCarthy's latest. The story was based upon a petition to Congress by three Army officers and seven civilians employed at Fort Monmouth by the Signal Corps. They alleged a subversive plot in which 57 top secret documents were missing. (It is curious how often the number 57 turns up in the witch hunt. At one time McCarthy had 57 card-carrying Communists in the State Department. The number makes one wonder whether these visions originate at the breakfast table while staring in a trance at an H. J. Heinz—"57 varieties"—ketchup bottle.)

The charges had the moldy flavor of the stuff regurgitated in loyalty hearings. An example was "5. Numerous allegations of conversations in which certain employes talked in a vein indicating pro-Communism, in the opinion of complaining petitioners." Apparently these charges had already been investigated. Major General A. R. Bolling, assistant chief of staff, G-2 "revealed" at that time "that his men have been probing accusations against civilian employes of the Army Signal Intelligence Corps for more than a year," that one was found to be a Communist sympathizer and had resigned, that another had been dismissed but that "little tangible evidence of espionage or subversive activities" had been developed.

The FBI, Too, Had Investigated

The FBI, too, had been in on the inquiry. The *Chicago Tribune* gave its own sensation away to the discerning reader when it said near the end of the story, "After comprehensive investigations had been made by Army Intelligence and the FBI, indicating no activities of certain accused individuals outside the agency which would arouse suspicion, there was a tendency to attribute some complaints to office bickering between persons striving for authority. The petition to Congress and the report of missing documents, however, stirred the inquiry to great heights."

The ashes of old charges had been restirred by a group of office malcontents. The *Chicago Tribune* described how this little band "for weeks" had trooped the corridors of Congress. "In some instances," it said, "they were unable to get past the guardians of the outer offices of Senators and Representatives." In others "the sensational nature of their charges aroused in-

How RCA "Tipped" The Radar Secret to The Axis

credulity." Finally Senators Hoey, McCarran and McCarthy and Representative Velde had interceded to get their charges a fresh hearing. The upshot was the dismissal of these charges by the Army in March, 1952, without protest by McCarran, Velde or McCarthy.

That there is still no evidence behind those closed doors was indicated by the curious phrasing of the statement issued last Saturday by Harold E. Rainville, administrative assistant to Senator Dirksen of Illinois, who sat in on the hearings for the Senator. Rainville said the number of civilian employes who had invoked the Fifth amendment "clearly indicates . . . widespread communism in one of the government's most secret enterprises." But "without a confession of actual theft of top secret radar information, we yet have no alternative to feeling that this Communist cell was not just a social affair." This backs into an anti-climax. Yet this is the most Rainville could say a day after one witness was alleged to have broken down and "confessed."

Racial Friction at Fort Monmouth

The real story dimly visible behind the scenes is this. There was a good deal of covert discrimination against Jews in engineering before the war. Many obtained jobs in the Signal Corps in the 30's and have seniority status now. The complainants seem all to have been non-Jews. There was friction, suspicion and jealousy. Julius Rosenberg worked at Fort Monmouth as a civilian specialist in 1942 and 1943. There is little social life at Fort Monmouth and the Jewish engineers there lived an ingrown social life. Associations natural at the time may now be made to appear sinister. This is what lies behind Rainville's odd phrasing, "we yet have no alternative to feeling that this Communist cell was not just a social affair."

Witnesses have been bullied and threatened, given virtual three degree treatment behind the closed doors. One woman witness was asked whether she did not deserve to get the same treatment as Ethel Rosenberg. One man was asked, "If you had wanted to steal secret documents, could you have done so?" When he replied, "But I didn't want to steal secret documents," McCarthy insisted, "But if you had wanted to . . ." One frightened witness seems to have denied knowing Rosenberg when they in fact shared the same car pool.

McCarthy has abused the purpose of executive sessions by giving out (from what little one can learn) fantastically one-sided versions of what occurred. The result has been to spread a nightmareish fantasy across the front pages of the nation's press with McCarthy as the hero.

What Did Happen A Decade Ago

Senator Potter's stand-in at the hearings, his administrative assistant, Robert L. Jones, said the evidence "should have been brought out ten years ago." A decade ago investigation would have brought out the fact that the secret of radar *had* been disclosed to a foreign enemy power, and that secret documents *had* disappeared. While McCarthy is chasing bogeymen, the real radar scandal was one of the least discussed scandals of war-time Washington.

The last time it was told the press generally ignored the story, and Hawkshaw McCarthy, already in the Senate and on the trail, paid no attention to it. The story may be found spread on the record of the hearings held by the Senate Labor and Education committee in July, 1950, on ethics in government. Drew Pearson was the witness. This is the story, as he told it under oath.

Radar was developed before the war by the Signal Corps at Fort Monmouth. Its development was surrounded with as much secrecy as the atom bomb. Certain employes of Radio Corporation of America, however, were trusted with access to the project. In 1936 a civilian employe of the Signal Corps, William D. Hershberger, who had played an important role in the development of radar, resigned from the Corps and went to work for RCA. Two years later RCA filed an application for the basic patent on radar.

That was in 1938, after Hitler had already seized Austria. The Army took steps to prevent the application from being made public and a patent from being granted lest the secret fall into the hands of a potential enemy. But it could not prevent RCA from filing patent applications abroad. RCA obtained patents in Australia and New Zealand, which published them. RCA also filed for patents in Germany and Japan, which denied the applications. But when war came both Germany and Japan used radar.

Doubling in Brass—For the RCA

After the war, the Army informed the patent office that it had put in six years of work on radar. The patent office was of the opinion that the Army was entitled to the patent. "Suddenly," Pearson said, "the Army cooled off." In 1946 the patent was granted RCA. Several individuals had shuttled back and forth between the Signal Corps and RCA: Hershberger; David Sarnoff, chairman of RCA, a brigadier general in the Signal Corps during the war; and Major Harry D. Newton, an RCA employe who also worked at Fort Monmouth. Pearson testified that after the war in 1946 Newton returned to Fort Monmouth "and made a request to see the files on secret radar developments."

Senator DOUGLAS. He was then a civilian?

Mr. PEARSON. Yes. Major Newton tried to get a civilian employed at Fort Monmouth, James Enright, to show him the file, but Enright called military intelligence, which put Newton on the carpet for a couple of hours. I do not think he was permitted to see the files, but those files mysteriously disappeared.

According to Pearson, there was talk of prosecuting RCA in connection with the radar patent. Major General Harry Ingles, who was then Chief of the Signal Corps, retired in March, 1947, to take an important position with RCA. "After General Ingles joined RCA," Pearson testified before the Senate committee, "his former outfit, the Signal Corps, cooled off regarding any prosecution of the Radio Corporation. The Army did send the entire radar patent matter to the Justice Department, however, where it has lain dormant for approximately four years."

No McCarthy hounds RCA.

I. F. Stone's Weekly

• Editor and Publisher, I. F. STONE

Published weekly except the last two weeks of August at Room 205, 301 E. Capitol St., S.E., Washington 3, D. C. Subscription rates: Domestic, \$5 a year; Canada, Mexico and elsewhere in the Western Hemisphere, \$6; England and Continental Europe, \$10 by 1st class mail, \$15 by air; for Israel, Asia, Australia and Africa, \$10 by first class mail, \$20 by air mail. Single copy, 15 cents. Tel.: LI 4-7087. Entered as Second Class mail matter, Post Office, Washington, D. C.

October 24, 1953



Vol. 1, No. 38

Around The Capitol

Peace

Farther off. Dulles at State Department Tuesday on his return from London had the cat-and-canary look. Churchill is the canary. As Dulles told the New York *Herald-Tribune* Forum that night "there were initial differences" at London but "these quickly fell into the background as we immersed ourselves in constructive efforts." This extends occupational therapy into the domain of diplomacy. There must have been a sour chuckle for Churchill in Dulles's remark in the same speech that our power is now "so large that there is danger that we seem to use it for coercion." Sir Winston, according to Dulles, was not coerced. He was merely given constructive work to do, lest idle thoughts turn again to Malenkov and Moscow.

Moscow

One of the main objectives of Dulles's policy—and Germany's (the two are growing inextinguishable)—is to push Russia back into gloomy Stalinist isolation. The anti-Churchill blast from Moscow, the first in many months, represents a victory for the State Department. The Russians in desperation are wooing France, but France has long lost the habit of initiative in European affairs (as will Britain, if the present trend continues). The State Department is feeding out a line intended even to disparage the fake olive branch of a non-aggression treaty, lest this somehow relax tension and interfere with German rearmament. Dulles is prepared to subordinate all else to the creation of an effective German-American military alliance.

Korea

It will be no loss if Korean peace talks are never held since there is not the faintest chance of an agreement which would satisfy Rhee and his Congressional supporters. To hold a conference under these conditions would merely be to dramatize failure, to exacerbate East-West relations and to make the inevitable Rhee walkout (with ourselves in his wake) a means of heightening world tension and creating a new crisis atmosphere. The meaning of the Dulles line that we will only

discuss broader Asian issues if the Korean conference succeeds is both simple and subtle. This means that the Chinese, who might be ready to bargain Korea against Formosa and a broader settlement, will be asked to relinquish North Korea to Rhee with no assurance on these other issues. In leaving no room for negotiation, we ensure failure in advance.

Israel

The new crisis marked by the suspension of economic aid to Israel is to be read in the light of the familiar Middle Eastern patterns, which have not been changed by Israel's achievement of independence. If concessions have to be made to the Arabs, the Jewish community in the Middle East is the easy expendable. The State Department takes the side of France against the Arabs in Morocco and of Britain against the Arabs on Suez. It must take the Arab side somewhere.

In the old days before independence, the Mandatory power always managed to overlook Arab excesses and bear down hard on Jewish resistance. So it is today. Since the Tripartite Declaration of May, 1950, there have been 866 armed Arab attacks across the border and 421 Israeli killed and injured. All this was regarded with characteristic equanimity but the reprisal raid against Kibya is greeted with horror and Israel is brought before the bar of the UN.

The Jordan water issue is inflated beyond all reason. The Israelis are digging a channel to be used ultimately for the development of hydroelectric power in the Huleh valley. No water has yet been diverted. When it is, the water will flow back again into the Jordan. The river flows through Israeli territory in that area and Israel is prepared to safeguard Arab interests in the operation.

The State Department crowd is irked because it had been working secretly on another TVA plan for the Jordan, Litani and Yarmuk river systems. It wants an international setup under its own aegis in the hope of playing politics with water as a means of appeasing the Arabs. This, too, repeats a pattern familiar under the Mandate. The Arab States are hostile to any water scheme, because it would involve recognition of Israel and cooperation with it. In the meantime, the Israelis have been going ahead on their own—just as the *Yishuv* used to do under the British, who were exasperated in just the same way.

RIP — IWO

The International Workers Order suffered its death blow this week when the Supreme Court refused to hear its appeal from an order of dissolution by the New York State Superintendent of Insurance. A benefit society with 162,000 members and \$6,500,000 in assets, with a margin of safety over statutory requirements of 40.37 percent, was ordered dissolved purely as "a political hazard." The words quoted are those of the Superintendent of Insurance. The case establishes a new high water mark in guilt by association. What if a reform government some day were to revoke the charter of a bank because it did not like the political opinions of the bank's officers?

"EMOTIONAL APPEAL HELD KEY TO SALES"

Said the headline on the financial page last Wednesday. So what I can I do for an emotional appeal? Print a picture of my children barefoot in the snow outside the U.S. Treasury? Those renewals have started coming in—with some of the kindest and most heartening letters any newspaperman ever received—but there are only 12 shopping weeks left before Vol. 1 ends. Those of you who can will save the editor and publisher a lot of headaches and expense by getting your renewal in now. And don't forget you can get a 2-year sub for \$9 or send the *Weekly* as a gift to a friend for another \$4. Use the blank on the reverse side TODAY and many thanks.

—I. F. STONE

JENNINGS PERRY'S PAGE

Both Sides Ought to Persuade POWS to go Home

Life Magazine this week has given us the pictures of twenty American prisoners of war in Korea who have told their captors they do not want to be repatriated. There is nothing unusual in the appearance of these men; a "composite" picture of the twenty would very closely resemble the typical young American male of the shirt ads, the hair slickum ads, the Armed Services recruiting posters with which three wars—and the times between—have made us all familiar. Looking at these faces it is difficult for any American not to echo the puzzled inquiry of the father of one of the prisoners, addressed to him viva voce by a recording arranged by the Veterans of Foreign Wars: "Son, what on earth is the matter with you?"

The VFW recordings have been made and sent to Korea in the hope of conveying to the prisoners, Life tells us, "the enormity of renouncing their own country." Conceivably these messages from the families of the prisoners if permitted to go through will be more effective than the arguments our explanation teams make at Panmunjom. In any case the "reconversion" of any one of these prisoners will be regarded by his countrymen as a happy event, a natural and wholesome thing, and the best possible solution of the strange "reluctant prisoner" problem that has risen from the strange war in Korea.

What is amazing is our evident unwillingness to apply exactly the same reasoning to the situation of the far greater number of prisoners in our own hands who have declared that they do not want to go home. Whether or not as the other side charges we have "invented" obstacles to their effort to convince these prisoners to change their minds and accept repatriation, we certainly have gone to great lengths to protect these prisoners from high pressure arguments from their own countrymen and have been quick to applaud their demonstrations against exposure even to the explanations promised in the truce agreement.

Yet plainly if the renunciation of one's country is an "enormity," it is enormous for others than Americans. The North Koreans who do not want to go back to North Korea,

the Chinese who vociferously demand to be sent to Formosa instead of back to their homes have an attitude which should be as inexplicable and as unfortunate to us, and to their own people, as the attitude of our lad who chooses not to be sent back to Arkansas. And simply by conceding the non-exclusiveness of our own feeling toward our own. We ought to be able to realize that the best possible solution for the whole exchange problem would be for all prisoners, theirs and ours, to decide to go back to the villages, the farms and the families from which they were dragged to war.

The truth is, I am afraid, that we still are trying to eke some sort of token of "victory" out of the tragic struggle in Korea, and that our concern is far more for turning the turn-coating of these recalcitrants in our bag of PWs to propaganda effect than for the fate of the prisoners themselves. Our purpose in this confounds our ordinary concepts of "right" and "wrong." Some of these prisoners deserted to us on the field of battle, surely a crime in a soldier: we rationalize it as a "flight to freedom." We professed a mission of liberation: thus the renunciation of country by men of the other side, which in our own we proclaim an "enormity," must be seen as a virtuous choice.

The acid test of our fellow feeling for these freedom-choosing prisoners would be a proposal that they all be settled not in Syngman Rhee's parlous domain nor in far-away Formosa but on the really-free soil of Australia—or California.

On the completion of the prisoner exchange depends in large degree the success of the peace negotiations. This is the great goal. Whatever would expedite the exchange would favor the peace. Instead of bickering over the competing explanations to the prisoners, and seeking to make propaganda of the PWs' decision to stay or to return, both sides should join in helping the prisoners to choose to go home. What is wrong is not so much what is the matter with the reluctant young men of either side as what is the matter with the rest of us who assure that loyalty to home must and should mean less to the son of one land than to the son of another.

PLEASE RENEW NOW

I. F. Stone's Weekly, 301 E. Capitol, Wash. 3, D. C.

Please renew (or enter) my sub for the enclosed \$5:

Name _____

Street _____

City _____ Zone _____ State _____

Enter this gift sub for \$4 more (money enclosed):

(To) Name _____

Street _____

City _____ Zone _____ State _____

10-24-53

I. F. Stone's Weekly

Room 205

301 E. Capitol St., S.E.

Washington 3, D. C.

Entered as
Second Class Mail
Matter
Washington, D. C.
Post Office

NEWSPAPER

I. F. Stone's Weekly

VOL. I, NUMBER 39

OCTOBER 31, 1953



WASHINGTON, D. C.

15 CENTS

The Hunger Marches Begin Again

Sitting down in that crowded auditorium they looked like any group of middle class Americans in their standardized sack suits, white shirts and four-in-hand ties. But the backs of their necks, red and wrinkled from the constant sun, gave them away, as did the broad-brimmed Stetsons on their laps. The "cattlemen's caravan" from the West and Southwest had arrived.

Camera men swarmed over Jefferson auditorium at the Department of Agriculture, operating even from high red ladders propped up on the stage. The Secretary of Agriculture, Ezra Benson, moved affably about on the floor below them, shaking hands, playing the democratic host. In his rimless spectacles, with his thin nose and rather anemic expression, the Secretary looked like the first vice president of any small town bank, or a well-to-do deacon playing usher at church on Sunday.

Everybody was on their best behavior, and indulged in the polite prevarications called for by the occasion. Assistant Secretary of Agriculture Davis assured the cattlemen they were welcome, and their main spokesman, Dennis Driscoll, assured the Secretary they were not there as a pressure group. They rose to their feet when Benson began to address them, and gave him polite applause at the close, but the only point at which they warmed up was when he said his mind was still open on the question of support prices for livestock. This also turned out to be a fib.

The Republicans had been back in power less than a year. Only a few months had elapsed since the fighting stopped in Korea. But the wheels were already slowing down and here was the first of those hunger marches again. These were not peasants in tatters, nor emaciated men in rags. "We're not a rabble, Mr. Secretary," said their leader, Driscoll, a short stocky cattleman from Colorado Springs, with a stub nose and graying marcelled hair. "I dropped \$100,000 this year on 1,000 head of cattle and I'm still in business. But there are men here who are broke. They have no money to feed their cattle. They're going to lose their foundation herds. They face the liquidation of their life work."

The witnesses from the floor were brief and eloquent. "I've been in the sheep and cattle business all my life and my father before me," said one cattleman from Utah. "As a young man I went broke in 1921 and my wife and I homesteaded in the sage brush. We lost most of what we had again in 1932. We see another depression coming and we want to stop it." There was an alarmed hush from the cattleman and a hopeful ripple of applause from Benson and his aides when one man from Sherman, New Mexico, got up to say, "I don't think my government owes me anything. I'm only asking my just rights under the Constitution." There

was a burst of applause from the cattlemen when it turned out that for him as for the rest of them "just rights under the Constitution" meant support prices for livestock.

One cattleman said, "I defy any man to call me a socialist or anything." These men visualized themselves as rugged individualists—and indeed most of them bore the visible marks of rugged living. But Benson and his aides, behind their composed faces, could not have been blamed if they regarded them as traitors to the cause of free enterprise. The attempt to stabilize the economy, balance the budget, and restore a sound dollar had hardly begun. And here was socialism creeping—perhaps galloping—in again!

Benson did his best. He spoke of "adjustments" and of doing everything "practical and feasible." He spoke of an overproduction of cattle. He made a demagogic reference to "the doctors and lawyers and beauty shop operators" who had "put a few head of cattle in their backyards and sat back to watch their money grow." "There had to be an adjustment," he pleaded. But with these, the men who would be "adjusted" out of business, his plea was a failure, as one could tell from the angry outbursts when they met later with their National Farmers Union sponsors in a dingy American Legion hall at Third and E Streets, N.W.

The old problems were back and the old issues. Cattle, cotton, wheat and corn were in "oversupply" again, and once more poverty was appearing amid plenty. Benson spoke for those who had benefitted by inflation and had the money to weather a "healthy shakedown." His meager relief measures, like Hoover's, are poured in from the top and dribble weakly toward the bottom; the packers are the first beneficiaries of the current beef buying, and a Meat Institute man has been chosen by Benson to "investigate" the spread between beef on the hoof and beef on the table. The clock is turned back two decades, and again the first rumblings of discontent are from the farm country. The difference is that now the idea of government subsidies and government controls are so deep rooted that Benson's position is politically hopeless.

Unless a temporary way out is found by renewed war in Korea, there will be more of these "marches," as farm income falls and industrial employment sags. From the standpoint of capitalist economics, these pyramiding subsidy costs and controls are deadly. But so long as people have the right to vote, it is hard to keep them from voting security for themselves. Each control, as Benson rightly argues, forces another and there is no end in sight short of complete regulation. Thus while we carry on a counter-revolutionary crusade against those "isms" abroad they make themselves felt at home. Men who never heard of Marx move America inescapably toward a socialism of our own.

Will They Override the Referendum They Lost?

The ACLU's Directors Prepare to Jettison Its Principles

The American Civil Liberties Union, which was born in the Red scare after World War I, may become the victim of the Red scare which has followed World War II. Its national board of directors at their regular meeting next Monday (November 2) may split the organization wide open by voting to override the results of a national referendum which has just decisively rejected three policy statements proposed by a majority of the national board.

These statements have the effect of weakening the traditional libertarian principles on which the ACLU was founded and of putting the organization in the position of condoning (1) guilt by association, (2) loyalty purges in the UN, the Federal government, schools and private industry and (3) the discharge and blacklisting of persons who invoke their privilege under the Fifth amendment.

Of the ACLU's 23 national affiliates, one abstained, three small ones supported the Board and the remaining 19 voted to reject the proposed new statements of policy. To override this verdict, the Board may invoke a provision newly added to the by-laws two years ago. This says the Board shall act in accordance with the majority recommendations of the biennial conference, "the preponderant advice" on any question submitted between biennial conferences and "the majority in a referendum." But the provision adds immediately thereafter, "except where it [the Board] believes there are vitally important reasons for not doing so which it shall explain to the corporation members."

A motion to override the referendum lost by one vote at the Board's last meeting on October 19. Since then three members who voted to sustain the referendum have said they wanted to reconsider their vote. A majority to override therefore seems assured but a vote to override will precipitate a battle at the next biennial conference, which is scheduled to convene in New York during the Thanksgiving holiday at the end of next month.

Malin Disturbed by Leak

Every effort has been made to keep the fact and content of the referendum a secret, though the ACLU, as America's oldest and most respected civil libertarian organization is certainly (to borrow a phrase from public utility law) "affected with a public interest." The text of the proposed policy statements and the arguments submitted pro and con in the referendum leaked, however, through the militant Northern California branch of the ACLU, which printed them in its monthly bulletin, published at 503 Market Street in San Francisco.

Patrick Malin, national director of the ACLU, said publication had created "difficulty," explaining that "There would normally be no publicity during a referendum. . . . There would ordinarily be even after a referendum, no release of such complicated and technical material—in any event, not without an attempt at paraphrasing it intelligently for the general reader, and at putting the material in its full context."

There are others within the ACLU and outside it who believe the fullest publicity called for when so important an organization in times as difficult as these is on the verge of compromising the fight for civil liberties. Publicity is especially important where Malin and a majority of the National Board are preparing to override the referendum of their own membership. When a representative of the *Weekly* put some questions about the referendum to the national office, the editor was angrily accused of unethical journalism. The charge is interesting in view of the dubious course on which the national officers and a majority of the national board are preparing to embark.

The three proposed policy statements are extraordinarily vague and verbose, but their ambiguities and concessions flow

out of the statement condemning the American Communist party as obedient to "a despotic foreign power which dominates a world-wide revolutionary movement unprecedentedly threatening the national independence and individual civil liberties of all other countries."

The Familiar Premises of the Witch Hunt

Intellectually this has been well disposed of in one letter of protest published by the Northern California *Civil Liberties Union News* for September which says this portion of the statement "oversimplifies" the world situation "to the point of dangerous idiocy." From this familiar premise of McCarran and McCarthy flows the equally familiar conclusion that Communists are in a special class. The ACLU says it will defend the rights of Communists and says it does not condone "guilt by association" but declares "it is not a violation of civil liberties to take into account a person's voluntary choice of associations when that choice is relevant to a particular judgment . . ."

This leads—through a forest of phrases as tortured as the conscience of the Board—to the proposition that despite invocation of the Fifth amendment or the First, "It is not a violation of civil liberties for authorities legally responsible for employment in certain areas—including government, the United States and education—to ask . . . questions relating to an employee or prospective employee's present, recent or pertinent past membership in, or submission to the discipline of, the Communist party or other totalitarian organizations, and—if he refuses to answer—to take into account that refusal and give it such weight as may be appropriate in the particular circumstances."

This places the imprimatur of the ACLU on the widening loyalty purge, and on punishment for refusal to answer—not questions about possible crime—but questions about past or present associations with a political party still legal in this country. Note that the wording does not deal merely with membership but with "submission to the discipline of" the Communist party, a much looser matter, open to just the kind of abuse visible in the Lattimore case.

Broad Enough for McCarran and McCarthy

So much for employment purges. What of the Congressional witch hunt? The proposed statement says weakly, "questions concerning Communist or other totalitarian associations which are not illegal should, in the case of a legislative committee, generally be limited to the purpose of possible legislation within its purview." The italics are ours. This is broad enough to cover the needs of McCarran and McCarthy.

A letter of protest published by the Northern California branch well says of these proposed statements, "The threat of the American Communist is defined as being of such proportions that a bet on democracy in open competition would be a poor one." This is a strange position for a civil libertarian organization. The rationale was well summarized and rebutted by Mr. Justice Black in his dissent in the *Dennis* case. Of the court's decision to abandon the clear and present danger rule, Mr. Justice Black said, "the chief reason for jettisoning the rule is the expressed fear that advocacy of Communist doctrine endangers the safety of the Republic. Undoubtedly, a governmental policy of unfettered communication of ideas does entail dangers. To the Founders of this nation, however, the benefits derived from free expression were worth the risk."

This is the faith the ACLU is abandoning in its search for respectability. Instead of fighting the spreading witch hunt and the widening loyalty purge, it accepts and excuses them. Unless the membership acts strongly, the watchdog of civil liberty may nestle down as the lapdog of its enemies.

I. F. Stone's Weekly

• Editor and Publisher, I. F. STONE

Published weekly except the last two weeks of August at Room 205, 301 E. Capitol St., S.E., Washington 3, D. C. Subscription rates: Domestic, \$5 a year; Canada, Mexico and elsewhere in the Western Hemisphere, \$6; England and Continental Europe, \$10 by 1st class mail, \$15 by air; for Israel, Asia, Australia and Africa, \$10 by first class mail, \$20 by air mail. Single copy, 15 cents. Tel.: LI 4-7087. Entered as Second Class mail matter, Post Office, Washington, D. C.

October 31, 1953



Vol. 1, No. 39

From Around the Capitol

THE VOTE WE WOULD HAVE CAST: Were we a resident of New York, we would cast our vote next Tuesday for Clifford T. McAvoy, and his colleagues of the American Labor Party ticket, to help keep alive one radical party in New York and to show our respect for McAvoy, an able public servant in the La Guardia Administration and a courageous defender of civil liberties in these cowardly times.

PEACE POINTER: The oil industry, a world state-within-a-state, with better sources of information than many governments, seems to expect world tension to die down. The Petroleum Administration for War, set up after the Korean fighting began, is to be liquidated. The National Petroleum Council has been summoned to meet here December 3, a month ahead of schedule, to pass on a subcommittee report recommending a successor agency. This is expected to be nothing more warlike than the old Gas and Oil Division of the Department of the Interior, which the PAD absorbed.

THOSE GERMAN CURRENCY PLATES STOLEN FOR THE RUSSIANS: The witch hunt *whodunit* about how a spy ring in the U.S. Treasury during the war stole the allied military occupation currency plates for the Russians was rehashed for the umpteenth time before the Jenner committee last week by Elizabeth Bentley. But last Sunday the conservative and respected Washington *Star* ran a story almost two columns long citing "competent and informed sources . . . American officials close to the original decision on the German marks deal" as saying "Red Army in Europe, Not Spies, Got Military Currency Plates." The story told by the *Star*: The decision to print occupation currency for Germany was taken early in the war by British, American and Russian military fiscal authorities. It was first suggested that the money be printed at one central place and shipped to the three powers in accordance with allocations. The Russians rejected this. They said it would be simple to distribute this money to the British and Americans "who were fighting behind a single line" but might be difficult if not impossible to get it to the Russians. They threatened to develop their own occupation currency unless furnished plates with which to print their supply of the occupation marks.

ADD PRIVATE ENTERPRISE: Last spring the owner of a New York building maintenance concern made a splash by telling a Congressional subcommittee private business could clean government buildings twice as often for one-fourth less than the government's own GSA cleaning staff. GSA was hauled on the carpet and agreed as an experiment to invite bids from private contractors on one of Washington's biggest buildings, South Agriculture. James A. Campbell, president of AFL American Federation of Government Employes, discloses that when bids were opened recently, the low bid came from the firm whose head had testified last spring. But his bid was more than 40 percent higher than the present cost of GSA operation, while other bids ran as high as \$1,208,079 a month as compared with the GSA cost of \$321,152 for the year.

MOTE IN OUR OWN EYE DEPT: "In contrast to the Soviet system of criminal justice, Attorney General Brownell told the New York Herald-Tribune Forum last week, "our system sets up elaborate safeguards to protect the innocent who have been charged with crime." He specified, among others, the right to know the nature and cause of any accusation and to confront accusing witnesses. Three days later the White House announced that 1,456 government employes had been discharged since May 27th under the Eisenhower Security Order which Brownell helped to frame. This, like Truman's Loyalty Order, permits Americans to be branded as untrustworthy for the rest of their lives often without being told the exact nature of the accusation against them and without a chance to confront their accusers. The standard of reasonable doubt is abandoned. Where derogatory information turns up against any employe, the head of the department or agency must determine "whether retention of such person is clearly consistent with the interests of the national security." This means that where there is any doubt, the doubt is resolved against the accused.

GRATEFUL FOR SMALL MERCIES DEPT.: Robert Morris, chief counsel of the Jenner committee, has been having his troubles with New York City bar associations as candidate for Municipal Court Justice in the Ninth Manhattan District. Morris declined to furnish information to the judiciary committee of the New York City Chapter of the National Lawyers Guild on the ground of "unpleasant experiences with two other bar associations' judiciary committees." Experience as counsel to the McCarran and Jenner committees is not the best exercise for developing a judicial temperament, but those lawyers who deal with all three witch hunt committees—Jenner, Velde and McCarthy's—have been so enraged by the arrogance of McCarthy's Roy Cohn that they have come to take an almost idyllic view of Morris. Morris is said by contrast to be gentlemanly and ready to show the victims and their counsel at least elementary courtesies on their way to the pillory.

HARVEY O'CONNOR: Pleading not guilty to contempt before Judge Holtzoff in Federal district court here October 23, released in \$1,000 bail, his First amendment plea set down for trial January 11.

DON'T RUE IT — DO IT

Last week we received a subscription from a former reader of *PM* and *Compass* in a Western State. He said that in going over his papers he had just come across a letter I sent out last November asking subscriptions for a proposed weekly. "Now if your address is still the same," he wrote, "and that weekly is being published, here's my sub with apologies. I meant to subscribe then but somehow . . ." If others had acted like our friend in the West, there would have been no *Weekly*. There will continue to be a *Weekly* only if you—yes, you—renew now while you think of it. Use the blank on the reverse side TODAY, and remember you can get an extra year or a sub as a Xmas gift for a friend for \$4 extra. Let our friend in the West be a lesson to you. So we say—*don't rue it, do it*. And do it today.

With many thanks, I. F. STONE

JENNINGS PERRY'S PAGE

Alabama Casts Her Coast for the Commonwealth

All of us, I think, must now root for Alabama, the first state to reach the Supreme Court with a flat challenge of the 1953 submerged lands act. Arkansas has been in the running, but Arkansas is, after all, the second state alphabetically; besides, it is easier for Alabama, with the crime on, as it were, her very front porch, to show hurt.

Arkansas has a shore on the Mississippi River, a navigable stream, and can argue reasonably that the Gulf of Mexico must belong to all of the people also, as a mere extension of the river. Alabama, however, has an 80 mile front on the sea itself. The new law, confirming the "historical rights" of Florida, Louisiana and Texas to the waters out to ten miles from the lengthy coasts, of these states, hems her in.

We need not speculate on what might have been Alabama's attitude had her seashore stretched for hundreds of miles—as surely might have been the case had those brave Spanish captains Panfilio de Navaraz and Hernando de Soto settled Mobile Bay instead of leaving it to the French. What is important, whether or not a historical accident lies at back of the emergence of this champion against the famous historical rights, is that the fight to test the legality of the Eisenhower Administration's great give-away of offshore oil is so promisingly launched. Within six weeks, by order of the Court, the government as well as the states favored by the act must show cause why they should not be sued for improper alienation of property and for trespass.

The Alabama petition maintains the state's claim, as one of the 48 states, to a share of the \$62,000,000 in impounded oil funds held by the government, and seeks further to enjoin the states holding offshore sovereignty under the act from demanding licenses of or otherwise interfering with Alabama fishermen. The relief thus sought, if granted, would re-establish freedom of the seas in the Gulf and do much to ease conflicts and tensions among states, and not only among states but between nations, resulting in that area from passage of the submerged lands act.

These troubles probably had not been foreseen by those who

bulldozed the act through Congress this spring as the first important—as almost the only important piece of legislation completed by the new administration. While Sparkman and Kefauver protested, and Wayne Morse filibustered, the rest of the nation rather phlegmatically assumed that the Republicans "owed" the debt to the oil interests which had helped their party break the Solid South and had to pay it, and that would be the end of the business. The oil fleets rushed out with their depth charges to prospect their new domain.

It was then that the interests of the oil industry in the Gulf collided with the interests of an industry that was old and adventurous when oil was an unsuspected treasure in the bowels of the earth. The fishermen out of Mobile, out of all the ports on the vast curving coast from Brownsville, Texas to Key West, began to encounter new difficulties in the waters they always had used at will—particularly the shrimpers, whose annual catch makes up in value and quantity by far the largest part of the seafood harvest.

What had the fishermen to do with state lines? Outside the traditional three mile limit they had hunted without let, casting their nets where seemed to them good. The idea of state conservation patrols in the open sea hit them hard. True, on the shores of Yucatan, where the richest hauls of the great pink shrimp are taken, they had sometimes had brushes with the Mexican authorities; but their own government always had been able to back them up. Outside the three-mile limit it was anybody's ocean. . .

Now their own government can do little for them. By the submerged lands act it has tied its own hands: for the ten mile limit asserted by Mexico is based on precisely the same historical rights—the old Spanish claims—recognized by Congress this spring to California, Texas, Louisiana and Florida. And Mexico's claim is older and of firmer descent than theirs.

Under the circumstances the situation in the Gulf has been slipping fast, and it is pleasant to suppose that the plea of Alabama, once the capitol of the Confederacy, may yet save both the honor and the commonwealth of the Union.

PLEASE RENEW NOW

I. F. Stone's Weekly, 301 E. Capitol, Wash. 3, D. C.

Please renew (or enter) my sub for the enclosed \$5:

Name _____

Street _____

City _____ Zone _____ State _____

Enter this gift sub for \$4 more (money enclosed):

(To) Name _____

Street _____

City _____ Zone _____ State _____

10-31-53

I. F. Stone's Weekly

Room 205

301 E. Capitol St., S.E.

Washington 3, D. C.

NEWSPAPER

Entered as
Second Class Mail
Matter
Washington, D. C.
Post Office

I. F. Stone's Weekly

VOL. I, NUMBER 40

NOVEMBER 7, 1953



WASHINGTON, D. C.

15 CENTS

A Report on An Atrocity Report

Washington

The atrocity report issued by the Pentagon last week broke down its statistics into three classes: "reported," "probable" and "known victims." "Reported," it explains, "represents the maximum figure possible, or the total number actually reported in each case, *irrespective of the merits of the evidence contained therein.*" (Italics added.) "Probable," the next category, "represents an approximate true count of atrocity victims, since the figures under this heading show the number which, in the opinion of the legal officer who examined the file, are justified by the available proof and the general tenor of the report." Finally, "bodies recovered" and "survivors" are self-explanatory terms, and definitely reflect known victims." The grand total is given as 57,559 "reported," 29,815 "probable," 10,032 "bodies" and 533 "survivors."

This is an unusual system of classification. It means that of 57,000 reported atrocities, the War Crimes Division of the Army regards almost half as improbable. It means that the Army's own investigators, after studying these reports, do not believe these atrocities ever happened. Why, then, include them in the grand totals, knowing that they may only inflate the headlines and exaggerate the toll?

The next category is also vague. This is not called "proven" but "probable." This "represents an approximate true count of atrocity victims" based on the judgment of the officer examining the file. The figure of 29,815 is only an estimate of probability. This is a loose method of estimating crime, and again encourages inflation in the headlines and a false impression in the reader's mind. For few newspaper readers will be aware of these classifications or their significance.

Dubious Confessions

What was the principal source of information on these atrocities? The report says "the bulk" of them were based on confessions by enemy prisoners in our hands. How is a prisoner prevailed upon to confess a crime against United Nations personnel for which he may suffer severe punishment, indeed death itself? Obviously such confessions will not be made voluntarily. A prisoner is not going to open up under interrogation and say, "Oh, by the way, I murdered several of your chaps recently." It would be interesting to know in how many cases the confessions were obtained by mistreatment or torture, as we claim (and quite correctly I believe) that the enemy elicited germ warfare "confessions" from some of our captured personnel. Confessions under torture may be entirely false.

The report itself reflects distrust of these atrocity confessions. It says, "Since the bulk of the cases opened were based initially upon the confession of a prisoner, it was essential

that every effort be made to discover corroborating evidence to establish the fact that the incident had actually occurred, i.e., the *corpus delicti.*"

The report says that during March, 1952, the atrocity cases were screened and placed in two categories: "those in which there was definite evidence of *corpus delicti*, or where a confessed perpetrator or eye-witness had, outside of the PW compound, verified his statement, and pointed out the location on the ground, and those others based solely on confessions or statements of a PW, without verifications." No figures are given on these two categories. It would be good to know how these figures broke down, why the Army was so distrustful of these confessions, and how they were obtained.

Wine and Rice for the Doomed

It is on such a confession that one of the biggest atrocity stories of the Korean war is based. Readers may remember that when Colonel James M. Hanley, Judge Advocate of the 8th Army, gave out his famous atrocity statement in Pusan on November 13, 1951, he said "Incidents involving the killing of from 1 to 1250 UN war prisoners at a time are recorded in the UNC files. The killing of 1250 involved Americans killed near the Yalu river in North Korea by North Koreans between the 16th and 18th of September 1950. The prisoners were transported from a prison camp near Pyongyang and shot in groups after being fed rice and wine according to the report of the incident." The wine and rice incident seemed a strange detail.

Now the same story turns up in this new report as "KWC #279, Slaughter of 1250 American Prisoners." The report says these prisoners "were slaughtered in cold blood by their Communist captors if the confession of a North Korean prisoner is true. Unfortunately, that is all the evidence contained in the file."

Incredible things happen in war, but it is hard to believe that mass murder could have been carried out on such a scale without finding at least one other witness or some corroborating detail among the tens of thousands of North Korean prisoners in UN hands. The report can only conclude, "Every effort should be expended to discover corroborating evidence for this reported atrocity." This one story accounts for 1250, or 20 percent, of the Army's estimate that a total of 6,113 American soldiers were "probably" the victims of atrocities.

Why Weren't the Criminals Held?

There is another sidelight on these confessions. A prisoner who confesses to the torture or murder of soldiers he has

Few Atrocities Since the Early Days of The War . . .

himself taken prisoner is subject to punishment under the rules of war. He may be tried and convicted by the detaining power. The Army seems to have made no effort to prosecute, punish or even retain these self-confessed criminals. Its press officers now blame the release on the repatriation agreement. But the atrocity report itself says, "Three primary causes have resulted in the release from restriction or confinement of individuals implicated in war crimes. They are: closure of cases, Operation 'Little Switch,' and the mass breakouts of June, 1953." One would have thought the Army would at least have segregated the self-confessed perpetrators of such horrible crimes and kept them under special guard.

The report says that on June 30, 1953, War Crimes Division Files "contained 1615 alleged atrocity cases." As against this total, the report itself gives details on only 34. They are divided into two classes, "referable" cases, ready for trial, of which there are said to be 34 altogether, and "non-referable" cases "in which there is sufficient evidence to prove that the crime has been committed, but which have not been referred, primarily because no perpetrators are in custody." The total number of non-referable cases is not given.

One assumes that the 34 cases on which details are given in the report are among the best in the Army's files. They are interesting for several reasons. The most important is that only one of these 34 cases is alleged to have been committed by Chinese and only one is alleged to have occurred since January, 1951, almost three years ago.

Trying Hard to Prove a Point

The written summary of the one atrocity cited since January, 1951, begins, "Proving that the Communists still persist in committing atrocities, this recent case occurred on 21 September 1952." The date, more than a year ago, is not so "recent" at that. But the significant point is that the writer of the atrocity report felt under compulsion to prove "that the Communists still persist in committing atrocities." The fact is that two graphs in the appendix show that there have been very few atrocities in the past two years. Exhibit H shows no "referable" case since the early part of 1951. Exhibit C, "Monthly Totals of Atrocity Cases Classified According to Perpetrator," which covers all "reported" cases shows no Chinese atrocities reported since July, 1951, and only three small North Korean cases reported since that time, the last being the one mentioned above.

This latest atrocity of September, 1952, as cited by the

Even Sober Newspapers

"This report of grisly horror and calculated bestiality, of savage torture and cold-blooded massacre. . ."

—*New York Times, October 30*

"To find an analogy to the atrocities perpetrated by the Communists in Korea one must go back to the sufferings of the European Jews at the hands of the Nazis. . ."

—*Washington Post, October 31*

report may be an atrocity or judging by the summary it may be the case of a terrible hand-to-hand fight. "An American forward observer team," the summary says, "and a squad of South Koreans occupied Hill 854 near Samchi-yong. Their position was overrun by the enemy, but was recovered the following day in a counter-attack. The bodies of two U.S. soldiers, horribly mutilated, together with those of several South Koreans were discovered by a friendly patrol."

Confusion Well Confounded

Presumably the "referable" cases, set down "as being ready for trial" would be the best documented. But even among these the summaries reflect far from satisfactory proof. An example widely cited in the news stories is KWC #67, the Naedae Murders. The summary fails to tell when this happened and ends on a confusing note. "Photographs," it begins, "clearly reveal that the six American soldiers detained as prisoners in a Korean house near Naedae were shot in cold blood and probably bayoneted. Ironically, this slaughter took place in front of a Communist propaganda bulletin board. However there were five survivors, wounded in the massacre, who escaped by feigning death. In addition a captive North Korean sergeant has admitted participation in the murders. Close examination of the evidence leaves some doubt as to whether this case was properly referred, since there seems to be discrepancies between the confession and the survivors' statements."

The report gives ten other "referable" cases involving alleged atrocities against Americans. But one, KWC #125, is a case where two American soldiers were killed "in combat with North Korean soldiers" after a South Korean civilian

Other Testimony From Three Korean War Correspondents

"One of the 'Eight Rules of Conduct' laid down by Peking provides for the good treatment of captives. It is the Communist theory that this contributes to victory. . . . The Chinese were certainly far more correct than were the North Koreans. This is not surprising, as both North and South Koreans are notorious for their cruelty."

—*Marguerite Higgins: War in Korea*

"This period (December, 1950) was probably worst for the Americans, for there was in that army a very considerable fraction of young soldiers fed on the ideological spirit of the war. They had to think of the Chinese Communists as brutal tyrants and that the Southern Republic stood for freedom: as the tales of mild and correct behavior to prisoners and population by the Chinese began to filter through and revelations of the Republic's festering corrup-

tion piled up, these young men were left without ballast."

—*Rene Cutforth (BBC Correspondent in Korea): Korean Reporter (London, 1952)*

"Few attempts were made to explain to the American soldier why he was fighting. Publications similar to those of the British Army bureau of current affairs were naive in the extreme. The national hatred and fear of Communism was sufficient in most cases to inflame him with a rather indiscriminate belligerence which showed itself in an ugly way, especially in the treatment of prisoners of war, who had to suffer the indignity of being stripped naked. It failed, however, to bring about any kind of sympathy for South Koreans. . . ."

Louis Heren (correspondent of the London Times in Korea): Brassey's Annual, The (British) Armed Forces Year-Book, 1951.

... The Real Atrocity is The Spread of Poison Against Peace

had disclosed their hiding place to the enemy. "It is doubtful," the summary ends lamely, "that this case should be considered an atrocity, but appears at best to be a case of collaboration with the enemy." Three other "referable" cases involve the killing of wounded American prisoners by civilians.

Among the eight "referable" cases involving Koreans, one casts a grisly light on the reality of confessions. KWC #29 says, "Two North Korean officer prisoners have confessed to killing as many as 2000 'anti-Communists,' but check with natives indicate that approximately 80 were slain. Two survivors state that 16 were in the group with them, and that death in each case was by beating at the hands of a mob."

The Army Waxes Funny

There are evidences of cheerful humor on the Army's part in KWC #102. The summary says, "Obligingly cooperative, one North Korean prisoner stated that he was a member of the Education and Cultural Section in the village of Kwangju, and that in this capacity, together with two accomplices, on 16 September 1950, he took ten anti-Communist prisoners about eight kilometers in the country and there executed them. He adds that he used a carbine and did not bury the bodies. He desired to point out the sites, so accom-

Purpose

"The United States . . . is launching a counter attack on those who want to do business with Communist China. . . . Documented facts on Communist atrocities are likely to get wide scrutiny. Winning friends away from the U. S. and 'shooting its way into the United Nations' may become a harder job for Communist China."

—U. S. News & World Report, November 6

panied by a war crimes investigator and a Korean detective from Kwangju, he directed them to the spot. Three badly decomposed bodies were found, and the suspect insisted that these were three of the ten victims he had helped murder. The case was probably submitted to accommodate the confessor." (Italics added.)

Another puzzler among these Korean "referable" cases is KWC #180. A junior lieutenant in the North Korean political police is alleged to have taken six political prisoners out of jail at Naju on September 28, 1950 "and as usual, without trial, shot and bayoneted them." The hands of the victims were tied behind them. "They were shot and the bayonet used for the 'coup de grace'." The lieutenant confessed. The puzzling part about this case is that the summary says, "Despite this treatment, five persons [of the six] survived, although one died shortly thereafter. All identify the confessor as the perpetrator."

The atrocity report is almost apologetic about the absence of material on the Chinese. "The predominance of North Korean incidents," it says, "is attributable to the fact that the bulk of those recorded occurred prior to the official (sic) entry of the Chinese into the war. Since October, 1950, however, the Chinese have been fully as active as the North Koreans." Though the Chinese may well have been "fully as active," the report only gives one case—a "nonreferable" one—of an atrocity alleged against the Chinese. A lieutenant survivor of a patrol ambushed on November 8, 1950, alleged that the Chinese set the wounded afire and bayoneted them. Corroboration is claimed by a medical officer who examined the bodies when they were later recovered.

The Report's Striking Omission

This paucity of cases alleging Chinese atrocities makes striking the omission from this report of the biggest shocker in Hanley's atrocity report two years ago. "The largest number of Americans known to have been killed by the Chinese," Colonel Hanley reported, "was a group of 200 U.S. Marines killed on December 10, 1950, near Sinhung on orders of the regimental commander of the 23rd Regiment of the 81st Division of the CCF [Chinese Communist Forces]."

No mention of this alleged crime is made in the new report. When the writer asked the Pentagon press office why it was omitted, he was given various answers, among them (1) that the new report was only an "excerpt" and did not cover all cases, (2) that the War Crimes Division did not have that case yet (3) that this case was KWC #661, and included in the reported totals but that the actual file had not yet been forwarded from Korea, (4) that Korea has "a great many more cases" and (5) that while these other cases are covered in the report totals, physical possession of them is still held in Korea. A phonograph record of these replies would be a treasure.

Two years ago, when this same Marine atrocity made the headlines, this writer was told at Marine Corps HQ that it had no record of any such atrocity and did not believe it had occurred. Last week, when the writer went from the Pentagon to Marine HQ on the same story, a query elicited the unusual response of a written statement, with permission to quote and attribute. "This HQ," said the Marine Corps statement, "was never able to confirm the news report published in 1951 to the effect that 200 American Marines were victims of atrocities 10 December 1950 by members of the Chinese Communist Forces. At that time the total number of Marines missing in action was less than 200. Since the Armistice 39 Marines have been repatriated who were captured prior to 10 December 1950 thereby decreasing the number who could have been killed on that date. There has been no information received from returned prisoners," the official U.S. Marine statement continued, "which would corroborate this story. This story is based on the statement of one captured Chinese soldier." (Continued on Page 4)

ONLY THIRTY COPIES

Of the atrocity report were made available to the press last week by the Pentagon. Most newspapermen had to depend on the wire service summaries. At the UN the American delegation made public only a three paragraph memorandum. The distortions in such cursory coverage led us to devote the bulk of this week's issue to a full study of the report. In this I believe the Weekly again performs a public service no other publication has rendered. Extra copies are available on request. But don't forget we need your renewal—or new subscription—NOW to stay alive and continue the fight. The rate is still only \$5 a year and you can get a two year sub or give a gift sub to a friend for only \$4 extra by using the coupon on page four TODAY.

With many thanks, I. F. Stone.

Using Atrocities to Plug for A Bigger Arms Budget

What the Report Really Shows

What this report really shows is that after the terrible brutality which marked the Korean civil conflict on both sides in the early months of the war, conditions improved from the time the Chinese intervened in the fighting. There is back-handed admission of this in the lush double-talk of the report itself. It divides atrocities into "acts of commission and acts of omission" and then says, "The former, the acts of brutality such as wilful murder, attempted murder, mutilation, and various forms of torture, have greatly declined from the shocking rate prevalent in the early stages of the war."

"However," the report continues, "as the war progressed and more men fell into the hands of the enemy, coupled with his limited ability to provide sufficient food, proper medical care, necessary clothing and shelter resulted in appalling death rates in the various camps and collecting points." It said that on the marches to prison camps "most deaths resulted from non-treatment of combat wounds aggravated by lack of water, food and clothing." It was "in this initial stage of capture," the report admits, "where most acts of violence were perpetrated against the prisoners." Other deaths resulted from "malnutrition and dysentery" on the way to the final camps. These are not atrocities in the real meaning of the term, or as understood by the public.

The report goes on to say, "The Chinese, soon after the beginning of the truce talks in July, 1951, realizing the propaganda value of prisoners, commenced a 'program of leniency' which resulted in slightly better treatment of captured personnel." It continues, "Medical care, still woefully lacking, was augmented with some of the newer drugs to combat disease and infections. The quantity of food, still pitifully low, was raised to a more life-sustaining level."

For a report which begins by equating the Chinese Communists with the Nazis, these are considerable admissions. They admit that real atrocities fell off after the early months of the war, that mistreatment of prisoners occurred on the marches to the camps rather than in them, and that the Chinese two and a half years ago began to improve the treatment of the wounded and the feeding of prisoners.

The Real Atrocity

The real atrocity is this report itself. The Korean war has been unusually horrible. Both North and South Koreans have acted with shocking brutality. Our own treatment of

Weird Statistics

Earlier atrocity reports including Colonel Hanley's as Judge Advocate of the Eighth Army may be found analyzed in I. F. Stone's *Hidden History of the Korean War*. This is how the figures now stack up:

1. General Ridgway's report to the UN dated November 12, 1951, said "As of July 20, 1951, approximately 8,000 United States military personnel have been reported killed as war crimes victims. Of this number, approximately 7,000 were reported killed by North Koreans and the remainder by Chinese Communists."

2. Colonel Hanley's report as head of the war crimes division in Pusan next day, November 13, 1951, said Chinese Communists had killed 2,513 American prisoners of war. Hanley gave the total number killed in atrocities as 5,500. Hanley's total was 2,500 less than Ridgway's, but his total of those killed by the Chinese was 1,500 greater.

3. Colonel Hanley in a follow up statement from Pusan three days later, November 16, 1951, raised the total to 6,270.

4. General Ridgway in a statement from Tokyo four days later, November 20, 1951, said "possibly" 6,000 Americans had been killed in war atrocities but placed the number of those "definitely known" as victims at 365.

5. Now, as of June 30, 1953, the Korea War Crimes Division places the number of "probable" victims at 6,113 and attributes 2,178 of these to the Chinese. No "definitely known" figure is given.

prisoners has been far from exemplary. The report can serve no purpose other than to inflame public opinion. The report is a sloppy and mendacious job, typical of the stuff the military has poured out in this war in its constant effort to control and poison the American mind.

The final touch was the statement with which Secretary of the Army Stevens accompanied the release. "This report," Stevens said, "describing the cold-blooded program of torture and murder carried on by the Communist enemy in Korea, is one of the best answers that can be given to anyone who questions the need of strong military defenses for our country and the free world." So the atrocity story ended with a plug for a bigger military budget.

Don't Rue It, Do It.

PLEASE RENEW NOW

I. F. Stone's Weekly, 301 E. Capitol, Wash. 3, D. C.

Please renew (or enter) my sub for the enclosed \$5:

Name _____

Street _____

City _____ Zone _____ State _____

Enter this gift sub for \$4 more (money enclosed):

(To) Name _____

Street _____

City _____ Zone _____ State _____

11-7-58

I. F. Stone's Weekly

Room 205

301 E. Capitol St., S.E.

Washington 3, D. C.

Entered as
Second Class Mail
Matter
Washington, D. C.
Post Office

NEWSPAPER

I. F. Stone's Weekly

VOL. I, NUMBER 41

NOVEMBER 14, 1958



WASHINGTON, D. C.

15 CENTS

Desperate Men and Ghoulish Politics

The fury of the press with the President Wednesday reflected not only a sense of elementary fairness but the frustration which developed Monday when a major portion of the press corps camped all day outside the Attorney General's office. New revelations had been promised in the White case. But all day the Attorney General could not make up his mind whether to see the press. Brownell finally ducked out of the building late in the afternoon after sending to the mimeograph room a quite inadequate statement which not only added nothing to the charges against the late Harry Dexter White but backed down on Brownell's charges against former President Truman.

Brownell had told the Executives' Club luncheon in Chicago "I can now announce . . . that the records in my Department show that White's spying activities for the Soviet government were reported in detail by the FBI to the White House by means of a report delivered to President Truman through his military aide." This says that the records show the report was delivered to Truman. But there was a different version in the skimpy statement Brownell issued Monday after taking a run-out powder rather than face the press. Now Brownell merely said that the FBI transmitted the report "to Brigadier General Harry H. Vaughan . . . for the attention of the President."

There was a second discrepancy. In Chicago Brownell said the December report gave White's spying activities "in detail." These were the details for which the press corps waited. But on Monday the Attorney General spoke of the December document as "a general report on the subject of Soviet espionage activity in the United States." The document to which he referred was printed in the report of the Jenner committee last August. Here White was mentioned in passing among many others named by Elizabeth Bentley. It is presumably because the December report merely mentioned White that the FBI felt it necessary two months later in February to compile that "special and detailed report" to which Brownell also referred in Chicago. "As you know," Brownell said, "the FBI was not allowed to make those facts public, but merely to present its findings confidentially to higher authorities." The press waited all day in vain for him to "allow" the FBI this time to make public the facts on which its charges were based.

Brownell's Biggest Misstatement

The most shocking misstatement made by the Attorney General at Chicago was that, "White died without the prior Administration ever having acted on the FBI report." While the reporters were waiting outside Brownell's door, the

Washington Star appeared on the streets with a story which gave the lie to Brownell. T. Vincent Quinn, District Attorney of Queens County, New York, told the *Star* by telephone that he and Thomas J. Donaghan of the Justice Department presented the Bentley charges and "everything we had" to a special grand jury in 1947 but that the evidence was insufficient to indict.

The next day the *Newark Evening News* disclosed that no less than 500 FBI agents worked for a year after hearing the Bentley charges. "Every effort," the *Newark Evening News* reported, "was made to put Miss Bentley back into her espionage contacts. No move was made all year by the FBI against White or any other suspect . . . the agency did not want to arouse the suspicions of persons on whom it was checking. However, by January, 1947, the official said, the FBI concluded it couldn't reestablish Miss Bentley's contacts and gave up the operation."

Donaghan, the FBI man, who worked with Quinn that year in presenting the case to the grand jury, is now special assistant to Brownell in charge of international security. How can Brownell say that the Truman Administration was given "full and adequate notice of White's spying activities" early in 1946 when even a year later, after 500 FBI men had worked on the case, the evidence was neither "full" nor "adequate" enough for an indictment.

Evidence or Suspicion?

The failure to obtain an indictment throws a singular light on the FBI statement upon which Brownell relies. "This information," the FBI said in the February, 1946, report, "has been received from numerous confidential sources whose reliability has been established either by inquiry or long established observation and evaluation." If the sources were so "numerous" and so "reliable" it is strange indeed that Quinn, in telling the *Star* about the grand jury proceedings, should say, "We can't indict on suspicion." If the prosecutor characterizes this evidence as mere "suspicion," can it have been as good as the FBI's "numerous" and "reliable" implies?

The man who ought to be subpoenaed in this case is J. Edgar Hoover. There is reason to believe that White was under surveillance long before Miss Bentley told her story. Brownell said in Chicago, "The FBI became aware of White's espionage activities at an early point in his government career and from the beginning made reports on these activities to the appropriate officials in authority." White entered the government in 1934. When did these reports begin and what did they allege? Why did none of the Attorneys General—

(Continued on Page Four)

Report From the Grass Roots: That Witch Hunt in Philadelphia's Schools

Robert L. Kunzig, who made his debut in Washington this year as counsel to the House Un-American Activities Committee, is a tall stoutish young man with the manner of a Restoration dandy; in his moments of exasperation with a recalcitrant witness or an obtuse committee member, he seems almost on the verge of reaching into a flowery waistcoat for the comforts of a snuff box. He is a Philadelphia lawyer (Clark, Ladner, Fortenbaugh & Young) and takes the House committee back to his native city Monday (November 16) for three days of hearings. These deserve national attention. They will show how a Congressional investigating committee may be used to nullify State legislation designed to protect State employes and teachers in the witch hunt.

Politically, the hearings will be a curtain-raiser for the 1954 elections in once safely Republican Pennsylvania, a try-out on the local scene of the new G.O.P. strategy of staking all on the Communist issue. Though these three days of televised hearings will deal with alleged "subversion" in the schools, they will have a wider impact. Their outcome will affect the political future of Philadelphia's two political hopefuls, municipal reform Democrats reaching out for bigger conquests, District Attorney Richard Dilworth who hopes to run for Governor next year and Mayor Joseph Sill Clark, who may some day be a possibility for the Presidential nomination.

A Return Engagement

For Dilworth and Clark, this is a return engagement. As Deputy Attorney General of Pennsylvania during 1951-52, Kunzig led the fight at the State Capitol for the Pechan loyalty bill, lobbying for it on the floor of the Legislature. Clark and Dilworth, both associated with Americans for Democratic Action and the American Civil Liberties Union, campaigned against the bill. In Philadelphia, with a strong Quaker tradition, the opposition rallied both local papers, the *Bulletin* and the *Inquirer*, and many conservatives, including former Supreme Court Justice Owen J. Roberts. The result was a defeat for Kunzig, the adoption of certain model protective amendments which deserve to be copied elsewhere. Kunzig hopes to succeed in doing via Committee hearings what he would be unable to do under the State law as passed.

The Pechan Act forbids the employment in government and in the schools of "disloyal" persons and provides for their discharge. But in its final form looser standards of the subversive list variety were omitted and "disloyalty" or "subversion" linked directly to advocacy of change by force and violence.

The Act provides that the appointing authority "may" act to discharge an employe, including teachers, but this must be "upon written complaint." If there appears to be substance to the complaint "the person [accused] shall immediately be privately and confidentially notified." The Act goes on to say that there shall be "No public announcement, release, statement or comment concerning the investigation . . . unless and until the person is discharged." The accused has the right to counsel and to a hearing within 30 days, and the option of having the hearing in public or private.

Safeguards Against The Anonymous Accuser

The original bill would have allowed the source and content of accusations to be withheld from the accused on security grounds, as in Federal loyalty hearings. "The charges," the original bill said, "shall be stated as specifically and completely as in the discretion of the appointing authority security considerations permit." This was stricken out. A complementary section on procedure in loyalty hearings said "Evidence shall not be restricted by the rules of evidence and procedure prevailing in the Courts." The "not" was taken out and new provisions added. One provided that all testimony had to be given under oath or affirmation, thus excluding anonymous accusation and guaranteeing the right

to confront the accuser. Another accorded the defense the right to reasonable cross-examination and to subpoena witnesses and records on its own behalf.

For these precise standards and modes of procedure, Kunzig will be able to substitute methods the State Legislature rejected. A former FBI man, Earl Fuoss, has been working undercover, and an advance leak has already provided eight column headlines. It would appear that House investigators have found evidence that "at least 20 to 30" Philadelphia school system "were or are" members of the Communist party. Since Philadelphia has about 7,500 school teachers, that would seem less than stupendous. If true, it would mean that one-third of one percent of Philadelphia's teachers "were or are" Communists. This drop of radicalism in the school system is unlikely to do as much harm as the Committee.

The Board of Education Panics

The Board of Education has already been panicked into offering up a sacrificial victim. A favorite target of Philadelphia's professional patriot organizations is Mrs. Lillian Lowenfels, a teacher of French in the veterans' program at the Benjamin Franklin High School. Her real crime is conubial. She is the wife of Walter Lowenfels, managing editor of the Pennsylvania edition of the *Daily Worker*, one of eight Philadelphia Communists recently indicted under the Smith Act. Last Monday the Superintendent of Schools, Louis P. Hoyer, ordered her suspended for "incompetency and persistent and willful violation of the laws of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania." She is charged with refusal to say whether ten years ago she was a member of the City Committee of the Communist Party. Trial has been set for December 3.

Three members of the Board of Education were not present when the rest of the Board unanimously voted to take this action. One of the absentees, perhaps significantly, was Walter Biddle Saul, its president. A respected elderly conservative lawyer, a member of one of Philadelphia's old families, Saul opposed the Pechan bill in its original form and has resisted the local witch hunters. His own attitude was reflected in the precise wording of a statement he gave the *Philadelphia Bulletin* on October 21. He said that so far as he knew there had "never been any subversive teaching in any public school in the city" and added that he assumed that if any evidence of law violations were uncovered by the House committee it would be sent to the Board of Education for appropriate action "in accordance with the laws of the Commonwealth." These laws may already have been breached by the Board of Education itself in publicly suspending Mrs. Lowenfels in advance of trial and by raising questions not covered by the Pechan Act.

To say, as Mr. Saul does, that he has no evidence of "subversive teaching" is to speak in such old-fashioned terms as to seem suspect. The phrase implies a framework in which people are convicted on the basis of words or acts for which objective proof may be offered. The witch hunt rests on faith in influences too mysterious to be susceptible of proof, and too sinister to be treated with due process. As was said recently of the Feinberg law "aimed at protecting New York school children" from "teachers who were spreading Communist propaganda"—"the poisonous propaganda was sufficiently subtle to escape detection in the class room." This was not said tongue-in-cheek but quite seriously in an address before the Law Club of Chicago last week by Attorney General Brownell. If it was too subtle to be detected, it could not be proven. In Philadelphia, as elsewhere, the idea that people may be pilloried, ostracized, fired and punished for their ideas without proof of misconduct may turn out to be a good deal more subversive than anything a handful of hounded radicals can do or say.

I. F. Stone's Weekly

• Editor and Publisher, I. F. STONE

Published weekly except the last two weeks of August at Room 205, 301 E. Capitol St., S.E., Washington 3, D. C. Subscription rates: Domestic, \$5 a year; Canada, Mexico and elsewhere in the Western Hemisphere, \$6; England and Continental Europe, \$10 by 1st class mail, \$15 by air; for Israel, Asia, Australia and Africa, \$10 by first class mail, \$20 by air mail. Single copy, 15 cents. Tel.: LI 4-7087. Entered as Second Class mail matter, Post Office, Washington, D. C.

November 14, 1953



Vol. 1, No. 41

Answer to the G.O.P.'s Problem

If it is important to keep "subversive" persons out of government, teaching, research and the opinion industries, is it less important to keep them out of the place where the ultimate power in our country is exercised—the voting booth? A handful of "subversives" may swing the balance in a close election. Or they may infiltrate a major party let us say, the Democrats, as some good Republicans have been suspecting ever since FDR (or indeed since Jefferson himself).

A loyalty test for voters would require more subtle methods than in the case of government workers or teachers. It would not do merely to ask whether the voter is or ever has been . . . He can claim to be a Democrat. He may be a Republican. When Martin Agronsky on his TV show, *At Issue*, interviewed Dennis Driscoll, leader of the recent cattlemen's march on Washington, Driscoll said he was a Republican and had voted for Eisenhower because he wanted a change. But as soon as cattle prices fell, Driscoll wanted a change again. When Agronsky asked Driscoll whether his demand for price supports must not lead inevitably to socialism, Driscoll said the cattlemen didn't care what you called it, so long as they got the government help they needed.

There's the danger. Merely to exclude a few thousand Communists from the polling places would not be enough. Even outlawing the Democrats (just temporarily, of course, until purged) would also be inadequate. What of the Republicans like Driscoll who want policies which lead inevitably to government control of the economy, as in Socialist Britain or Communist Russia? Why bar a few suspects from Federal employment and allow misguided people of this kind to vote anti-capitalists into our highest offices?

How easily this problem could be solved, and all that worry about the 1954 elections ended, by barring from the polling places as security risks everyone who ever voted for FDR or Harry?

Back to Burluson?

The Espionage Act of 1917 makes non-mailable any matter (1) advocating treason, insurrection or forcible resistance to any law of the United States, and (2) in time of war making "false reports or false statements" with intent to interfere with military operations, cause insubordination in the armed forces, or obstruct recruiting. Wilson's Postmaster General,

Quote-of-The-Week

" . . . If then Russia gets a promise of financial aid to develop her internal resources, and if she need not fear attack, then I believe the moment will have come to negotiate with a reasonable chance of success. There is a great deal of fear in the Soviet attitude. It is not fear of Germany, but of being attacked by the U.S."—Chancellor Konrad Adenauer, as interviewed by U.S. News & World Report, for November 13, 1953.

Burluson, distinguished himself in World War I by using these provisions for widespread political censorship of the mails, and they were utilized in World War II against six publications—four rightist (including *Social Justice*), one pacifist and one Leftist (the *Militant*, a Trotskyist organ).

Despite the truce in Korea, Eisenhower's Postmaster General seems to be reviving their use. The April, 1953, issue of a mimeographed publication, *Vets' Voice*, a Leftist organ, has been declared non-mailable. A similar proceeding has been begun by the Postoffice Department against *New World Review*, which was formerly known as *Soviet Russia Today*. The September, October, November and December 1952 and the January, 1953, issues were declared non-mailable (although long since mailed) and the October 1953 issue has been held up for study.

Strictly speaking, the government might be hard put to prove that anything in these issues really advocated treason, etc., or obstructed recruiting, but (as Zechariah Chafee shows in his classic, *Free Speech in the United States*) these provisions can and have been very loosely construed. Considering the growing recklessness of this Administration, we believe it would be well for liberal and radical editors to consult together now for mutual defense against the threat of postal censorship and suppression.

The One Way to Unite Europe

It is a pity the UN does not have power to hold elections of its own in the Russo-American impasse over Germany and Europe. We suspect that there would be similar majorities on both sides of the Iron Curtain if Eastern Europe were asked, "Do you want the Russians to stay or withdraw?" and Western Europe were asked, "Do you want American bases on your soil or would you rather have the Americans go home?" If there is one permanent fact of international politics which no revolution can change, it is that no people likes to have the soldiers of another power on its soil—even allied soldiers in time of war are a source of irritation. This is the one issue which could really unite Europe today from the Irish Sea to the old Russian border.

Add Worries

And as if we didn't have enough to worry about, the Washington Times-Herald has discovered, "National Anthem Lags in Record Sales, Survey of Leading Stores Here Discloses. Famed Soprano Calls Situation Shocking. Song Isn't Even Available on New Speed Discs."

INAUGURATING A NEW FEATURE

With this issue, we launch a new feature—*Report from The Grass Roots*. We hope to make it a means of covering local situations of national interest from time to time, especially on issues and in areas where local press coverage is inadequate or one-sided. Several thousand Philadelphians who may be seeing the *Weekly* for the first time can subscribe by using the blank on the reverse side, and assure themselves of an independent hard-hitting report from Washington every week. To regular readers, don't forget that you can get a renewal and a gift for only \$9. Renewing ahead of time will ease one of the basic headaches from which all publications suffer. So please do it now.

With many thanks,

I. F. Stone

The Truman-Brownell Battle May Prove Decisive

(Continued from Page One)

Murphy, Biddle, Jackson, Clark—act upon them? Was everybody out of step but Hoover? Or were those reports too flimsy to carry weight?

About a year and a half after White died, Walter Trohan, who has good FBI news sources, reported in the *Chicago Tribune* and *Washington Times-Herald* (February 1, 1950) that White's mail had long been under secret surveillance. "White's name," Trohan reported, "was on a postoffice list of persons whose mail was stopped for examination in 1943 and 1944. The examination may have continued until White left Washington in 1948. . . . The White mail was opened and photographed in 1943 after Chambers named Hiss and White as his sources of government secrets when Chambers was a Soviet spy." Trohan added, "It could not be learned what evidence was obtained by examination of White's mail. A high government investigator said the agency was satisfied long ago that White had subversive connections."

Just What Did the FBI Find?

This reference to "subversive connections" is tantalizing. For in the notoriously loose vernacular of government loyalty investigations, "subversive connections" may be a long way from espionage. Just what did the FBI find? And just when does the presumption of innocence begin? White had been in Washington since 1934. The FBI began to watch him early. If the Trohan story is true, his mail was opened and photographed from 1943 on. After the Bentley story, a small army of FBI men tried to help her reestablish the contacts she claimed to have and dug up all the evidence it could find to support her. Yet a grand jury, after hearing her and them, failed to indict not only White but a single one of the other persons she named! After all this surveillance and effort, is it fair to speak as Brownell does—to give the impression that the facts were indisputable and the charges proven? To smear man in his grave?

The *Newark Evening News* recalled that in her first public appearance before the House Un-American Activities Com-

mittee, Miss Bentley "said that while she was sure White was a member of the ring she had never seen him." The *News* reported, "The former official who told of the FBI's futile efforts to tag White with a grand jury case, said that had been her story to the FBI, too." Was it fair of the Attorney General not to mention that Miss Bentley's charges were hearsay and that Chambers himself said White was too "independent" ever to accept the discipline of the Communist Party? This is the background against which to assess the indignant question Eisenhower dodged at press conference Wednesday—whether he thought the FBI report was justified in calling White a spy when a grand jury refused to believe it on the basis of that same FBI evidence?

Afraid to Tackle Truman?

As we go to press, the House Un-American Activities Committee has called off its Friday session to hear former President Truman. We believe that Velde and his colleagues, especially after Eisenhower's virtual repudiation of Brownell earlier in the day, lost their nerve. The ex-President would make a doughty witness, and we hope the committee will yet screw up enough courage to question him.

A battle has begun which may decide the future. Either this excursion in ghoulishness will finally bring a public revulsion against the witch hunt or America will be driven further along the road to Fascism. Brownell's voice was the voice of men driven desperate by fear that power is again slipping from them. The recent elections, like the uproar from the farm country, shows how superficial was that cry for a change. The tide toward the welfare state is not reversible. The recognition is beginning to make Fascist adventurers of once responsible conservatives; their strategy is to rule by fear and to ruin by smear. The shrewd *New York Daily News* said Monday, "By vigorously, incessantly and justly throwing 'party of Moscow' dirt at the Fair Deal Democrats, the Republicans might well remain in power for a generation to come."

Don't Rue It, Do It.

PLEASE RENEW NOW

I. F. Stone's Weekly, 301 E. Capitol, Wash. 3, D. C.

Please renew (or enter) my sub for the enclosed \$5:

Name _____

Street _____

City _____ Zone _____ State _____

Enter this gift sub for \$4 more (money enclosed):

(To) Name _____

Street _____

City _____ Zone _____ State _____

11-14-58

I. F. Stone's Weekly

Room 205

301 E. Capitol St., S.E.

Washington 3, D. C.

Entered as
Second Class Mail
Matter
Washington, D. C.
Post Office

NEWSPAPER

I. F. Stone's Weekly

VOL. I, NUMBER 42

NOVEMBER 23, 1953

WASHINGTON, D. C.

15 CENTS

America's Own Reichstag Fire

There was an unnoticed bit of unconscious self-revelation in that speech of the Attorney General's in Chicago. "Every place the Communist movement has been successful," was the way Brownell prefaced his attack on former President Truman, "it has been preceded by a period devoted to breaking down the faith of the people in their government so that it was weak and helpless in the face of a coup." Substitute "Fascist" for "Communist" and this begins to describe what McCarran, McCarthy, Jenner, Velde and Brownell have been doing.

The tactics of the gutter have been a feature of our free and easy politics ever since George Washington was accused of plotting for a crown. But surely no responsible official of Cabinet rank in our history has done more than Attorney General Brownell in the past ten days to break down the faith of the people in their government, spreading suspicion of an ex-President, a deceased Chief Justice of the U. S. Supreme Court, and an Attorney General who now sits on that high bench. Indeed the widening repercussions of the Brownell charges, if taken at face value, must also engulf the two Truman Administration officials who turned State's evidence, as it were, in the White case—former Secretary of State Byrnes and FBI Chief J. Edgar Hoover. For if they knew a Soviet spy was operating in the top reaches of the government, why did they also acquiesce in the conspiracy of silence?

If all the allegations are true, nothing White and his associates did could be so subversive as the work being done by Brownell and his Senatorial allies to shake the ordinary person's faith in the American government to its foundations. Their excursion in creating distrust, panic and insecurity has now rallied openly to its support the most powerful single figure in the American government, its sacred cow, the untouchable product of an unparalleled publicity buildup ranging from

gossip columnists to comic strips, the G-man, J. Edgar Hoover. The character of the forces with which he and Brownell have joined hands was dramatically indicated by a question interjected in the midst of the Attorney General's testimony.

The interruption came when Brownell, in covering the career of Harold Glasser, said Glasser had gone to Moscow early in 1947 as adviser to the Secretary of State. "What Secretary of State was that?" Senator Jenner, sitting as chairman, asked Brownell with just the hint of a smile. Brownell replied, "Mr. Marshall." The Senator from Indiana looked as if he were about to lick his chops. The Senator who delivered the China Lobby speech calling General Marshall a front for traitors had finally won to his dubious banner the Administration of Marshall's war-time subordinate, protege and friend. A coalition of calumny had been cemented. The stage had been set for what I believe will be the dirtiest and most dangerous year in U.S. politics. The White case is our Reichstag fire.

Questions of guilt or innocence should not be allowed to hide the broader panorama of the campaign now unfolding. The misdeeds, real or imaginary, of a small group of anti-Fascist and pro-Soviet officials are being made the excuse and occasion for the rise to firm power in American life of pro-Fascist and pro-Nazi forces which resented the last war and hated Roosevelt as much as Hitler did. They are out not merely to rebuild German power abroad but to rewrite history and destroy those who opposed Hitler here at home. Stepping warily, avoiding anti-Semitism which they regard as the Fuehrer's cardinal error, they are out to defame Truman, to desecrate the memory of Roosevelt, to smear our wartime leadership, and to use against the popular aspiration for social welfare the same tactics of panic, terror and repression which Fascism wielded in Japan, Germany and Italy.

Was Eisenhower A Pro-Red Conspirator, Too?

It is fortunate for the helpless and ineffectual Eisenhower that he is the Republican President, or these forces would already be giving him the same treatment they gave Marshall. The installment of Churchill's memoirs published by the New York Times on Friday, November 13, shows Eisenhower may be accused as easily (if as unfairly) of "selling out" Central Europe to Communism as Marshall has been for "selling out" China. Churchill writes that it was politically important for the Anglo-American armies in March, 1945, to seize Berlin ahead of the Russians despite previous agreement and to meet the Red Army as far to the East as possible. Churchill complains that Eisenhower, without consulting the British and "short-circuiting . . . the highest authorities, both military and constitutional," communicated directly with Stalin a

decision to strike south toward Leipzig instead of Berlin and (as agreed at Yalta) to meet the Red Army on the Elbe.

Churchill writes that Marshall upheld Eisenhower against the British and (as the *Chicago Tribune* and the *Washington Times-Herald* have already noted in a restrained but gleeful editorial) that when Eisenhower's dispatch arrived in Moscow the commander of the American military mission, Gen. John R. Deane, was so disturbed by its contents that he delayed delivery for 20 hours before handing the message over to Stalin. This is an incident made to order for Jenner, McCarthy and Velde. If history is to be rewritten by hindsight, if motives are to be twisted by malice, Eisenhower may yet face accusations as unscrupulous as those levelled at Truman.

Mr. Truman Loses The First Round

Mr. Truman has never been more effective or moving than in his TV address Monday night. I am sorry to say, however, that after hearing Brownell and Hoover next day, I believe he lost the first round. He shifted from the story that he fired White as soon as he learned that White was disloyal to the story that he kept White on in order to give the FBI a chance to trap him and his associates. This gave Hoover an opportunity to pay off some old scores: Truman as Senator was critical of FBI methods and opposed wire-tapping. As President, he declined to put Hoover in charge of the newly established Central Intelligence Agency, which was kept independent of the FBI. When Truman's long-time friend, Max Lowenthal, dared publish a full length critical book on the FBI in 1950, Truman with characteristic spunk declined to disown him. As the Red scare campaign gets rolling, the plans are to strike at Truman through Lowenthal. Last

Monday a week the *Chicago Tribune* and the *Washington Times-Herald* had an 8-column line page one sensation about a "plot" to smear the FBI, referring to Lowenthal and to Dean Acheson's law partner, Charles Horsky, who once signed a report critical of FBI wire-tapping.

I suspect that one reason Truman paid so little attention to the report on White and praised White when the latter retired from government service is that Truman had a healthy contempt for FBI loyalty reports. Unfortunately he did not take the risk of candor in his speech and gave up the one line of defense left him when he assumed White's guilt. Had Truman made the point that the charges were unproven, had he pleaded a man's right to the presumption of innocence, he would be in a better position to counter-attack now on the only grounds which seem open to him—and that is the nature of the evidence against White and his associates.

What of The Evidence Against White?

Hoover has also shifted his grounds. The Lowenthal book, a carefully documented study by one of the country's ablest lawyers, quotes (p. 439) from a 1942 radio speech in which Hoover, explaining his methods, said: "The Federal Bureau of Investigation has operated on the premise that we should first find out who the spies are who are working against our national welfare, and then, carefully keeping them under scrutiny, ascertain their sources of information, the identity of their associates, their methods of communication, and finally taking over the supervision of the spy ring until the time comes to take them into custody. In other words, we have followed the practice of counterespionage, namely spying on the spies." Charges so serious against White and his associates called for thorough investigation with an eye either to prosecution or clearance. The FBI is supposed to enforce the law, not merely collect half-proven surmise for half-baked loyalty proceedings.

Unfortunately there was no Democrat on the Jenner committee with the nerve to raise these or any other real questions with Hoover, nor to question Brownell about the difference between his Chicago address and the two FBI covering letters to the White House which he put into evidence. Brownell in Chicago said flatly, "White was a Russian spy. He smuggled secret documents to Russian agents for transmission to Moscow. Harry Dexter White was known to be a Communist spy by the very people who appointed him . . ." But this is not what the two Hoover letters to the White House said. That of November 8, 1946, said persons in the government were furnishing information "to persons outside

the Federal government, who are in turn transmitting this information to espionage agents of the Soviet government." At the present time, the letter went on, "it is impossible to determine exactly how many of these people had actual knowledge of the disposition being made of the information they were transmitting." Hoover said he was investigating to determine "the degree and nature of the complicity of these people." White was on a list of persons who were "either participants in this operation or were utilized by principals in this ring." (Italics added).

The letter of February 1, 1946, transmitting the special report on White to the President is also inconclusive. It says first of all that information had come to the attention of the FBI "charging White as being a valuable adjunct to an underground Soviet espionage organization." A "valuable adjunct" is not necessarily a spy. The letter also says that "Material which came into his [White's] possession as a result of his official capacity allegedly was made available through intermediaries to Nathan Gregory Silvermaster" (italics added) who in turn was alleged to have been photographing the documents for transmission. Finally Hoover refers to a Canadian source fearful lest White become head of the International Bank, or the International Monetary Fund. "Fear was expressed," Hoover wrote, "that facts might come to light in the future throwing some sinister accusations at White and thereby jeopardize the successful operation of these important international institutions." There was no need to wait for sinister accusations in the future if White was already known to be a Soviet spy.

Just Like Mc Carthy at Fort Monmouth

The wording of these two letters by J. Edgar Hoover to the White House at the time of the White appointment fails to support Brownell's statements. Hoover did not say White was a spy, nor that he was smuggling secret documents to Russian agents. How can Brownell say that Truman knew these to be facts when Hoover did not assert them as facts? Hoover's words throw an unflattering light on Brownell's statement in Chicago, "there certainly was no reason why the Senate could not be informed of the established fact that White was a spy." The fact was not established.

In his statement to the Jenner committee, Hoover said the "Red Fascists distort, conceal, misrepresent and lie to gain their point." He and Brownell were not exactly models in their own presentation. Like McCarthy in the Fort Monmouth farce, they were stepping out from behind the closed curtains to present their own little dribbles of the alleged evidence as suited their purpose. This piecemeal *ex parte* presentation, with no one present to ask questions on behalf of the accused, is a long way from the kind of serious inquiry and fair trial called for by such grave charges.

The *Washington Post*, supporting Brownell and Hoover, speaks of the "devastating nature" of their "factual presentation." But the only thing "devastating" about their report is how little factual material they offer to support these allegations. There is first of all the anti-climactic description by Brownell of the section in the FBI report relating to "White's known contacts with Russian officials over the years." Brownell said this "cannot be declassified." Just why is not clear since Brownell goes on to admit that "these contacts were not inconsistent with the regular performance of White's duties and considered by themselves are not incriminating."

There is next the gobbledygook section which describes the results of FBI surveillance. Brownell claims that the FBI report on White "contains much corroborative evidence which cannot be made public either because it would disclose investigative techniques or because it might be harmful to the national interest." Presumably the former refers to wire-tapping and opening of mail. The latter may mean anything or nothing. But if White was passing out material and the

FBI, forewarned by Bentley, put him and his associates under surveillance, it would do no harm to the national security now to report that one had been seen passing information to another, that Silvermaster had been caught copying documents or that an FBI agent had seen a courier picking them up. The espionage had to take place somewhere in some tangible form. What did the FBI find when it watched these people?

Brownell's answer is that "it can be pointed out" that "over a period of three months beginning in November of 1945 the activities of Harry Dexter White were entirely consistent with all the previous information contained in the report." Does that mean he passed out documents? Apparently not. Apparently all it means is—and let us return to Brownell's own words: "White was in frequent close personal contact with nearly every one of the persons named as his associates in the spy ring." But most of these people were fellow employees of the Treasury. What in this context does "close personal contact" mean?

What They'd Be Saying if Hoover Were A New Dealer

The record is so extraordinary that if Hoover were a New Dealer instead of a rightist, he would be the main target of the witch hunt attack. Let us look at the record as we now know it. Frank Coe was accused by Whitaker Chambers in 1939. Silvermaster was up on loyalty charges in 1942 and was cleared with White's support; Hoover complains that when the FBI interviewed White in March, 1942, he "spent more time in denouncing" loyalty investigations than "in furnishing facts." Chambers named White as part of the Communist underground in March, 1945, and August, 1946, though as late as that (six months after the White appointment) Chambers told the FBI "It was not a spy ring, but one far more important and cunning because its members helped to shape policy in their departments." (Memorandum of conversation with Ray Murphy, August 28, 1946).

The extraordinary thing is that with these early tips from Chambers and later Bentley, and all the opportunities for surveillance, the wire-tapping, the mail covers and the spies inside the Communist party, the FBI failed to get a single indictment, much less conviction, for espionage from among all the people named by Bentley and Chambers. If Hoover were a New Dealer, he would be accused of covering up for the Reds.

There's something fishy about this business, though one despairs of ever disentangling the false from the true. Bentley's story does not seem to be quite the same as Hoover's; she says she made her first contact with the FBI in August; he says she told her story on November 7, 1945. He sent his first letter to the White House the very next day, but one would never guess from its wording that this was something freshly told by a new informant and as yet unchecked, nor that Bentley's story of spying differed so sharply from that which Whitaker Chambers had been telling of a Communist ring in the government concerned only with policy.

Were there ever the American equivalent of a British

The Attorney General goes on with exactly the kind of vague stuff familiar in loyalty proceedings. White made a trip to see a doctor in Newark who "had been reported by numerous sources as having had frequent and close contacts with numerous Communists in the State of New Jersey." White was seen at the home of Alger Hiss. White and his wife visited Maurice Halperin, who in turn was alleged to be a Communist and to have passed on information to a courier. White had "close personal" relations with Frank Coe, who was then one of his chief assistants in the Treasury.

Brownell does not say that these three months of surveillance proved the allegations. He says White's activities were "entirely consistent with" the allegations. But his own description indicates that this vague phrase merely means that White did associate with the close associates who were alleged to be Soviet agents. If this was the kind of stuff presented the following year to the grand jury which heard these charges, it is no wonder that no indictment was returned.

Royal Commission to provide a real investigation, attention might usefully be focused on Bentley's later testimony that White drew up the Morgenthau Plan to "pastoralize" Germany in order to further Communist ends; this seems contrived since an examination of Communist publications at the time shows the party's opposition to the Morgenthau plan.

The mystery which haunts the whole affair is why that 1947 grand jury returned not a single indictment against any person Bentley named. There is no statute of limitations on war-time espionage. A showing of intent to help a foreign power is enough to convict even though there was no intent to injure the United States. The strict two witness rule which governs prosecutions for treason does not apply to espionage. A lesser indictment for conspiracy or attempt to commit espionage might have been returned. There is no technical reason of law that I can find which would prevent indictment or conviction on the basis of Bentley's testimony alone if sufficiently credible to the jury. Nine persons named by her, including White and Coe, denied her charges under oath in 1948 and could have been prosecuted for perjury, as Hiss was in denying the testimony of Chambers. This failure to indict must be seen against the background of the Truman Administration's eagerness to obtain an indictment for the 1948 campaign, both to rebut Republican charges and to strike a blow at the Wallace movement, which the Democrats then feared.

Hoover said of Bentley in his testimony last week that she had been "subjected to the most searching of cross-examinations; her testimony has been evaluated by juries and reviewed by the courts and has been found to be accurate." The fact is that only a single person named by her has been convicted, and that was several years later. This one conviction is so peculiar that it undermines the implications Hoover intended to convey.

Next Week's Eye-Opener: The Only "Spy" Bentley Convicted

ROBIN HOOD'S IN DANGER — ACT QUICKLY BEFORE THEY GET SANTA CLAUS!

Those censors who sniffed subversion in Nottingham Forest may soon be getting around to that (Red costumed) free spending old fellow Kris Kingle, no Kautious Kapitalist he. While there's time, in renewing your subscription, add \$4 and send the Weekly as a Christmas gift to a friend, or at the same rate to several. You'll keep the gray streaks out of the harassed publisher's whiskers by doing this form of Xmas shopping early, too, and we'll send a gift card announcement to your friend or friends.

With many thanks,

I. F. Stone

JENNINGS PERRY'S PAGE

Who'll Tell Hummon What Webster Told Hayne?

There's no denying that Gov. Herman E. Talmadge of Georgia, lately emerged as the most outspoken spokesman of those patriots determined to preserve segregation in the public schools as part of the American Way, is both quick on the trigger and slick on the dodge.

Having already proclaimed that his own state, like neighboring South Carolina, is ready to junk its school system to evade a possible Supreme Court ruling against segregation, Old Gene's lively son now is crying the charge that the Court itself, if it should hold that public schools must be open to all alike, would be guilty of "nullification."

The charge is intended, of course, to build up blame to hide blame; and all in fanning this quaint backfire the Governor doggedly dances away from the crucial question of whether, in any case, Georgia proposes to comply with or defy the law of the land. Over and over again in a recently televised interview he slid off of this point, protesting always that if there should be any contempt of the law, "radical groups" (the Court) would commit it.

The interrogation did produce one exchange in which the wily Governor apparently outfoxed himself. He was asked if in essence the game of the segregationists were not to play with the Court when the Court was on their side but against the Court when the decision was the other way.

Gov.: "Not necessarily. I don't mean to say that the people would fail to comply with any decision of the Supreme Court of the United States; but if they had to, they would resort to the extreme measure of abolishing the public school system itself *rather than comply* with such an order of the Supreme Court."

The italics are mine. The report is from Governor Talmadge's own weekly *The Statesman*. In the same issue, in a lengthy signed editorial, the Peach State's Calhoun solemnly juggles the nonsensical proposition that legality of "separate but equal" public schools hinges on whether the men who now compose the Supreme Court "believe that the Constitu-

tion of the United States means what it says or whether it means what they might say it says."

It was later, at the conference of Southern governors at Hot Springs, Va., that Gov. Talmadge handed down his personal dictum on the legality of any Supreme Court ruling in which a majority of the justices should express the belief that the basic law forbids discrimination in education: it would be "blatantly unconstitutional."

More respectful and more reasonable patriots well may be shocked by the aspersions directed at the Court before the fact by the Georgia executive and perhaps merely bored by his twisting and turning—before the fact—on the question of what his state will do to maintain segregation in education "in any case." A present day patriot of Daniel Webster's turn undoubtedly would be inclined "to run the honorable gentleman's doctrine a little into its practical application," to ask him as a lawyer—as Webster asked Hayne when South Carolina set out to nullify the tariff laws—how he proposes to circumvent a court ruling against segregated schools and avoid treason?

The Governor does have a plan—or plot to do away with the school system "and subsidize the child rather than the political unit of government." But would not the school teachers of Georgia, pledged to uphold the Constitution, deem it "somewhat dangerous to resist a law of the United States?" Would not the transfer of school properties to "private operation" be quite too thin a pretense? Would not the Court surely hold again that even the State of Georgia cannot do by indirection what is forbidden by law?

"*If a thing can be done,*" Webster told Hayne, "an ingenious man can tell *how* it is to be done." But plainly neither Gov. Talmadge nor his brash mentor in this matter, Gov. Byrnes, have yet hit upon a foolproof formula for staying in the Union while excepting themselves—by any ruse—from what the Supreme Court says that the Constitution says.

Of course there is—or was—secession. That has been tried.

Don't Rue It, Do It.

PLEASE RENEW NOW

I. F. Stone's Weekly, 301 E. Capitol, Wash. 3, D. C.

Please renew (or enter) my sub for the enclosed \$5:

Name _____

Street _____

City _____ Zone _____ State _____

Enter this gift sub for \$4 more (money enclosed):

(To) Name _____

Street _____

City _____ Zone _____ State _____

11-23-53

I. F. Stone's Weekly

Room 205

301 E. Capitol St., S.E.

Washington 3, D. C.

NEWSPAPER

Entered as
Second Class Mail
Matter
Washington, D. C.
Post Office

I. F. Stone's Weekly

VOL. I, NUMBER 43

NOVEMBER 30, 1953



WASHINGTON, D. C.

15 CENTS

Was J. Edgar As "Blind" As Harry?

There is a strange, untouched, perhaps untouchable aspect of the Harry Dexter White affair. To go back and re-study the hearings and reports since Elizabeth Bentley began telling her story publicly on July 30, 1948, is to wonder why it was never inquired into. For if it can be said that Harry Truman "knowingly" promoted a Soviet spy, it can also be said that J. Edgar Hoover allowed a known and registered Russian agent to operate unscathed. The biggest mystery of all is why the FBI chief should have been surprised when Elizabeth Bentley first talked in November, 1945. Because the central character in her story, the master spy whom she claimed to have served as courier and lived with as man and wife, Jacob Golos, had been publicly accused of military espionage for the Soviet government by the Attorney General almost six years earlier and forced to register as a Soviet agent.

One of Frank Murphy's last acts as Attorney General, just before his elevation to the U.S. Supreme Court, was to file charges on January 2, 1940 against eight persons and three business houses for military espionage on behalf of the Soviet government and for failure to register as foreign agents. One of the men was Golos and one of the business firms was World Tourists, Inc., of which he was the sole stockholder.

Two months later, in March, a special grand jury in Washington indicted "Jacob Raisin, also known as J. N. Golos" and World Tourists, Inc., for failure to register as foreign agents. The charge of military espionage and the case against the others had been dropped. The next day Golos pleaded guilty. He was sentenced to four months in jail but put on probation and fined \$500. A similar fine was imposed on World Tourists, Inc., but that fine was suspended.

Just why the more serious charge was dropped and why Golos got off so easily on the lesser charge was never explained. The greater mystery is how Golos, after being publicly accused of military espionage and forced to register as a foreign agent, was able to go on operating as a master spy. For according to Miss Bentley, she began in 1941 to travel between New York and Washington as his courier and go-between, to build up a whole circle of informants in the government and to bring large quantities of secretly filmed documentary material out of the capital in her knitting bag every two weeks or so. This went on, according to Miss Bentley, from 1941 to 1945. Yet her story, when told to the FBI, apparently came as a complete surprise. Either the FBI was extraordinarily inefficient or there is much more to this affair than has yet been told.

It is curious that in her book, "Out of Bondage", Miss Bentley does not mention the charge of military espionage made against Golos in January, 1940. Here she was engaged in a very dangerous and intimate relationship with a Russian agent. The Attorney General of the United States suddenly

accuses him of engaging in military espionage. The charge would endanger her, too, for she speaks of being shadowed in this period by the FBI. Yet this vital fact—when she seemed on the verge of being caught—is omitted. As told vaguely in the book, the government had become more hostile to the Communists after the Nazi-Soviet pact. The records of World Tourists were seized, revealing that Earl Browder had used a false passport.

But her account does not mention two dramatic episodes which focused publicly attention sharply on World Tourists, Inc. The first was Earl Browder's admission to the Dies committee in September, 1939, that he had used false passports in travelling abroad; it was as a result that in October the records of World Tourists, Inc., were seized. (From Miss Bentley's account one would believe that this happened in reverse; that the government only learned of Browder's false passports after it seized the records.) The other episode was the FBI "midnight raid" in Detroit and Milwaukee, in which 11 persons were arrested on charges of recruiting soldiers for the Spanish Republican Army. That occurred early in February, 1940, and the Federal District Attorney in Detroit said recruits were given their tickets to Spain by World Tourists, Inc., in New York. Had these events, and the charge of military espionage, been related in the book (or indeed in any one of Miss Bentley's appearances before Congressional investigating committees) they would sharply have raised the question of how, after that, Golos could still have operated a spy ring successfully under the very nose of the FBI.

It is possible that this is how it happened but it is not likely. World Tourist, Inc. with its link to *Intourist* was a pretty obvious place for surveillance long before 1939. Hoover in the radio speech of 1942 quoted in last week's issue said the FBI's method was to "first find out who the spies are . . . and then carefully keeping them under scrutiny, ascertain . . . the identity of their associates . . . finally taking over the supervision of the spy ring until the time comes to take them into custody." Miss Bentley says (p.295) that after telling her story in 1945 an FBI agent asked her, "Would you be willing to keep on going as you are now? . . . With you in there, we can keep tabs on what is going on. Then, too, it's vital to keep in contact with the Russian secret police and also with the people you know in the American Communist Party." This embodies a basic technique of counter-espionage, to try and turn a spy into a counter-spy. One wonders why if she is telling the truth this was not done with Miss Bentley in 1940-41 when (as she says) she was under surveillance for a time. Or was it? The puzzle is increased by a re-study of the Remington case, and of her admissions under cross-examination. These are discussed on the next page.

Eye-Opener: Bentley's One Conviction in That "Spy" Ring

In his appearance before the Jenner committee, J. Edgar Hoover praised Elizabeth Bentley, saying "She has been subjected to the most searching of cross-examinations; her testimony has been evaluated by juries and reviewed by the courts and has been found to be accurate." The unwary reader would never guess that she was subjected to cross-examination in only one case growing out of her sensational spy ring story to the FBI in November, 1945. This was the case of William W. Remington.

Remington was one of the 30-odd government employees named by Miss Bentley to the FBI in November, 1945. He himself was not questioned until a year and a half later. Presumably the charges were kept secret during the interval while the suspects were under surveillance. On April 15, 1947, three FBI agents questioned Remington for three and a half hours. Remington denied he had ever been a member of the Communist party and denied that he had ever given Bentley secret information. In June, 1947, after Miss Bentley told her story to a special grand jury, Remington testified voluntarily and at length. Neither he nor anyone else named by Miss Bentley were indicted.

That grand jury sat a long time. In the spring of 1948, before the outcome was known, Miss Bentley called on Frederick Woltman of the New York *World-Telegram*. Miss Bentley, as was later testified, wanted to find out when the grand jury was going to return indictments. Woltman arranged for her to tell her story to a fellow staff member, Nelson Frank. Miss Bentley entered into a contract with Frank making him her literary assistant and promising him a share in the proceeds of any writings based upon her disclosures. Frank wrote a sensational series about her for the *World-Telegram* in July, 1948. On July 30 she was summoned to Washington to tell her story before a Senate committee and a few days later before the House Committee on Un-American Activities. These made her famous and launched her on a career as an ex-Communist writer and lecturer.

Bentley in Danger

This career—and Miss Bentley's usefulness to those who wished to picture the New Deal as a nest of spies—was soon endangered by the Remington case. By the time Miss Bentley testified publicly in July, 1948, Remington was (with one possible exception) the last of those she named still on the Federal payroll (White and V. Frank Coe were employed by the international monetary fund). Remington was at once suspended by the Department of Commerce pending loyalty proceedings.

Thanks to her public appearance, Miss Bentley was no longer one of those confidential informants whose identity (as the formula goes) could not be disclosed lest it endanger FBI sources of information. Remington asked to confront his accuser. The Loyalty Board lacked power of subpoena but invited her to appear. She twice accepted and twice failed to appear. When a third attempt also proved fruitless, the Board cleared Remington. The decision was a blow not only to Miss Bentley but to the FBI since it had marshalled "derogatory information" from many other sources to prove that Remington was a Communist.

The verdict was given additional weight because a former national commander of the American Legion was on the Loyalty Board which cleared Remington. A new blow was the payment of \$9,000 to Remington in settlement of a libel suit he brought against a TV show on which Miss Bentley had repeated her charges. A star witness was waning. Something had to be done. In April, 1950, the House Un-American Activities Committee reopened the Remington case. They summoned not only Miss Bentley but several of the FBI's hitherto confidential informants whose accusations had been before the Loyalty Board. These new witnesses claimed that

Remington had been a Communist in Knoxville, Tenn., in 1936-37. Again Remington denied the charges under oath before the committee and before a new grand jury. Again there was no indictment.

A Stacked Grand Jury

It was not until a third grand jury took up the matter in May, 1950, that an indictment of Remington was finally obtained, not an indictment for espionage but for perjury in denying that he had ever been a Communist. This grand jury, as was revealed during the ensuing trial, was stacked in Miss Bentley's favor. Under cross-examination, she admitted that the special prosecutor in charge, Thomas E. Donegan, had been her personal attorney in a suit for back pay. One of the first witnesses called was Joseph E. Egan, her counsel in the libel suit brought by Remington. And during the trial two women who had been employed by Miss Bentley's publisher turned up to testify that John Brunini, the foreman of the grand jury, was collaborating on Miss Bentley's book at the very time the grand jury was drawing up the Remington indictment. This information was known to the prosecution (and discussed with Attorney General McGrath) but hidden from the defense.

The conviction of Remington in that case was reversed on appeal, but the indictment was not dismissed. Rather than let this tainted indictment become an issue in a new trial, the government obtained a new indictment for perjury. Remington was convicted again, but as in the Lattimore case there had been a steady deflation in charges. This time he was convicted for denying at the first trial that he had given Miss Bentley information to which she was not entitled (a far cry from the original espionage charge) and for denying that he knew there was a Young Communist League on the campus when he was a student at Dartmouth (an equally far cry from the charge that he was himself a Communist).

What Bentley Told Her Contacts

What makes the Remington case so relevant for study today is that under cross-examination Miss Bentley admitted that most of the persons from whom she obtained information in Washington did not know that she was a Russian agent. Remington himself swore (as did another witness named by her) that she represented herself as a research worker. Miss Bentley said the Silvermasters and Ullman knew what she was doing and that "from what they said, Mr. White knew where it [the information] was going but preferred not to mention the fact." Of the others, she said, some may have guessed but most thought they were merely aiding the Communists in this country. "That was especially true of the individuals I contacted," she admitted at one point, "because they were told by Mr. Golos that this information was for the personal use of Earl Browder in preparing books and in preparing policies of the Communist party."

"The general policy," Miss Bentley testified at another point, "was to try and keep, at least for that period, to keep American Communists from knowing things were going to Russia because if anybody turned sour, as they called it, or turned traitor, then they could tell a great deal more than they could otherwise."

Of the Perlo group, Miss Bentley said "no one was actually told that it [the information] was going to Russia." And of Remington she admitted that maybe he had grown "less willing to see her" because he began to suspect from the nature of her questions that she might be a Russian spy.

Thus, according to her own story as it finally came out, Miss Bentley was taking advantage of Communist or Soviet sympathies to draw Federal officials into a dangerous relationship whose real nature was deliberately hidden from them. This begins to appear in retrospect as an exercise in entrapment, and the full truth about that has yet to be told.

I. F. Stone's Weekly

• Editor and Publisher, I. F. STONE

Published weekly except the last two weeks of August at Room 205, 301 E. Capitol St., S.E., Washington 3, D. C. Subscription rates: Domestic, \$5 a year; Canada, Mexico and elsewhere in the Western Hemisphere, \$6; England and Continental Europe, \$10 by 1st class mail, \$15 by air; for Israel, Asia, Australia and Africa, \$10 by first class mail, \$20 by air mail. Single copy, 15 cents. Tel.: LI 4-7087. Entered as Second Class mail matter, Post Office, Washington, D. C.

November 30, 1953



Vol. 1, No. 43

What Country Does Ike Think He's President Of—Denmark?

President Eisenhower to the B'nai B'rith:

"In this country, if someone dislikes you or accuses you, he must come up in front. He cannot hide behind the shadows, he cannot assassinate you or your character from behind without suffering the penalties an outraged citizenry will inflict."

Portrait of a Fighting Newspaper About to Take a Stand But Then Quietly Lying Down Again for Comfort

"Even though it seems necessary to permit the use of wiretap evidence in national security cases, Congress ought to remember that such undercover snooping is, as Justice Holmes called it, 'dirty business.' Resort to this method can be condoned only if the strictest precautions are taken to avoid abuses and encroachment upon individual rights . . . by requiring the Attorney General to authorize each request for permission before a court order is sought."—*Washington Post*.

The Attorney General being that renowned defender of fair play, due process and private reputation, Herbert Brownell, Jr.

Query

We would like to know whether the Catholic Bishops of the United States, assembled here in Washington, had any evidence to support the language of their joint statement on "Peter's Chains."

"Peasants are slaughtered," they said, "and flung upon the pyre of their burning churches. Innocent children are torn from the arms of their Christian mothers and handed over to atheist debauchers."

We would also like to have some fuller exegesis for their attack on "the Voltaires of the West." It would seem from

their language that the Bishops have not forgiven the great champion of toleration and enlightenment.

It has become one of the clichés of American political rhetoric to equate intellectual freedom and belief in God. But the attack on "the Voltaires of the West" reflects hostility to intellectual liberty, to toleration of differing opinions, and to the spirit of free inquiry.

There was a loyalty case here some years ago in which a Federal employe was accused of having Rousseau in his library. Is Voltaire to become "subversive," too?

Unerring Instinct for Not Being Where the Battle Is Hottest

"Seen from Belgrade and Trieste, which I visited last week, it was clear to me that the boundary line between Italy and Yugoslavia is not the crucial problem."—Walter Lippman, November 24, 1953.

And on careful consideration, we agree with him.

The Elephant Is Not Alone In Having Two Heads

Adlai Stevenson before the Georgia legislature: "Root out, I say, the agents of this Satanic world-wide conspiracy. . . . But for the love of heaven let us do it with dignity, objectivity and justice."

Are sober methods encouraged when one uses the very metaphors of witch-hunting? A "Satanic world-wide conspiracy" is a bogeyman, something too occult and elusive for normal methods of prosecution; too sinister, dangerous and frightening.

To use the language of medieval superstition is to recreate its atmosphere and foster the revival of its methods. This is not the way back to national sanity.

Hats Off

To Ed Murrow, whose great Alcoa TV show on the Radulovich case deserves a major share of the credit for Air Force Secretary Talbot's decision last week reinstating Lt. Milo J. Radulovich as a reserve officer in the Air Force.

Recommended

For the best background account of what lies behind the anti-Israel maneuvers at the UN: Lillie Schultz's "British Plot Return to Israel" in the November 21 issue of *The Nation*.

Note

The *Weekly* had to go to press early last week because of the Thanksgiving holiday. The Circuit Court decision in the Remington case came too late for this issue and will be discussed in our next.

DON'T BE ALARMED

If you've already renewed and get a letter asking for a renewal—that letter was sent to all subscribers. It would have been too time-consuming and costly to weed out the renewals first. And don't be worried if you get a duplicate some time in the next few weeks. Your name may also have been on one of the lists we are using in the current 50,000 promotion-and-renewal mailing. To those who have already renewed—many thanks for a promptness which enables us to see and plan ahead for the new year. To those who have not yet renewed please do so TODAY if you can, and add a gift sub for a friend who'd like something different out of Washington than the AP pap in his local paper. For the kind words which accompanied many renewals, we are grateful and beg your forgiveness if these have not yet been acknowledged.

With many thanks,

I. F. Stone

JENNINGS PERRY'S PAGE

"Old New Dealers" Meet Under the Magnolias

Not long ago the TV people were looking hard to find one prominent Southern liberal willing to take on Georgia Gov. Herman Talmadge in debate on segregation in the schools, and finally found one. Aubrey Williams had the gizzard to come up from Montgomery, Ala., and say the Supreme Court *ought* to rule there is no such thing under the Constitution as "separate but equal."

Last week, I went down to the one-time capital of the Confederacy to see how else this lean, soft-spoken Alabaman who headed Roosevelt's National Youth Administration is using himself. Clifford and Virginia Durr joined us at dinner.

It was good to be able to come up with them all again, to "catch up" a little on their lives since Washington—where, in those days of reinvigorated democracy, Williams under Harry Hopkins labored to set up the Civil Works program, Durr served as a New Deal member of the Federal Communications Commission and Virginia, from their rambling big frame house in Alexandria, fervently urged and aided the movement to make voting free, in fact, for all in the land.

And now, back home from that stirring scene and time, in their native Deep South? Williams is publisher of Southern Farm and Home, a long-established monthly with wide circulation in the rural areas of the lower states. He himself is a farmer and cattle-raiser, with two sons grown up to share with him in these enterprises. Cliff Durr, who used to lecture on law at Princeton, has his own office now at Montgomery. Virginia is his secretary.

None of these people has changed in spirit or convictions, though their environment at Montgomery, beside the slow-moving waters of the Alabama River, is a far cry from the strenuous life of which they were a part beside the sluggish Potomac. The walls of Williams' office at his modern printing plant, as indeed the walls of his quiet suburban home, are friendly with inscribed photographs from "those days"— of FDR, of Eleanor Roosevelt, of Hopkins, La Follette, Olson. These presences comfort and stay him, he says, when the

Brownells, the McCarthys—and Talmadges "posture as patriots."

As always scholarly and gentle, Cliff Durr cons the liberty-loving philosophers from Milton and Mill to Commager and Conant and traces the lamentable parallel between the persecutions of the early Christians and "atavistic" legal efforts to suppress intellectual freedom in our times.

Stricken by a painful spinal condition after leaving the government service, Durr has recovered completely. His family has been seated at Montgomery for generations, and though undoubtedly his association with the defense in loyalty hearings in the East is held against him by the predominantly conservative elements of his home town, his exemplary virtues of mind and manner cannot but claim for him increasing respect in his profession and community.

As for the irrepressible Virginia, Virginia remains irrepressible, indignant at all social injustice and incapable of complacency. The fight for free suffrage of which she was, in Washington, "la Pasionaria" holds her unabated interest in the far South. Alabama has made some amendment of its restrictive voting laws, but the poll tax still goes before the ballot. "You just don't rest with that," Virginia Durr protests. "It's un-American!"

I went out with Aubrey Williams to his farm—Peace Farm—, a 2,500-acre sweep of wooded hills and bottom pastures in a bend of the Alabama River. The place is remote. Green oat-fields spread along the ridges. A herd of 200 mixed-breed cattle runs in the low meadows, watered by springs that "won't quit." Beside the river and beside the creeks flowing unhurriedly to it, tall live oaks drip pendants of gray moss.

The one-time Youth Administrator's eyes light up at all this. "The neighbors were skittish at first," he says. "We wouldn't cheat the hands, and showed them our books. Now some of them are coming around. Some of them are beginning to give their own tenants a fair shake. We keep calling it 'the New Deal, Alabama speed.'"

Don't Rue It, Do It.

PLEASE RENEW NOW

I. F. Stone's Weekly, 301 E. Capitol, Wash. 3, D. C.

Please renew (or enter) my sub for the enclosed \$5:

Name _____

Street _____

City _____ Zone _____ State _____

Enter this gift sub for \$4 more (money enclosed):

(To) Name _____

Street _____

City _____ Zone _____ State _____

11-30-53

I. F. Stone's Weekly

Room 205

301 E. Capitol St., S.E.

Washington 3, D. C.

NEWSPAPER

Entered as
Second Class Mail
Matter
Washington, D. C.
Post Office

I. F. Stone's Weekly

VOL. I, NUMBER 44

DECEMBER 7, 1953



WASHINGTON, D. C.

15 CENTS

That Fake Pre-Bermuda Tussle With McCarthy

The immediate precipitant of the Dulles statement against "McCarthyism" was Canadian resentment over the Jenner committee in the Gouzenko affair, which has upset negotiations for joint defense facilities with Canada. The tip-off was the passage in which Dulles said "we gain security because of an early warning system which permits of interception and civil defense. But this requires facilities in the friendly countries which are nearer the Soviet Union. Without that such industrial centers as Detroit, Cleveland, Chicago and Milwaukee would be 'sitting ducks' for atomic bombs." It is the Canadian border to which he referred.

Gouzenko Wants to Get Into the Act

Gouzenko's name and whereabouts are no secret in Canada and any newspaperman who wants to interview him can do so—for a fee. Gouzenko feels cheated. Whitaker Chambers, Louis Budenz and Elizabeth Bentley cleaned up on their revelations while Gouzenko has had to be satisfied with a small annuity conferred upon him by a Canadian business man. Gouzenko may yet yield to temptation and cross the border. Book, magazine and movie rights dangle before him.

Ike Will Not Fight McCarthy

McCarthy would like a battle with Ike, but Ike will not fight McCarthy. The President's endorsement of the Dulles statement at the White House press conference last week was cautious, discreet and limited. It was intended to appease the restive British and French at Bermuda. British business men smart under McCarthy's reference to their trade with China. No such spotlight is thrown on West German and Japanese trade with the Communist mainland, and the U. S. itself directly and through Japanese intermediaries has been increasing its trade with China. American cars are conspicuous in Peking.

A Crisis in Western Relations

The British and French attitude toward negotiation with the Russians is diverging sharply from that of the State Department. M. Laniel's difficulties over German rearmament in any form reached their climax before the latest Soviet move was heard of. The British are insisting on a meeting with the Russians while the mood in Bonn is described as "pessimism verging on despair . . . as a result of the combined impact of the Soviet note and the French debate" (*Sunday Times*, London, November 29). Dulles and Adenauer see eye to eye—their objective is to stave off negotiations until the U. S. has financed German rearmament, and then to "push" eastward at the risk of war.

Dulles is still "liberationist" and Eisenhower, a weak and uncertain cipher in the equation of American government, now seems to agree with him. At press conference last week the President said "a breath of freedom" must mean giving the satellite countries the right to determine their own form of government. This and his remark shutting the door even on negotiating about recognition of China shows that the American government is still dead set against a conference with Moscow, and will seek some formula at Bermuda with which to block talks or ensure their failure.

Eisenhower's Strategy

Abroad is to continue the Truman-Acheson policy of "containment" plus, holding the French back from a settlement in Indo-China, restraining the British in their relations with China and leaving Korea as an insoluble sore. At home his Administration will pursue the policy of trying to cut the ground out from under McCarthy by outdoing him in the loyalty purge and in sensations like Brownell's smear of Harry White.

McCarthy and Dulles Both Pro-German

Despite Eisenhower's personal predilections, which count for very little, this is a pro-German orientated Administration. McCarthy, the defender of the Malmedy slayers, will ride herd on the Administration to force it into anti-British and anti-French positions. Dulles has been pro-German at least since the early '30's and despite his "rebuke" of McCarthy has pursued a policy of imposing American will on the Atlantic powers for the benefit of Germany and Japan. The way he rammed the Japanese peace treaty down the throats of London and Paris was an example. In a speech earlier this year Dulles said the U. S. need not take a "popularity poll" before deciding what course to pursue in foreign policy.

Rhee May Upset the Applegart Again

In this situation, Rhee may upset the applegart again. It was the Korean war which enabled Acheson unilaterally to launch Germany on the path of rearmament. A renewal of the Korean war would again "solve" the German problem. The American military in Korea are pro-war and many of the American military in Washington are resentful of the truce and the curb put on them by Eisenhower's big business advisers. Rhee is being encouraged to start the war up again. The logic of the situation indicates that now as in June, 1950, he can force the Administration to support him once the fighting resumes. The Rhee-Chiang visit is a danger signal which should not be ignored.

Fallacies of the Drive for Wiretap Legislation

It Won't Catch Spies, But It Will Police Thoughts

The Federal Communications Act of 1934 makes wire-tapping a crime. In 1937 the Supreme Court (*Nardone v. U.S.*, 302 U.S. 379) rejected the Justice Department's contention that this did not apply to Federal agents. Ever since the Department has been (1) violating the law and (2) trying to get legislation which will authorize the FBI to tap wires. Attorney General Herbert Brownell, Jr., failed to get such legislation last spring. He is using the White affair as a springboard for another attempt.

The impression has been created that if wire-tapping were legal, convictions might have been obtained against those named by Elizabeth Bentley. Thus the New Republic (November 30) says, "The Grand Jury heard the evidence for eighteen months, and decided that no case had been presented against any member of the group that called for court action. Its conclusion was based largely on the inadmissible nature of evidence gained by wire-tapping."

If Elizabeth Bentley told the grand jury what she told the Court under cross-examination in the Remington case (see last week's *Eye-Opener*), there could hardly be an indictment returned against most of the people she named. For she testified that except for the Silvermasters and Ullman, none of the persons from whom she claims to have collected information were told that she was a spy working for the Russians.

The persons named could not be indicted for espionage if according to Miss Bentley herself they did not know that they were helping a spy. It is hard to see what could have been added by wire-tapping. If Miss Bentley herself did not tell these people what she was really doing, they would hardly be discussing it among themselves over the telephone. Wire-taps could show *association*. But the fact that these people associated with each other would not prove espionage.

The Attorney General's summary of the evidence obtained by FBI surveillance shows that only association was uncovered. Though evidence obtained by wire-tapping is inadmissible in a court of law, there was nothing to stop the Attorney General from using facts obtained by wire-tapping in his summary. It would have been the strongest possible argument for the legislation Brownell and Hoover want, if they had said, "We heard two officials planning to obtain a secret document but we could not use this information before the grand jury because it had been obtained by wire-tapping."

Documents cannot be passed by telephone. There must be physical contact. This can be observed. Documents must be filched and photographed. This can also be observed. The strangest thing in this whole story is that though the Silvermasters and Ullman were involved in loyalty proceedings in 1942, three years before Miss Bentley told her story, and were supposed to be using basement photographic equipment for improper purposes, surveillance neither before nor after the Bentley story turned up any evidence. The only fair inference under the circumstances is that there was none to turn up.

The Coplon case is supposed to show the need for permitting wire-taps. It is said that in this case a spy went free because wire-tap evidence was not admissible. But this does not happen to be true. Miss Coplon was tried in Washington and in New York. The conviction in Washington was reversed not because the government had used wire-tapping to investigate espionage but because the FBI had listened in on conversations between Miss Coplon and her lawyer. The Circuit Court of Appeals in the District of Columbia said this was an invasion of her constitutional rights under the Fifth and Sixth amendments "which unqualifiedly guard the right to assistance of counsel" (191 F. 2d 749). Even if wire-tapping were made legal, it would still be illegal to listen in on a lawyer and client preparing for trial.

As for the New York case, the finding of the trial judge, Sylvester Ryan, throws considerable light on wire-tapping in espionage cases. "Careful study of the information obtained on all these interceptions," Judge Ryan ruled, "reveals that at no time was a conversation between Coplon and Gubitchev intercepted; that at no time was either defendant heard mention the name of the other; that the existence of the alleged conspiracy was never discussed in the slightest manner."

The New York conviction was reversed because no warrant had been obtained for the arrest of Miss Coplon and the seizure of the confidential material found in her purse. The conviction was also reversed because the Circuit Court felt that Miss Coplon and her counsel had a right to examine the wire-tap records for themselves extensively enough to determine whether the original tip or later evidence had been obtained by wire-tapping. Only Judge Ryan had seen this evidence (185 F. 2d 629).

According to Judge Ryan's findings, an examination of the records would show that wire-tapping had disclosed only two matters, one irrelevant, the other unnecessary. The irrelevant was "information on her contacts and relationships to one H.S., a male acquaintance" (88 F. Supp. 926). This had no bearing on the charge of espionage. The other information was that she was going to New York on three specific dates, "but this information," as the Circuit Court pointed out in Washington, "was also given to Foley [Miss Coplon's superior in the Justice Department] by the appellant herself."

In the Coplon case, wire-tapping was unnecessary. Coplon and Gubitchev did not communicate by telephone. The reasoning of the two Circuit Courts would have called for reversal even if wire-tapping were legal. The Department of Justice and the FBI were the victims of their own unfair and clumsy tactics.

The existence of legislation permitting wire-taps in such cases would have made a difference in other respects, however. If wire-tapping were legal, Miss Coplon's lawyer would never have been able to learn that the FBI had been listening in on his telephone talks with his client in preparation for trial.

The FBI would also be saved the embarrassment of subpoenas which reveal how extensively it has been tapping wires and what trivial, scandalous and personal material it gathers. The FBI reports seized in Miss Coplon's possession were published at the time and they showed widespread wire-tapping as a means of political surveillance often unconnected with any allegations of crime or threat to internal security.

The reports which came to light in the Coplon case showed that the FBI's criteria of "loyalty" are (as the National Lawyers Guild declared in a comprehensive analysis of the documents at the time) "subjective and reactionary." Affiliation with the Progressive Party, "writing a master's thesis on the New Deal in New Zealand," "opposing the House Committee on Un-American Activities," "making a strong progressive speech which attacked an anti-Semitic teacher," "taking courses under Veblen" and even having Kravchenko's anti-Soviet "I Chose Freedom" in one's library were enough to qualify one for inclusion in an FBI dossier.

Public and private wire-tapping is now so extensive in this country that everyone assumes that it is no longer safe to discuss private affairs of any kind on the telephone. Wire-tapping will catch no spies. But to take off all inhibitions and make wire-tapping by the FBI legal would be to encourage the G-men to expand their work as a political thought police.

(Note: A succeeding issue will provide a study of the wiretap legislation now before Congress.)

I. F. Stone's Weekly

• Editor and Publisher, I. F. STONE

Published weekly except the last two weeks of August at Room 205, 301 E. Capitol St., S.E., Washington 3, D. C. Subscription rates: Domestic, \$5 a year; Canada, Mexico and elsewhere in the Western Hemisphere, \$6; England and Continental Europe, \$10 by 1st class mail, \$15 by air; for Israel, Asia, Australia and Africa, \$10 by first class mail, \$20 by air mail. Single copy, 15 cents. Tel.: LI 4-7087. Entered as Second Class mail matter, Post Office, Washington, D. C.

December 7, 1958



Vol. 1, No. 44

They Keep Re-Heating The Cold War

The Eisenhower Administration is serving warmed over spy at home and warmed over atrocity at the UN. The latest on atrocities (UN Document A/2563) is referred to as a "report" but consists of a "compilation of typical documents" which turns out to be a hodge-podge of affidavits, stapled together in no particular order. The pages are not numbered and the material is not analyzed. There is nothing in it particularly new (See the *Weekly*, No. 40, Special Issue: A Report on An Atrocity Report) but what there is makes one wish a legal commission had been set up to examine the witnesses and documents for itself, instead of depending on these ex parte statements. A few samples will allow the reader to get the flavor for himself.

Some of the incidents hardly seem atrocities but the sort of things which happen in the heat and panic of war. Thus no less than six affidavits are provided on Case No. 639 in which 3 British and 5 Belgian soldiers were killed. These were prisoners captured on the Imjin April 23, 1951. "They were given some food and had not been mistreated at all," one of the documents says, "until a flight of American fighter planes began dropping napalm bombs. The Chinese became frightened and one or more of them started firing at the British and Belgian soldiers."

Page 8 of Part III is the affidavit of a returned American POW who tells how three captured soldiers went looking for food. They were discovered by a Chinese soldier, killed him and started burying his body. Three other Chinese soldiers came upon them. Two of the POW's made a get-away but the third was captured, court martialed and shot.

Case No. 16 makes one wonder just what methods were used to obtain confessions in our own POW camps. This is the affidavit of a North Korean POW on Koje Island, dated August 17, 1951. It says "Prior to my making this statement I have been interrogated by different persons on several different occasions at Waegwan, at Taegu, at Pusan and also here on Koje island. I was also given a lie detector test sometime in October 1950 at Pusan. To my knowledge I have never written or signed any statement. On all of these occasions when I was interrogated I did not exactly lie, however, I also did not relate the complete true facts of the details which occurred in the vicinity of Waegwan between 15 and 17 August 1950. I will now of my own free will, write

the true facts." This is followed by an affidavit by a South Korean War Crimes investigator saying, "no force, threats or promises" were made to extort the confession.

Tricky Tactics

The 2-to-1 decision by the Circuit Court of Appeals in the Remington case serves as a reminder of just how low the government stooped to obtain its one and only conviction growing out of Elizabeth Bentley's spy ring story (see the *Eye-Opener* in last week's issue).

When the Circuit Court two years ago reversed Remington's conviction for perjury in denying to a grand jury that he had ever been a Communist, it did not dismiss the indictment but recommended a new trial. It also gave the defense limited access to the grand jury minutes so that on a new trial the defense could fully explore evidence that the indictment had been unfairly obtained because (1) the foreman of the grand jury was Miss Bentley's literary and financial collaborator and (2) the U.S. Attorney (Irving Saypol), after consulting then Attorney General McGrath, had withheld this information from the defense.

The government, to avoid full exploration of these charges, applied to the Supreme Court for permission to have the indictment dismissed. When this was denied, the government nonetheless shelved the old indictment and went to trial on a second indictment hastily obtained from a new grand jury. The new indictment was based on his testimony in the trial. This novel procedure raised the question of whether the government might, by a succession of indictments for perjury, keep trying a man until it got a conviction which would stick. The Circuit Court has now upheld this conviction, but this time with a dissent by Judge Learned Hand that may help Remington to get a hearing in the Supreme Court.

The majority (Augustus Hand and Swan) declared that even if the first indictment had been illegally procured that would "not permit the defendant to commit a new and independent crime." Learned Hand felt that testimony given by Remington in the trial of the tainted indictment hardly constituted a "new" and "independent" crime. He also objected that improper pressure had been brought to bear by the first grand jury on Remington's former wife Ann, to get her to change her testimony and give evidence against Remington.

Learned Hand's dissent says that after prolonged questioning by the first grand jury, Ann Remington protested that she was getting "fuzzy" from fatigue and hunger. She was refused permission to see her lawyer. The questioning continued and the witness finally broke down, giving the testimony the grand jury wanted, though this consisted largely of communications privileged as between man and wife.

Judge Hand said that Brunini, the foreman of the grand jury, Bentley's collaborator, advised Ann Remington falsely when he told her during this prolonged examination that she had no privilege to refuse to answer the question put to her. Judge Hand thought this ground enough for quashing the first indictment. "It seems to me," he said, "that the case at bar is within the implied ambit of the doctrine of 'entrapment' as well as it is within that of the doctrine against using evidence unlawfully obtained."

THE LONDON TIMES WAS SURPRISED . . .

The *Times* of London Literary Supplement (September 9) reviewing "The Truman Era", a collection of my Washington dispatches and columns published by Turnstile Press in England, said the book "may indeed come as a surprise to those who doubted that the McCarthys and the McCarrans could have so outspoken a critic in the city where 'the Red hearing has become the American equivalent of the bullfight' . . . That this crusade should be conducted with such outspokenness and vigour, even from the very committee rooms and corridors of the Capitol, is, perhaps, testimony in itself to the strength of the American way of life he [Stone] is defending."

Help that fight along by renewing TODAY and, if you can, add a gift subscription for only \$4 more.

I. F. Stone

Jennings Perry: Daring Dulles Peeps in from the Outside

I am so pleased that we did not have to go to war with Canada over Igor Gouzenko that I could pass napkins at a cocktail for John Foster Dulles. This would give me a chance to ask him whether his remarkable Answer to Jenner was a quippish thought, happily tailored for the moment only, or a new doctrine intended to guide our external relations henceforth.

If the latter, we all could indulge in fresh hope for the eventual triumph of sanity.

For what Mr. Dulles has done here is that amiable but for some reason most difficult thing to do—put himself in the place of the other party to a dispute. Instead of cracking down on our Canadian friends for refusing to deliver their ex-spy unconditionally into the hands of the headline-happy Indiana senator, he told the senator he would have taken the same position on behalf of the United States.

You have to admire a stand of that sort on the part of a fellow countryman placed to speak for the nation. It is a stand of understanding, of principle, related to the great philosophy of live and let live, to the Golden Rule itself. And you have to imagine what the effect would be upon the whole community of humanity, on the temper of the times, if more of the same fellow feeling were allowed to enter our bearing toward all other peoples.

Canada is of course on our side, our uranium mine, as it were, and important for bases all along the rim of the arctic. We owe those people some special consideration. But others who also are our friends and valuable to us certainly deserve equal treatment with the "most favored" under the new policy; and still others, at present outside this description, have a right to expect that even they will be touched agreeably by sympathetic orientation of the American point of view.

Great meetings appear to be coming up—at Bermuda, perhaps at Berlin and in the Far East. These will be the conference tables we look to as places for "making our principles prevail." Here the new Dulles Doctrine must be tested.

Britain will press for high level talks with Russia and defend the expansion of her trade with Red China: France will

try to explain her fear of German rearmament and her need to close out the dreary war in Indo-China. Will we have the candor to reply, "Yes, in your place we would feel the same way?"

At the Berlin conference of foreign ministers the Russians also will protest German rearmament and undoubtedly will complain of encirclement by the military forces of "capitalist imperialism." Mr. Dulles will be there: can we depend on him to brush off these representations with the usual comment about "the same old line?"

Or will the other Dulles, the let-principles-prevail Dulles, the Dulles of the Answer to Jenner respond:

"I know exactly how you feel. The Germans have marched on your land, wrecked your cities, slaughtered your people; your nervousness is entirely natural. If you had air bases on our borders from the Pole to the tropics and back to the Pole again, if you were subsidizing our close neighbors, if your great publications constantly were pointing out the vulnerability of our atomic plants and hailing the establishment in our back yard of some new field providing 'a point of return for strategic bombers striking across the Polar zone'—under similar circumstances I would be stating exactly the concern you state on behalf of the United States."

What are the chances that our spokesman will so respond? For the question is not exclusively whether our principles will prevail among others, the benighted: they must also be honored at home—and their enunciation in Mr. Dulles' Answer to Jenner leaves plenty of room for their exercise in other directions.

Our forbearance with Canada is indeed exemplary, and most gratifying if we have set an example for ourselves. Other nations also have their reasons for pride and dignity and for fears for their security. If we recognize and respect them as Mr. Dulles has done in the instance in question, as we recognize and respect our own, the conference tables hereafter will be more profitable for all concerned. It just could be as one result that, understanding others, we should find ourselves better understood.

Don't Rue It, Do It.

PLEASE RENEW NOW

I. F. Stone's Weekly, 301 E. Capitol, Wash. 3, D. C.

Please renew (or enter) my sub for the enclosed \$5:

Name _____

Street _____

City _____ Zone _____ State _____

Enter this gift sub for \$4 more (money enclosed):

(To) Name _____

Street _____

City _____ Zone _____ State _____

12-7-53

I. F. Stone's Weekly

Room 205

301 E. Capitol St., S.E.

Washington 3, D. C.

NEWSPAPER

Entered as
Second Class Mail
Matter
Washington, D. C.
Post Office

I. F. Stone's Weekly

VOL. I, NUMBER 45

DECEMBER 14, 1953



WASHINGTON, D. C.

15 CENTS

Evaluating the Eisenhower Bombshell:

Diplomacy a la B. B. D. & O.

At the very entrance of the difficult path toward peace lie two similar problems. One is the unification of Korea, the other the unification of Germany. These cannot be separated from each other or from the broader context of strategic relations between the two great Powers.

If the Russians were sure, for example, that peace had been made in the Far East, they might be willing to release their hold on Eastern Germany. But it would be folly for them to give up Eastern Germany if there is still danger in the East, for any resumption of hostilities might flare up into world war. Eastern Germany is an additional buffer protecting the borders of the Soviet Union.

There is a similar perspective from Peking. Korea has always been a minor concern of the Chinese Communists, a distinct diversion of their strength away from Formosa and internal construction. A proposal for the unification of Korea and for neutralization would take a military liability off their hands. But such a solution makes sense only if there is to be stability in the Far East. On the other hand, if war is a possibility, if Formosa is to be used as a springboard for intervention, then it hardly makes sense for the Chinese to move back to the Yalu and release the entire Korean peninsula for possible use as an avenue of invasion.

What blocks world peace is that the American government insists on approaching each of these problems in isolation. It wants the Russians to give up Eastern Germany and release their hold on Austria without assuring them of peace in the Far East or even that German bases would not be used as springboards for a new war of "liberation." At the same time, in the Far East, our government wants the Chinese to relinquish the Communist hold on Korea and abandon historic claims to Formosa with no assurance in return of recognition and stable relations.

We are trying to get something for nothing. We do not wish even to give paper promises in return, as shown by the cold shoulder Washington gave Adenauer last summer when he fished about for some "non-aggression" formula with which to sugarcoat for the Russians the loss of the East German buffer. Our desire to dictate instead of negotiating is what haunts our allies, and it is this which must have been the preoccupation of the British and French at Bermuda. They want a formula which might possibly lead to success at the forthcoming negotiations in Berlin. Dulles, on the other hand, merely wants to get the talking over with as rapidly as possible in order to press on with German rearmament and after that with the big push eastward.

When this picture is looked at in the context of the atom

and hydrogen bomb, the outlook is frightful. For resumption of the old German-Slav struggle in the area of atomic warfare, with the U. S., China and Western Europe drawn in, threatens—literally—the destruction of world civilization.

Against this background, it must have been furiously frustrating for Churchill at Bermuda to find serious discussion of these serious questions sidetracked in favor of preparing the gaudy pinwheel of a firecracker President Eisenhower was to set off at the U.N. The President's proposal in its original form, according to British sources, would have been another childish attempt to frighten the Russians with threats of how many and how potent were the atomic weapons in American hands. This was said to have been softened on Churchill's insistence in favor of the "constructive" aspect of the Eisenhower address.

In assessing this, the President's desire for peace and his sincerity need not be questioned. But the naivete is evident enough. If his proposal was intended to change the subject and to confuse the public mind, to give Washington the initiative over Moscow in the headlines, it was well fabricated. It is pure B.B.D.&O.—Burton, Barton, Durstine & Osborne—American publicity and advertising at its chrome-plated best. But it is not diplomacy.

We cannot make up our minds whether to let private American industry in on atomic development for peacetime use. We are unwilling to share our secrets with our closest ally, the British. Ever since we scrapped UNRRA, we have been against giving our help to the rest of the world through international organizations. We hobbled the World Bank and kept Point 4 out of the UN. Suddenly it is proposed that through the UN we set up an agency in which our scientists and Russia's will share the work and the secrets of atomic power development! If Russia ever accepted this, Congress would reject it.

How can Powers arming to the teeth against each other at the same time work together, sharing atomic secrets? How can we oppose every effort to relax world tension, and at the same time put forward a plan which the ever suspicious Russians (and our ever suspicious Congress) could accept only after a period of successful international cooperation on much less touchy subjects?

This is psychological warfare, not peacemaking. The Russians by their first furious reaction have already fallen into the trap. And with only a few weeks to that crucial Berlin conference, the air will again be filled with the mutual recriminations the enemies of peace and the advocates of German rearmament so fervently desire.

I. F. Stone's Weekly

• Editor and Publisher, I. F. STONE

Published weekly except the last two weeks of August at Room 205, 301 E. Capitol St., S.E., Washington 3, D. C. Subscription rates: Domestic, \$5 a year; Canada, Mexico and elsewhere in the Western Hemisphere, \$6; England and Continental Europe, \$10 by 1st class mail, \$15 by air; for Israel, Asia, Australia and Africa, \$10 by first class mail, \$20 by air mail. Single copy, 15 cents. Tel.: LI 4-7087. Entered as Second Class mail matter, Post Office, Washington, D. C.

December 14, 1953



Vol. 1, No. 45

Round the Capitol and the Globe

Towards Full Emancipation: Our readers, we are sure, do not need to be briefed on the school segregation case reargued last week before the U.S. Supreme Court. Nothing is more clear in our generation than the steady progress of the Negro to full emancipation. The South is waging a losing battle—and its leaders know it. Despite the new millionaire Republicans of Texas, the ballot has proven its potency. Both the Democratic and Republican parties through two successive Attorneys General have been compelled by the political power of the Negro to oppose Jim Crow in the schools. The reappearance of John W. Davis, already a half-forgotten figure, to argue for segregation was a symbol. Davis in 1936 was the American Liberty League, and the basic liberties it espoused seems now to have included the "liberty" to keep the Negro down. We believe the hydraulic force of political power and human aspiration will refashion the law to their purpose. We even expect to see the day when the National Press Club, last citadel of segregation in the national capital, admits Negroes to membership, though at the present pace this may be shortly after the Daughters of the Confederacy takes in the NAACP.

Crucial Difference: While American Congressmen junket to Formosa and make pilgrimages to Bonn, a French parliamentary delegation has flown behind the Iron Curtain for a visit to Poland. This was perhaps the most poorly covered story of the week, and we are probably the only publication in

America to give the names and party affiliation of this nine-man delegation. There were two Radical Socialists, former Premier Daladier and Verneuil; two Gaullists, Jacques Soustelle, formerly Secretary General of de Gaulle's R.P.F., and Lebon; two Socialists, Darou and Conte; and one delegate each from the Catholic M.R.P. (Denis), the Peasants (Loustanaunau-Lacau) and Pleven's party, the U.D.S.R. (Lanet). It thus represented every major shade of French opinion except the Communists. Its leaders, Daladier and Soustelle, are leaders of the opposition to the European Army plan. Their announced purpose was to study at first hand the Oder-Neisse territories which the Germans want to recover and a Polish paper, *Trybuna Ludu*, quotes Lebon as saying that the Oder-Neisse line "is extremely important to France."

German Social Democrats on Militarization: In this connection it is worth noting what few if any American papers reported—that in the debate at Bonn on December 2 Ollenhauer, leader of the German Social Democrats, opposed the bill submitted by the Adenauer government to amend the Basic Law of the West German Republic to enable it to raise armed forces for the European Army. Ollenhauer took the position that this would embarrass an East-West understanding and prejudice the position of Germany.

Just Like Wild Bill: Several commentators have pointed out that the desperadoes of the West, despite the romantic views of them derived by President Eisenhower from dime novels, favored the shot in the back as the safest and most expeditious mode of execution. Any doubt that the Eisenhower Administration is going to adopt different methods in dealing with government employes may be set at rest by (1) the Val R. Lorwin case and (2) the remarks Eisenhower made in "attacking McCarthyism" at his December 2 press conference. Eisenhower backtracked on the Wild Bill Hickock speech in which he spoke of the right to confront one's accuser, and said this did not apply to government employes. He also said any subversives located by a Congressional committee will be removed just as promptly as any others. Now Lorwin, a former State Department employe, is to be tried for perjury. He denied in 1950 that he had been a Communist in 1935, and the indictment came just a few days short of the statute of limitations. Since Lorwin has been out of the government for several years (after clearance in

Extra! Elizabeth Bentley Exposes Wire-Tap Drive

Last week's issue, "Exposing: The Fallacies in The Wire-Tap Drive," had hardly appeared on the newsstands when it was unexpectedly confirmed by Elizabeth Bentley herself. Miss Bentley was asked about wire-tapping by Raymond P. Brandt, chief Washington correspondent of the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, when she appeared on Meet-the-Press Sunday December 6. Her answers, though strikingly at variance with Attorney General Brownell and FBI Chief Hoover, were not considered newsworthy by the Associated Press. And so we give the text here as transcribed by NBC:

Q. Attorney General Brownell recommended to the Jenner Committee that there be legislation on wire-tapping. In your contacts with these people, do you think wire-tapping, had [it] been legalized, would have helped make a stronger case against them?

A. In other words, you mean you'd be able to use the information which you obtained through wire-tapping not just as an information lead but as actual concrete evidence?

Q. You can divulge it to a great many people.

Under the law, you cannot divulge what you get from wire-tapping.

A. Probably not in the case of my Soviet agents, because we were so frightened of telephones we never said anything over them. That's been my own experience.

Brandt was startled and repeated the question. This time the romantic Miss Bentley varied her answer:

Q. The real agents did not use the telephone?

A. We used the telephone, yes, but our code was so mixed up that an outsider could not have gotten and understood it.

The first answer, that they were so frightened of the telephone that they never said anything over them, is not quite the same as the second answer, that they used the telephone but kept conversations in code. But the two answers do agree in one respect—that wire-tapping would not have provided proof of espionage. They also dispose of the fallacies, still being propagated by editors who should know better, that Miss Bentley's collaborators were not prosecuted because (as the *Washington Post* said December 7 in an editorial, "The Silent Men"), "wire-tapping was used to expose these offenses."

loyalty proceedings) it is hard to see what purpose this cruel prosecution will serve other than to prove that the Administration can outdo McCarthy.

Subversion from The Sea: William Ullman's umteenth appearance before a Congressional investigating committee last week provided one new angle. Senator Welker of the Jenner committee asked him whether Harvey Cedars, N. J., (where Ullman and Gregory Silvermaster are in the building business) was on the sea. Ullman admitted that it was. Welker then wanted to know whether he ever had visitors from the ocean. Ullman pleaded the Fifth. Welker did not make clear whether he had in mind Russian submarines or indoctrinated mermaids.

Old School Tie Over Africa: Mr. Lyttleton, Secretary of State for the Colonies, in the course of explaining to the House of Commons why he deposed the Kabaka of Buganda: "I had a long talk with the Kabaka this morning. I did not wish to press him into further discussion of political matters more than he wished. He was alone. He feels very severely the loss of his sister, which I am sure the whole House deplores. (Hear, hear.) This conversation could not have been more friendly. It was extremely painful to me because of the dignity and correct bearing of the Kabaka in all these matters. It was all the more painful to me ["and his voice broke here" says the parliamentary reporter] because he is a member of my university and regiment and a friend of my son at Cambridge."

The Lesser Breeds Grow Fairer: Fair procedure was once the Anglo-Saxon pride but it was left to the lesser breeds to raise the elementary point during the UN debate on Korean atrocities. Despite Pakistan's anxiety for American military aid, its representative, Sir Zafrullah Khan, was bold enough to announce that he would abstain on the vote because there had been no hearing. Sir Zafrullah said he had no reason to believe the evidence manufactured but found the tendency not to hear all parties disquieting. The Indonesian delegate also felt the accused should have been given a chance to state their case. The resolution was dutifully voted, but many delegates noted that the documents presented by the American delegation turned out to cover only eight cases, all but one of which occurred in 1950, and that one the Imjin river affair of which we provided a glimpse in last week's issue.

Iran: The problem is a long way from being solved. The populace is not at all happy about recognizing Britain again and Britain is not at all happy about Herbert Hoover, Jr.'s, proposal that the marketing of Iranian oil in the future be handled by a consortium of American and British oil companies instead of by Anglo-Iranian alone. The net effect of "nationalization" seems to be Americanization of Iranian oil.

Chalk Up One for Fair Procedure: The National Labor Relations Board received two well deserved setbacks in the Circuit Court of Appeals in the District of Columbia last week in its effort to act as if the Butler bill were already

Convulsions at the ACLU

The directors of the American Civil Liberties Union are still trying to rewrite its principles against the wishes of its rank-and-file. The *Weekly* in its issue of October 31 disclosed (1) that the directors had sent out three proposed policy statements which would have accepted much of the premises and mechanisms of the American Inquisition, (2) that these had been overwhelmingly rejected in a referendum by the ACLU's affiliates and (3) that the National Board was preparing to set aside the results.

The sequel is now provided by the December issue of the bulletin published by the Northern California branch, the most militant of the ACLU's affiliates. The final vote had shown a majority of 2300 votes against the proposed policy statements. To avoid anything so barefaced as a Board vote to override, the executive committee of the Chicago affiliate was repelled by telephone. It was announced that Chicago, one of the largest affiliates, had shifted and that (under the ACLU's complex weighted system of voting) there was now a 2500 vote majority in favor of the policy statements. But on November 12 the Chicago executive committee adopted a motion to return to its original position.

Perhaps as a result the biennial conference, at which the whole dispute would have been aired, was postponed from Thanksgiving week-end until next February. The national board and the national committee are 3-to-1 for the change in policy. The affiliates, on the other hand, cast all but 600 of their 16,000 votes against it. The rank-and-file in February may yet save the ACLU from abandoning its traditional libertarian principles.

law. That bill would deny the benefits of the NLRB to unions which the Subversive Activities Control Board found to be Communist dominated. The NLRB tried to withdraw collective bargaining privileges from the Fur Workers because Ben Gold, its leader, is under indictment (though not yet convicted) of falsely swearing in his Taft-Hartley non-Communist affidavit. The Board also threatened to withhold NLRB privileges from the Fur Workers, the U.E. and the American Communications Association unless their officer reaffirmed their Taft-Hartley oaths. The Circuit Court ruled against the NLRB in appeals from both actions and Judge Bazelon commented, "To impose this penalty upon the great mass of innocent union members is as reckless as firing a shotgun into a crowd of people in an attempt to stop one who is picking their pockets."

To Be Filed But Not Forgotten: On December 7, 1953, twelfth anniversary of Pearl Harbor, Air Secretary Harold E. Talbott made a speech announcing that the U.S. would help Japan build another air force.

TO AN ANXIOUS SUBSCRIBER

A Mr. J. H. B. in upstate New York was good enough to subscribe early in November and now inquires anxiously why the expiration date under his name and address has not been changed. Other sharp eyed readers may be asking the same question. The answer is that the new plates for renewals are going to be made all at once, for reasons of efficiency and economy. The fact that the change has not yet appeared on your name plate does not mean that your renewal has gone astray. Also—those who subscribe early lose nothing thereby. The renewal counts from your expiration date, not from the date of renewal. But those readers who have sent in their renewals early—an amazingly large number—have saved our tiny office the burden of handling all renewals in one mad rush. They have also brought the encouraging news that the *Weekly* can face its second year with confidence. Renew now if you can, and give a gift subscription to help us grow. The response so far has given yours truly fresh heart.

J. F. Stone

Two Appeals to The Courts Against The Witch Hunt

Sooner or later, the courts will be forced to interfere with the witch hunt. There is ample precedent for such interference in past cases where the courts intervened to protect property rights from Congressional investigation. The value of filing motions to quash subpoenas and applications for injunctions (just like Jay Cooke and Harry Sinclair) is that such actions, though unsuccessful at first, will serve to build a record of sober affidavit and pleading which must eventually have their impact on the courts.

One such action was initiated in the Federal district court in New York last week by Mrs. Eleanor Hutner, who appeared as a witness in executive session during McCarthy's Fort Monmouth hearings.* She asked that McCarthy be enjoined from questioning her again in public session. Judge Clancy refused her petition on December 8 but her counsel, Victor Rabinowitz, says an appeal will be taken.

In her petition, Mrs. Hutner said her employment at Fort Monmouth terminated ten years ago, that she has had no contact since with Fort Monmouth or the Signal Corps, that her job required no technical training and that she had no access to confidential or secret material. Mrs. Hutner at an executive session of the McCarthy committee on October 13 denied that she had ever committed espionage, or given classified material to any Communist or to the Rosenbergs. Mrs. Hutner did not invoke the Fifth amendment until asked about her personal political beliefs.

An injunction was asked on the ground that the legislation under which the Government Operations Committee was established (see text in the *Weekly* for July 25) gave it no authority to investigate "subversion" or possible commission of crime. No purpose would be served, it was pleaded, by recalling Mrs. Hutner for a public session, except to hurt her health and reputation. (Another woman witness in the

* An article by Walter Millis, "The Scandal at Fort Monmouth," in the *New York Herald-Tribune* (Dec. 8) supports the charges made six weeks earlier by this *Weekly* ("McCarthy's Hoax and The Real Radar Scandal," Oct. 24) and says McCarthy's hearings have wrecked this "sensitive military installation . . . more thoroughly than any Soviet saboteur could have dreamed of doing."

The Informer: Self-Portrayed

"The informer is different, particularly the ex-Communist informer. He risks little. He sits in security and uses his special knowledge to destroy others. He has that special information to give because he knows these others' faces, voices and lives, because he once lived within their confidence, in a shared faith. . . . If he had not done those things he would have no use as an informer. Because he has that use, the police protect him. When they whistle, he fetches a soiled bone of information. . . . He is no longer a man. He is free only to the degree in which he understands what he is doing and why he must do it. Let every ex-Communist look unblinkingly at that image. It is himself."—Whittaker Chambers: *Witness*, p. 454.

Fort Monmouth hearings had a miscarriage; she was threatened with the electric chair.) The application said the hearing resembled a grand jury proceeding, except that there were constant "leaks" to the press and the supposedly executive sessions were attended "by friends and perhaps relatives of the Senator."

A Drive to Coerce Informing

A similar motion to quash subpoenas issued by the Velde committee was denied by Federal Judge Goodman in San Francisco. There the grounds were narrow—that the subpoenas failed to specify where the hearings would be held. The action was brought by the American Civil Liberties Union of Northern California, on behalf of eight witnesses.

"All of them," the Northern California ACLU explains, "either dropped out of the Communist party or were expelled from four to eight years ago. Several of them have had repeated visits from FBI agents who have sought unsuccessfully to secure names of persons who were in the party with them. One witness, who lives in a small town, has had two agents come to his home once a month during a six months period. The agents suggested that unless he cooperated with them he would not be able to stay in the town. . . ."

Don't Rue It, Do It.

PLEASE RENEW NOW

I. F. Stone's Weekly, 301 E. Capitol, Wash. 3, D. C.

Please renew (or enter) my sub for the enclosed \$5:

Name _____

Street _____

City _____ Zone _____ State _____

Enter this gift sub for \$4 more (money enclosed):

(To) Name _____

Street _____

City _____ Zone _____ State _____

12-14-53

I. F. Stone's Weekly

Room 205

301 E. Capitol St., S.E.

Washington 3, D. C.

Entered as
Second Class Mail
Matter
Washington, D. C.
Post Office

NEWSPAPER

I. F. Stone's Weekly

VOL. I, NUMBER 46

DECEMBER 21, 1953



WASHINGTON, D. C.

15 CENTS

Dulles As Germany's (Wobbly) Trojan Horse

The Dulles warning to France went over big here with the "go it alone" crowd; "go it alone" means go it alone with Germany and Japan. Dulles claims to be Francophile, but even Dulles's hatred for Communism and Hitler's pact with the Soviet Union did not keep him from opposing aid to Britain and France in 1939 and 1940. Union of Germany and France as he advocates it is an old pan-German and Hitlerite conception (see pages 104 and 105 of George Seldes's fascinating new autobiography, "Tell the Truth and Run"). It means domination of France and West Europe by the Reich.

Dulles has alarmed his friends, the Germans, who fear a new "encirclement" via another Franco-Russian entente. Moscow and Warsaw have been helped in their campaign to woo the French. This is one in a series of blunders which reflect Dulles's animosity to the British and French, and the arrogance behind his sanctimonious phrases. The British are annoyed over the way he has interfered in Iran and Egypt, and blocked their adhesion to the Anzus pact with their own Pacific dominions. The Catholic M.R.P., chief mainstay of

Atlantic Pact policy in France, would like to negotiate an end of the Indo-Chinese war but are frustrated by an American veto. While Italy wants Trieste as the price of adhesion to the EDC, the Soviet zone has elected a Yugoslav as secretary of the Danube Commission. "Containment" is cracking up.

The threat of French isolation was undercut by Dulles himself and next day by Defense Secretary Wilson. What happens to that "agonizing reappraisal" when Dulles said at Paris that the failure to approve the EDC would not upset the Atlantic Pact? And Wilson next day, without making ratification of EDC a condition, spoke of giving atomic weapons to France and other NATO members? Geography is in the way of an ultimatum. France is a necessary bridgehead for an American invasion of Europe. As an Atlantic power, America must inevitably defend the other shore of the Atlantic against attack whether from Germany or Russia. France can always lock the Reich in a military straitjacket by a new Eastern Pact. If France has the moral courage, she can make both Washington and Moscow dance to her tune.

European Prototype of Ike's Atom Plan

The U. S. is in danger of falling behind in the race to develop the peacetime uses of atomic energy. France in June of last year and Britain last December launched atomic power programs. Both countries are also participants in an organization of which little has been heard in this country—the European Organization for Nuclear Research established in May of 1952 to study the non-military uses of the atom. The other governments participating are Belgium, Denmark, Western Germany, Greece, Italy, the Netherlands, Yugoslavia, Norway, Sweden, and Switzerland. A \$30,000,000 laboratory is being erected in Geneva, where construction was approved in a referendum over Communist opposition after safeguards were adopted permitting the Swiss to shut the project down in event of war. Three Soviet satellites, Czechoslovakia, Hungary and Poland, were invited to participate originally but turned the offer down. There are some in Washington who regard the Eisenhower atomic proposal as an effort to take

this purely European project over, as the Brussels pact was taken over in the Atlantic Pact.

The new Eisenhower plan finds favor in Congressional circles only as a kind of atomic "Marshall Plan" enabling the U. S. to control West European research and development. Both the peacetime development program and the new proposal to make atomic weapons available to NATO will provoke a strong demand in Congress for an international agency to coordinate security safeguards for all the participating countries. The FBI, long jealous of the CIA and the OSS, has already established a beachhead on this assignment with the White House announcement last week that the FBI had been formally assigned the task of investigating all Atomic Energy Act violations, including illegal *export* of materials. Western Europe will be under strong pressure to adopt "American" standards of security as condition for any change in the Atomic Energy Act.

That Korean Truce Talk "Insult"

The Chinese Communists charge that the American military connived in the mass breakout of POW's may have been false, but there is reason to believe that the UN command looked with benevolent eye on South Korean arrangements for this truce violation. Robert Sherrod, writing "The Inside Story of the Korean Truce" from *Seoul* (and therefore subject to censorship) for the *Saturday Evening Post* (October 17) said that last March "our Far East Command made a daring proposal of its own—one which was never published. Why

not turn loose the 46,000 anti-Communist prisoners, first the North Koreans, then the Chinese? Wouldn't that automatically solve the prisoner question?" Sherrod wrote, "Such cold war tactics gave Washington cold feet. The answer to Tokyo was No." But the first part of this "daring proposal" of the Far East Command was carried out by Syngman Rhee. The guard was not stiffened to prevent further breakouts until there were protests to Washington from allied capitals, and from Washington to Tokyo.

The Hounded Champions of The Alien Meet in Chicago . . .

Chicago—Walsh's Hall at 1014 Noble Street might have been the scene of the Hunky wedding in Upton Sinclair's *Jungle*. The Hall lies in a Polish area, one of those incomparably dreary Chicago working class districts which sprawl out across the bare plain, miles away from the opulence of Lake front and Loop. The building is a three-story walk-up, on the top floor of which is the "hall," a barn of a place, with a stage at one end and a small, faintly and grotesquely Moorish balcony at the other. High columns intended to be ornamental line the wall on either side; they appear to be ordinary cast iron waterpipe stood on end by some plumber aspiring in his spare time to architecture. The windows are long and narrow. Through them, even under a cloudless sunny sky, the wintry Chicago landscape managed to look gray and bleak—row on row of ill-matched dirty brick and unpainted facades with gaps of dismal backyard in which there stood a few forlorn trees.

The hall was freshly hung with blue and white banners—"The Bill of Rights Belongs to All," "Stop Police State Terror Against Foreign Born Americans," "Public Hearings on the Lehman-Celler Bill." On the stage, against the faded green trees of what appeared to be a set left over from some forgotten performance of "As You Like It," a big benevolent bear of a woman, six feet tall with gray hair, grandmotherly expression, and one of those round unmistakable Russian Jewish faces, was reading aloud Eisenhower's campaign pledge to revise the McCarran-Walter Act. The woman was Pearl Hart, a Chicago lawyer famous throughout the Midwest for a lifetime of devotion to the least lucrative and most oppressed kind of clients.

This was the opening session of a National Conference to Repeal the Walter-McCarran Law and Defend Its Victims, sponsored by the American Committee for the Protection of the Foreign Born, one of the last functioning Popular Front organizations.

A Hounded Handful

At that early morning hour the seats beside the long wooden tables set up in the hall were but half filled. That such a meeting should be held at all was something of a miracle. The American Committee for the Protection of the Foreign Born is on the Attorney General's list. It is now involved in proceedings before the Subversive Activities Control Board to compel the Committee's registration under the McCarran Act as a Communist front organization. Its devoted executive secretary, Abner Green, a tall, lean man with the kind of long cavernous face Goya liked to paint, served six months in jail after refusing to hand over the organization's records to a Federal grand jury in July, 1951. The Secretary of the local Los Angeles committee, Rose Chernin, was unable to attend because she is under bond in denaturalization proceedings. The Secretary of the Michigan committee, Saul Grossman, who was present in Chicago, goes on trial in Washington this week for contempt of Congress in refusing to hand his records over to the House Un-American Activities Committee.

Despite this, about 300 delegates from 16 States had arrived, some from as far as Seattle and Los Angeles, and 150 more were to follow. They seemed, considering the circumstances, an extraordinarily cheerful lot. But looking at them during the day one was fascinated by several observations. The first was that the audience was a forest of gray heads, almost entirely made up of elderly folk—those who appeared young in that gathering were, when one looked at them more closely seen to be middle aged. This is unfortunately true of most radical meetings in America nowadays; it is as if those with their lives still ahead of them are too cautious or cowed to appear at such affairs. What struck one next about the gathering was the absence of foreign accents—with few ex-

In the Footsteps of the Holy Office

"One of the conditions [for escaping the stake] was that of stating all they knew of other heretics and apostates, which proved an exceedingly fruitful source of information as, under the general terror, there was little hesitation in denouncing not only friends and acquaintances, but the nearest and dearest kindred—parents and children, and brothers and sisters."

—Lea's Spanish Inquisition, Vol. 1, p. 165

ceptions one heard American speech indistinguishable from that of the native born. Assimilation has done its work and relatively few new immigrants are coming in. One also began to notice that though the deportation drive hits the labor unions hard, there were no labor union representatives present, other than men from a few so-called "progressive" locals. The Left labor leaders were conspicuous by their absence; the Taft-Hartley oath made their appearance at the meeting of a blacklisted organization too hazardous.

The Only Organization of Its Kind

Not so many weeks ago the case of an Air Force officer named Radulovich attracted national attention. He was about to be blacklisted as a security risk because his father and sister were supposed to have Communist views or connections. Edward Murrow put the case into a brilliant TV show and the Secretary for Air finally cleared Radulovich. But this comparative handful of elderly folk in Chicago were fighting a last ditch battle for a thousand and one other Raduloviches arrested—as the elder Radulovich may be—for deportation. This Committee, just 21 years old, is the only one of its kind.

On the eve of the conference, the American Committee for the Protection of the Foreign Born was given the treatment. The local Hearst paper published a smear attack and telephoned the Committee's various sponsors and scheduled speakers in an effort to frighten them off. The campaign failed. Among those who spoke at the banquet in that same hall that night were Professor Louise Pettibone Smith, Professor Emeritus of Biblical History at Wellesley; Professor Robert Morss Lovett, and Professor Anton J. Carlson, the University of Chicago's famous physiologist, who had not intended to speak but changed his mind after a call from the Hearst press. The sight of these three aged academic Gibralters of liberalism was inspiring, but again it was sad to note that the distinguished speakers—like the audience—were elderly.

Sick and Elderly Victims

An amazingly large proportion of the victims, too, are elderly. In his comprehensive report, Abner Green pointed out that of 300 non-citizens arrested in deportation proceedings, almost one-third—93 in all—are over the age of 60 and have lived in this country an average of 40 to 50 years. The kind of sick and aged folk being hauled out of retirement for deportation as a political menace to this country would be ludicrous if it did not entail so much tragedy. Two cardiac patients, Refugio Roman Martinez and Norman Tallentire, died of heart attacks in deportation proceedings. The economist and writer, Lewis Corey, long an anti-Communist, died September 16 at the age of 61 in the midst of deportation proceedings begun against him because he was a Communist 30 years ago. In California, a Mrs. Mary Baumert of Elsinore, now 76 years old, was arrested last month for deportation although she had lived here 51 years. In Los Angeles on

... A First-Hand Full Report from A Lonely Battlefield

November 4, Mr. and Mrs. Lars Berg, 69 and 67 respectively, were locked up on Terminal Island for deportation to their native Sweden; they have been American residents since 1904. One Finn arrested for deportation has lived here since he was 3 months old!

As in the days of the Inquisition, the Immigration and Naturalization Service and the FBI are engaged in using fear to recruit informers, even informers against their own kin. A striking case was that of Francesco Costa of Rochester, N. Y., arrested for deportation to Italy at the age of 83 because he refused to provide information to the Justice Department that could be used to deport his son, Leonard, to Italy. A triple squeeze play was brought to bear on Clarence Hathaway, once editor of the *Daily Worker*. When he declined to be used as an informer, denaturalization proceedings were brought against his wife, Vera. Her brother, William Sanders, 55, an artist who had never engaged in politics, was himself arrested after he refused to give testimony against his sister. Sophie Gerson, wife of Simon W. Gerson, one of those acquitted in the second Smith Act trial of New York Communist leaders, was arrested for denaturalization to punish her husband.

The Savage Unfairness of the Left Itself

By a political Freudian slip, no mention was made at the conference of one of the worst cases of this kind. In the Fall of 1952, Earl Browder and his wife were indicted for perjury in her original immigration proceedings and in February of this year Mrs. Browder was arrested for deportation. These punitive actions followed a warning from Bella Dodd to Earl Browder (see this *Weekly*, No. 7, March 7, 1953) that he had better show some sign of "cooperation." Though the ex-Communist leader in lonely poverty has withstood the temptations of the rewards which would be his were he to sell his "memoirs" to the FBI and the magazines, little consideration has been shown him. This reflects the savage unfairness with which the Left treats its heretics, however honorably these heretics behave.

The deportations drive cuts across every basic liberty. Fifteen editors associated with the radical and foreign language press have been arrested for deportation or denaturalization, including Cedric Belfrage of *The National Guardian*, Al Richman of the West Coast *Peoples World*, and John Steuben of *The March of Labor*. The foreign language editors arrested are elderly folk editing papers which are dying out as the process of assimilation steadily cuts into the number of Americans who still read the language of "the old country." Almost one-third of those arrested for deportation are trade union members or officials. Ever since the Bridges cases began (the government shamelessly is about to launch a fourth try), the use of deportation as a weapon against labor militants has been overt and obvious. Cases are pending against James Matles and James Lustig of the United Electrical Workers and against the wife of William

Senter, of St. Louis, another U.E. official, now up on Smith Act charges.

The Nowak Case

One of the leading victims of the current drive, Stanley Nowak, was present in Chicago. After ten years as a Democratic member of the Michigan State Legislature, part of this time as floor leader, he is facing denaturalization proceedings. This Polish born legislator played a role in the organization of the automobile industry and was first elected to the legislature in 1938 from the West Side area of Detroit, a Ford worker constituency. Similar charges ten years ago ("communist and anarchist sympathies") were dismissed with an apology by then Attorney General Biddle but have been revived under the McCarran-Walter Act.

The most numerous and widespread abuses have occurred in the treatment of Mexican-Americans. Reports to the conference from Los Angeles pictured terror and lawlessness—the use of roadblocks and sudden raids on areas in which persons of Mexican origin live, the invasion of their homes without warrants, the exile to Mexico of native born Americans of Mexican parentage. The Mexican-American community is kept steadily "churned up" to maintain it as a source of cheap labor in constant flux. Green reported that during the first six months of 1953 more than 483,000 persons were deported to Mexico—while almost half a million others were being brought in for low paid agricultural work.

The government is using "supervisory parole" to harass and intimidate radicals who cannot be deported because no other country will accept them. Three Communist leaders convicted under the Smith Act, Alexander Bittelman, Betty Gannett and Claudia Jones, out on bail pending appeal, were summoned to Ellis Island recently. They were told that they were being put under supervisory parole, must report once a week, submit to physical and psychiatric examination, abandon all political activity and give information under oath as to their associations and activities. They are challenging the order in the courts.

Snaking Up to St. Patrick

Last March 17 Attorney General Brownell made a particularly vulgar St. Patrick's Day speech to the Friendly Sons of St. Patrick—their parents once the target of similar anti alien hysteria. In this he announced that 10,000 citizens were being investigated for denaturalization and 12,000 aliens for deportation as "subversives." Action on this scale would dwarf the notorious deportation raids of the early twenties.

The suffering in terms of broken families and disrupted lives is beyond the most sympathetic imagination. As serious is the moral degradation imposed by spreading terror. People are afraid to look lest they be tempted to help, and bring down suspicion on themselves. This is how good folk in Germany walked hurriedly by and shut their ears discreetly to tell-tale screams. The American Committee for the Protection of the Foreign Born is fighting to keep America's conscience alive.

WHAT BETTER SURPRISE FOR THE SAGGING STOCKING —

Of a friend with sagging spirits than a gift subscription to our little weekly? A weekly reminder that the world has not yet come to an end, that free journalism is still possible in America, that there is resistance, that Fascism has not yet arrived—and may not come at all if we can hang on fighting until the old American spirit reawakens. Renew TODAY and give a gift subscription to a friend if you can. This week's special report from Chicago is a sample of the kind of job no other publication is doing. Extra copies are available. Merry Christmas, and be of good cheer.

I. F. Stone

JENNINGS PERRY'S PAGE

Even Fear Won't Work in a World Scared Stiff

The next bomb we loose at Eniwetok, they tell us, well may obliterate Eniwetok. Secretary Dulles ought to go first to warn the gooney birds. Not that the birds would be likely to thank him with anything but indignation. They have no place to go. But we owe them the same chance we have given the Europeans to cooperate or perish unwept; and in his own feeling Mr. Dulles would be prepared for the rebuff.

He should have been prepared when he went to Paris to put the heat on the Europeans, for it is not necessary nowadays to go far from home to find out that living things have run just about as far as they will go. Had he waited only one more day in Washington he would have had an illuminating preview of the kind of response his threat was fated to evoke over there.

As it was, he and Val Peterson had the same row to hoe at the same time: while Dulles was laying it down to the ministries over there the Civil Defense Administrator was laying it down to the American mayors. The alarm and notice from the government at Washington were the same. "Stir yourselves," Dulles told the Europeans, "or be responsible for your own doom." "Your cities are sitting ducks," Peterson told the mayors. "It's up to you." The alarm fell as flat, the resentment flared as promptly in one case as in the other.

Perhaps the reaction at home would have made no difference in our course abroad. However had Mr. Dulles waited, he would at least have known what to expect *la bas*, since anybody could have foreseen that a proposition—a threat—which so signally failed to impress even the astute and provident heads of our own centers of population would not be convincing to the less enlightened leaders of lesser breeds across the seas. M. Bidault might be as ready to make sacrifices for the security of France as is Mayor Clark for the security of Philadelphia; but when Mayor Clark concedes that American cities will not strain themselves to organize and support civil defense, it hardly can be surprising that M. Bidault and many of his countrymen are reluctant to accept the rearming of Germany as vital to *their* defense.

The question remains of why on both sides of the Atlantic

the fearful picture our government paints does not electrify the people; and the answer lies, I suspect, both in the out-size of the picture and the inconsistency of its details. One day our President describes, in tons of TNT "equivalent," the new weapons poised to destroy civilization; the next our Secretary of State brusquely admonishes the French to compose their differences with the Germans, and ratify the EDC pact, on pain of being cast loose to "commit suicide alone." The logical French immediately ask why with something really big like global suicide in the wind the United States does not make the same all-out effort to compose its differences with the Russians that we urge upon them with regard to their enemy?

We tell them shortly to put aside an ancient rivalry and "trust Adenauer." The French reply that it is the East-West rivalry which menaces all existence, not just the existence of two nations—and why don't we look for a little good faith in Malenkov?

The particular anxieties are engulfed in the overriding anxiety. The American mayors have heard over and over of the new bombs that can wipe out whole cities and the countryside around them, that "the only way to win the next war is to prevent it." When they are called upon to raise the funds with which to build defenses for their citizens, they ask what defenses? and what hole they could find the means to dig that would save their city in the event the city should have time to reach the hole?

Mr. Dulles pointedly hints to the Europeans that without better cooperation the American army may withdraw; Mr. Peterson informs our cities, now "in the front line," that unless they fend for themselves federal funds and the armed forces will be inadequate to preserve them. The free world friends and the local magistrates seem inclined to the view that the "threat" Washington dwells upon already is too big for them.

The evidence is that even one more atomic object lesson at Eniwetok would be supererogatory.

Don't Rue It, Do It.

PLEASE RENEW NOW

I. F. Stone's Weekly, 301 E. Capitol, Wash. 3, D. C.

Please renew (or enter) my sub for the enclosed \$5:

Name _____

Street _____

City _____ Zone _____ State _____

Enter this gift sub for \$4 more (money enclosed):

(To) Name _____

Street _____

City _____ Zone _____ State _____

12-21-53

I. F. Stone's Weekly

Room 205

301 E. Capitol St., S.E.

Washington 3, D. C.

NEWSPAPER

Entered as
Second Class Mail
Matter
Washington, D. C.
Post Office

I. F. Stone's Weekly

VOL. 1, NUMBER 47

DECEMBER 27, 1953



WASHINGTON, D. C.

15 CENTS

Ike Enlists in The Witch-Hunt

"I was not displeased at anything I heard," McCarthy said on leaving the White House legislative conference last week-end. He had reason to be gratified. The President had enlisted under his banner and Brownell's in the witch-hunt. The period of coy disclaimers and vapid invocations of Wild Bill Hickok are over. The man who was unwilling to turn his back on the traducers of his friend and patron, General Marshall, again demonstrates the flexible conscience he brought to the game of politics. The full weight of the White House is to be put behind the twin bills Brownell, J. Edgar Hoover, and McCarthy want: a bill to legalize wire-tapping and give the secret police carte blanche to pry into everyone's private conversation; a bill to force witnesses to give up their Fifth Amendment privilege against self-incrimination.

The liberal organizations—ACLU, ADA—which testified

"against" the wiretap bills last spring all added if and butts adequate for the witch hunt's purpose. They all agreed that in suspected cases of espionage, sedition, sabotage and treason, the FBI should have the right to tap wires and use the evidence. This is broad enough to run a highway through—the highway to Fascism. Wire-tapping will be used to collect "seditious utterance" and evidence of "guilt by association". The circular reasoning of the loyalty purge—A is suspect because he knows B and B because he knows C and C because he knows A—will make its appearance in criminal proceedings. As for the immunity bill, its real purpose is to force radicals to run the hazards of perjury contests against pet informers or go to jail for contempt. Many now invoking the Fifth are innocent of any crime but fearful of undergoing the kind of ordeal to which Hiss, Remington and Lattimore have been subjected.

The Meaning of the Beria Case for America

For the sake of remaining in political power, fearing an unfavorable verdict at the polls in a fair campaign, the Republicans are revising history, defaming the dead and launching on a campaign of smear and terror to remain in power. A similar process is taking place in our great adversary and mirror-image, the Soviet Union, though in a more advanced stage of degeneration. Beria, one of Stalin's closest associates all through the Great War, was arrested five months ago, held incommunicado and is now to be tried as a lifetime agent of foreign intelligence and capitalist imperialism. This fantastic rubbish is shielded from examination, since the prosecution has invoked the Kirov law of 1934 which provides for trials in secret, without counsel or right of appeal, and for the immediate death penalty. Apparently Beria was unwilling to "confess"; the methods he himself used in the past seem to have failed to break him in turn.

More of the same may be expected from Moscow, since Dekanozov, one of the three other Georgians accused with

Beria, has been closely associated with Molotov as deputy foreign minister since 1940. Trumped up charges, distortions of motive and past events, are being used there as here in a political power struggle. America is still a long way from the Russian pattern, but a few more years of the current trend will bring us closer. The weakening of the right to counsel, the invasion of privacy, the policing of political ideas, the acceptance of the notion that the security of the State excuses possible injustice to the individual, the establishment even in the courts of the idea that the FBI may withhold the source of evidence to protect its sources of information, the cloak thrown over the malicious and the crackpot, the informer and the perjurer—all these are in the totalitarian pattern. On one side, as in some Orwellian nightmare, serried ranks of Communists are taught to believe without question any charge against those whom they had but yesterday honored—on the other side, the same regimented gullibility of the American style, McCarthy era, anti-Communist. On either side, to doubt is dangerous; to question is to make oneself suspect.

The Grave-Robbers of The G. O. P.

Pertinax wrote of the grave-diggers of France: the men who betrayed her to Fascism. Some day an American perhaps in exile will write of the grave-robbers of America. The G.O.P. campaign this year depends more and more on one dead man, Harry D. White, exhumed in the witch hunt; others march behind a flag, the Republicans behind a corpse.

As our own contribution to justice and sanity, we are devoting this entire issue to examination of the latest charge against White—that he violated his duty and "stole" the German mark occupation plates for the Russians. This accusa-

tion, unlike most made against him, has the virtue of being concrete and specific. In addition, it also has the advantage that it can be studied in the light of an earlier investigation. How often the same *canards* are being warmed over! Even without a trial, with no chance to cross-examine the informer involved, merely on the meagre basis of some documentary material, enough can be learned to show just what flimsy, spurious and mangy tripe is being served up to the American people as the campaign of 1954 gets underway. Beginning on page two is the story, with the citations, so the reader may judge for himself.

Harry White and The German Currency Plates:

Elizabeth Bentley Comes Up With A Brand-New One

I

In her book, "Out of Bondage", Elizabeth Bentley writes (p. 241), "He (William Ludwig Ullman) also brought me samples of the marks the United States was preparing for use in the German occupation. The Russians were delighted, as they were planning to counterfeit them. However, due to a complicated ink process this proved impossible—until I was able through Harry Dexter White to arrange that the United States Treasury Department turn the actual printing plates over to the Russians!"

This was the story Miss Bentley elaborated in her appearance this Fall before Senator Mundt (R. South Dakota) sitting as a one-man subcommittee of the McCarthy committee. Miss Bentley testified (*Transfer of Occupation Currency—Espionage Phase: Committee on Government Operations*, U. S. Senate 83rd Congress, 1st Session, pps. 28-31) that she was instructed in late 1943 or early 1944 "that the Russians were very much interested in American occupation currency for Germany in the event that we won the war, and I was asked to contact Gregory Silvermaster, who was head of the Silvermaster group, and Ludwig Ullman, and to put pressure on Mr. Harry D. White in the Treasury to procure samples of this occupation currency."

Wrapped, Like Fish, In A Newspaper

Miss Bentley testified that she relayed these instructions. "I can't remember whether it was the next meeting 2 weeks later, or the next after that, but I believe it was Mr. Ullman who produced 2 or 3 samples of occupation marks, which he gave to me wrapped in a newspaper. He informed me that they were very valuable, and they must be returned before they were missed; that we could only borrow them to photograph them."

Ullman, according to her testimony on other occasions, is supposed to have had a dark room and a "Contax" camera in the basement of the Silvermaster home in which to photostat documents for the Russians. No one asked her why, if the sample marks were so valuable that "they must be returned before they were missed," they were not photographed then and there by Ullman. Instead Miss Bentley says she took them to New York "and delivered them to my Soviet contact, Bill."

"Put Pressure On White"

But at her next meeting or the one after, the sample marks "were returned to me," Miss Bentley related, "with the comment that they were unable to photograph them so that they would be useful, and that therefore we must ask the Silvermasters to put pressure on Mr. White to turn over the plates for making the marks to the Russians." The subcommittee's assistant counsel pressed for more details:

Mr. La Venia. Miss Bentley, when you were given your original instructions from Bill, your Russian contact, was there any indication given to you why Bill wanted copies of the currency?

Miss Bentley. Not in so many words, but it was implicit in it. Obviously you would not want occupation currency unless you could use it for counterfeiting.

It was on this testimony that Senator Mundt based an "interim report" last week (83rd Congress, 1st Session, Report No. 837) finding that White "the Communist agent involved in espionage . . . a trusted official of the Treasury . . . procured the samples of the Allied military mark in direct compliance with orders from his Russian superiors. This was done with full knowledge that the Russian government contemplated resorting to counterfeiting and forgery if necessary to accomplish their desires."

Two other associates of White, V. Frank Coe and Harold Glasser, are linked to the plot by the Mundt report, though a careful reading of the report and Mundt's own hearings will show that there is no evidence either participated in the decision to give these plates to the Russians. Coe testified that he did not enter the Treasury until 10 months later and the documents on which Glasser's name appears as a conferee deal with later negotiations to determine a rate of exchange for the Allied occupation marks.

The Mundt subcommittee also heard two "friendly" witnesses who were in the Treasury at the time and opposed the transfer of the plates to the Russians. One was Alvin W. Hall, still director of the Treasury's Bureau of Engraving and Printing. The other was Daniel W. Bell, then Under Secretary of the Treasury, now president of a Washington, D. C., bank. Both said the Treasury was reluctant to hand over the plates. Mundt and his assistant counsel tried hard to get some unfavorable testimony from them about White. Hall was asked by La Venia, "Do you recall anyone in the Department who constantly kept the negotiations open rather than turning down the Russian request?" Hall's answer was, "I don't know of anyone who kept it alive, except the Russians perhaps." Mundt tried a broader and more leading question:

Senator Mundt. During your tour of duty during the last long period of years, did any people in the Treasury Department ever arouse any suspicion in your mind that they might be a little bit overzealous in encouraging a Russian point of view, or being of assistance to the Russian Government from the standpoint of this monetary transaction?

Mr. Hall. I couldn't say, Senator, that I suspected anybody for any sabotage or espionage at all.

Mundt Was Charitable

"Of course," Senator Mundt commented charitably, "it must be remembered that that was a time when we were an ally of Russia, and it is quite conceivable that a statement which they might make which would sound pro-Russian today might not have sounded so suspicious at the time."

Mundt and La Venia tried again when Bell took the stand, but no more successfully. The course of the questioning soon disclosed that at an executive session earlier in the day Bell had spoken highly of White's patriotism. La Venia had begun by asking Bell whether he recalled that "in each instance when a decision was about to be reached adverse to the Russian government's demands, that it appeared to you that Mr. White, Harry Dexter White, wanted to keep those negotiations open." Bell replied, "No, I don't think there was anything that led me to believe that he particularly wanted to keep them open."

Mundt intervened, "I think the phrase you used this morning, Mr. Bell," the Senator said, "was while you and Mr. Hall were aloof to granting this request, you used the phrase, 'Mr. White was aloof to turning it down!'" Bell said that was "probably true, but as I still say, even with that it didn't in any way arouse my suspicions." Bell said he thought this desire on White's part to keep negotiations open was "quite a natural thing to do in his contacts with various foreign governments" and suggested White might have gotten this attitude from "other departments, because everybody wanted unity of action."

The Senator was exasperated. "I was not assuming," he said "that you looked at him [White] with skepticism or had any doubt about his purpose, because you testified this morning also, in executive hearing, that never on any occasion had he given you any acute reason to be suspicious as far as patri-

(Continued on Page 3)

We Still Need Your Renewal to Survive—Renew Today

Why Was She Silent When The Story Was Still Hot?

(Continued from Page 2)

otism was concerned." (My italics. As usual with these committees, material favorable to the victim is kept in executive session—only the bad is disinterred). But hadn't White insisted that negotiations be kept open?

Mr. Bell. I think that I said that the memorandums and the records show that he was trying to do everything he could to keep the negotiations open for further consideration.

Senator Mundt. That is right.

Mr. Bell. But we interpreted that to mean its was part of his duty.

At that point Senator Mundt desisted.

II

It is strange that Miss Bentley never told this story in any of her earlier appearances before Congressional investigating committees, strange that she waited five and a half years to testify about it. There was no mention of these currency plates in her public "debut" July 30, 1948, before the Senate audit and expenditures committee nor next day before the House Un-American Activities Committee. Harry White was still alive and might have been questioned about it.

A year earlier the Senate committees on Appropriations, Armed Services, and Banking and Currency had held joint hearings on "Occupation Currency Transactions" in which the story of these plates given the Russians figured prominently. (A freshman Senator named Joe McCarthy took part in the hearings). The Senators who sat in on those hearings might have wondered about certain aspects of the Bentley story.

They Got Them Faster Officially

They might have wondered why the Russians had to get samples by such slow and roundabout methods when they had already obtained samples directly and openly from two official sources. Hall testified in 1947 that the Bureau of Engraving and Printing had gotten up a supply of sample notes before going "into production of the regular run" (p. 121, 1947 hearings, as cited, 80th Congress, 1st Session). "When the Soviets asked for specimens of the currency we printed," Hall told the Senators that year, "we sent them a specimen book . . ."

Hall did not say just when the samples were given the Russians but there are two other documents in those older hearings which show how rapidly they got samples through official channels. A document on page 226 shows that at a meeting on February 1, 1944, in McCloy's office at the War Department, the designs for the German occupation currency were approved and a decision taken to go ahead without awaiting the full concurrence of the British and Russians.

On page 173 there is an official document dated February 9, 1944, just nine days later, from Harry D. White to Soviet Ambassador Gromyko "enclosing for your information" photostatic copies of the Allied mark occupation currency and saying, "It would be appreciated if you would cable descriptions of these notes to your Government in order to keep the Government informed as to our plans here."

So the Russians got sample notes made before the regular run from the Bureau of Printing and Engraving and within nine days they also were sent photostats by the Treasury. This was much faster than Miss Bentley worked.

Judging by the 1947 documents, the Silvermasters were not the only ones bringing pressure to bear on White. So were Molotov and Harriman. On page 151 there is a cable from Harriman in Moscow to Secretary of State Hull, with copy for "Mr. Harry White, Treasury Department", giving a paraphrase of a note from Molotov. In this note Molotov says the Soviet government does not consider "sound" the objections put forward by "Messrs. Morgenthau and White" in Wash-

ington against giving the currency plates to the Russians. Molotov warned that unless the plates were given the Russians they would be forced to issue marks of their own in Germany.

Another document on page 185 of the 1947 hearings hardly bears out the Bentley-Mundt picture of what White was doing. In this James Clement Dunn says he has just received another cable from Harriman saying he had been informed by the Soviet Foreign Office "that the Russian government was not prepared to accept as valid the arguments advanced by Secretary Morgenthau and Mr. White in their conversations with the Soviet Ambassador in Washington concerning the difficulties of making the plates available to the Russians." This document shows that the State Department and the Army, unlike the Treasury, favored giving the plates to the Russians because they feared the effects of separate occupation currencies (an alternative White suggested to Gromyko, according to a document on page 184). "Mr. Dunn", on the other hand, "said that it would have a very nice effect upon the German people if we all used the same type of currency."

The Order Was General Marshall's

It was not the Treasury but General Marshall (p. 193, of 1947 hearings) who finally ordered on April 13 that the Russians be given plates of their own. The British Foreign Office agreed (same) two days later "that for political reasons the Russians should be given plates." The Russians were given not only the plates but the proper inks and a document a month later (p. 201) describes a stormy conference over a rather silly mix-up with a very stubborn Gromyko. "After the Ambassador and his representatives left the room," this says, "the others present remained and discussed the situation. *Mr. White was anything but complimentary to the Russian delegation.*" (My italics).

The 1947 records show that the Treasury fought a rear-guard action against giving separate plates to the Russians. While Miss Bentley spoke glibly of counterfeiting, Mr. Hall, the head of the Bureau of Printing and Engraving, testified in 1947 and again this year that one reason they objected was that "it would be extremely difficult for the Russians to print a note to be identical to the one we were printing" (p. 3 Mundt hearings) and it was feared that differences in appearance would undermine faith in the currency.

War Department testimony in 1947 was to the effect that the U. S. and Britain wanted the Soviet government to use the same Allied military occupation marks "as part of the plan to treat Germany as an economic whole. To agree to the Russians using a different currency would have constituted an agreement in advance," Assistant Secretary of War Howard C. Petersen explained (p. 15, 1947 hearings), "to what unfortunately actually happened—the division of Germany into four airtight compartments." The Russians agreed, but insisted that they be allowed to print from plates of their own.

As General Hilldring explained (p. 119) to the joint committees in 1947, "the Russians said to us: 'We agree to use your currency, but we cannot trust you to print it and to fly it halfway around the world to Moscow in time for us to get it out to Zukov and his troops.' When they said that, a very plausible and reasonable case was made by the Russians."

III

In his appearance November 17 as backstop to Attorney General Brownell before the Jenner committee, FBI Director J. Edgar Hoover said "All information furnished by Miss Bentley, which was susceptible to check, has proved to be correct." This story of White and the German currency plates was one of the few stories Miss Bentley told which was "susceptible to check." Either it was held back from the FBI

(Continued on Page 4)

Only Three Weeks to Expiration Date—Use The Blank on Page 4

Warming Over An Old Fulton Lewis Bedtime Story

(Continued from Page 3)

by Miss Bentley, or the story—when checked—proved so weak that she was advised not to relate it at her public appearances in 1948 before the Senate and House committees. If this was one of the stories she told the 1947 grand jury investigation, the currency story may be another factor in explaining why that grand jury after months of deliberations failed to indict a single person she named.

White Was Not A Target In 1947

There is another angle of this story which cast doubt upon it. The German currency plate story first broke in 1947 as a sensational broadcast by Fulton Lewis, Jr. It was this which led to the investigation that year. The exaggerations inspired by the Fulton Lewis broadcast were fantastic. Thus one Congressman (White was not a target at that time) told the House in June of that year that Morgenthau "gave to Russia American printing presses in order that they might print invasion dollars to be redeemed by this country with gold at \$36 an ounce. All that Russia has to do today is to take a little paper and print the money and then we pay in gold." Rich said we had already paid Russia some \$300,000,000 to \$400,000,000 in this way. Knowland was telling the Senate at about the same time of reports that the United States had had to redeem \$380,000,000 in occupation currency spent in Germany by Russian troops!

Mundt brought up the same figure in his hearings but a representative of the Army Comptroller's Office explained, "That \$380,000,000, as I recall, Senator, represented the total amount of excess currency that we had in Germany and Japan. We had about \$75 million worth of excess currency in Japan, and the 2 figures, the 225 plus the 75, plus a few more incidentals, made up that figure."

Black Market Money

What is this "excess currency"? For many months after the war ended, the U. S. unlike any other occupation power East or West, allowed its soldiers to trade local occupation currency for dollars with no limitation. This was a boon for the black marketeers. A soldier could sell a carton of cigarettes for marks or yens at ten to a hundred times what he paid for it in an Army PX, then bring in his marks or yen and exchange them for dollars to be shipped home. The "excess" measures the extent of these practices. This means that the Army was called upon to redeem some \$380,000,000 more in marks or yen than the entire appropriation given it

by Congress for German and Japanese occupation costs. Soldiers had made profits large enough to equal their salaries, living expenses and other occupation costs plus \$380,000,000. The \$380,000,000 was paid by the Treasury.

Some of this filtered in from the Russian zone, but not the way Mundt pictured it. No Russian could collect dollars for his occupation marks. Russian soldiers, paid in marks they could not exchange for remittance home as rubles, found themselves with huge quantities of cash in a country denuded of goods. They bought wrist watches and other luxuries at fantastic prices from American soldiers, who promptly changed their profits into dollars and sent them home. It was in this way that some Russian occupation marks ended up in the Treasury.

The Same Thing Happened In Japan

Actually "Russian" marks were a small part of the picture. The same thing happened in Japan, where there were no Russians—and, again, earlier in Italy and Belgium, where local currencies were involved. Everywhere the American Army went, it showed remarkable entrepreneurial ability. Once the fighting was over, the "Yankee traders" got down to business. The Army never made its records public, but Treasury investigators are said to have found that one General made more than \$20,000,000 and that there were 100 new millionaires in the occupation forces. They "had it so good" that at one time the Army owed cable companies a million dollars for flowers cabled home to mother and girl friend by exuberant soldiers spending surplus marks.

The sour joke which tops this story is that if the voluminous 1947 hearings are read carefully it will be seen that it was the Treasury, and particularly its monetary research division, with White, Coe and Glasser, which began early to campaign for a system of scrip payments which would end the black marketing, and the drain on the Treasury. This was the system finally adopted by the Army late in 1946. (The same documents show Eisenhower long opposed the change). This made it impossible to run a few dollars into a small fortune in marks and then change the marks for dollars at Treasury expense. It also made it impossible any longer to sell the Russians \$50 wrist watches for \$200 in occupation marks. It was White and White's associates—the hounded men of 1953—who put a stop to the very practices by which the Russians were supposed to be cashing in on the U. S. Treasury. This is the real story behind the Bentley testimony and the newest G.O.P. stinkbomb.

Let Us Send A Sample Copy of This Issue to A Friend—Or, Better Yet, Start A Gift Sub With This Issue

Don't Rue It, Do It.

PLEASE RENEW NOW

I. F. Stone's Weekly, 301 E. Capitol, Wash. 3, D. C.

Please renew (or enter) my sub for the enclosed \$5:

Name _____

Street _____

City _____ Zone _____ State _____

Enter this gift sub for \$4 more (money enclosed):

(To) Name _____

Street _____

City _____ Zone _____ State _____

12-27-53

I. F. Stone's Weekly

Room 205

301 E. Capitol St., S.E.

Washington 3, D. C.

NEWSPAPER

Entered as
Second Class Mail
Matter
Washington, D. C.
Post Office