

# COUNTERATTACK

REG. U. S. PAT. OFF.

## FACTS TO COMBAT COMMUNISM

55 WEST 42ND STREET, NEW YORK 18, N. Y. LONGACRE 4-1458

Letter No. 72  
October 8, 1948

Dear Subscriber:

STALIN'S POLICY IN FRANCE IS HELPING DE GAULLE, whom he calls a Fascist. There must be a reason for this policy. What is it?

Communists' motive in calling a great French coal strike this week is political. Europe needs French coal. A big drop in the supply would hurt Marshall Plan. And French Govt lately adopted a new economic program so that it could get special Marshall Plan help. Coal strike is intended to kill this program and thus knock out Marshall Plan, as far as France is concerned. This would wreck whole plan because it can't succeed without France.

But Stalin offers the French Govt peace...at a price. All it need do is take the Communists back in the Cabinet. If it does that, all big strikes will be called off...for a while. But of course if the Communists were back in the Cabinet, they'd wreck the Marshall Plan. So the only way to save the plan is to keep the Communists out and yet stop the strikes.

But the Communists say the Govt is too weak to bring the strikes to an end. They think the rival Govt parties can't take effective joint action.

Is DeGaulle the answer? The Communists threaten civil war if he comes to power. They've said it often, and now the Communist Party of the USA is saying it, as a warning to Americans. "The big fact staring the State Dept in the face," says Stalin's Communist Party in this country, "is that DeGaulle's coming to power is most certainly going to precipitate civil war. American policy has not yet reached the stage where it is prepared to gamble on civil war in France. After all, France is not Greece."

Thus French Communists turn DeGaulle threat to their own advantage. In effect they say: "Do you threaten us with DeGaulle? We threaten YOU with DeGaulle. Unless you take us back into the Cabinet, we'll sabotage the national economy till you'll have to give up and let DeGaulle take over. And then we'll start civil war. Do you want civil war in France?"

Yet Stalin knows that this threat probably won't work... that the chances are strong against readmission of French Communists into Cabinet. He knows that the Communist strikes may well bring DeGaulle into power. The Communists call DeGaulle a Fascist. Whether or not he's really a Fascist, at least they SAY he's one. In that case you might think they would adopt a policy of keeping him out. But they aren't doing that. Instead they're helping him. Why? What's the explanation of their policy?

In some ways Stalin is repeating his policy with Hitler. It was Stalin who let Hitler become dictator of Germany. Stalin prevented the Communist Party of Germany from joining with other parties to keep Hitler out of power. And late in 1932 the Brown Fascists and Red Fascists cooperated in a great transportation strike in Berlin. Nazis & Communists actually stood arm in arm on Berlin streets while collecting money for relief of strikers. This was just a short time before Hitler became dictator.

Stalin said Hitler would only last six months. This was his happy

prediction. This was basis of his German policy. He thought Hitler would be beaten by the ghastly German economic problems, and couldn't keep his Govt going. That was the official Communist policy. So the German Communists waited for Hitler to flop. He didn't. He solidified himself in power. And then Stalin, behind the scenes, began trying to make a deal with him. He succeeded six years later, when he put over the Stalin-Hitler Pact.

Now Stalin's policy toward DeGaulle is somewhat similar...but with certain differences. French Communist leaders are going ahead with their strategy of strikes & sabotage, because Moscow figures it this way:

1. Strikes will cripple the Marshall Plan and may wreck it.
2. MAYBE the French Govt in its fear of DeGaulle will give in to the Communists, letting them come back into the Cabinet. That would stop the strikes, all right, but it would wreck the Marshall Plan.
3. But if the Govt doesn't give in to the Communists and if DeGaulle comes to power, the Communists will start civil war. They have arms and military organizations, and they may be able to do enough damage by strikes, sabotage, and guerrilla war to wreck the Marshall Plan.
4. And in any case the Cominform can picture DeGaulle as a Fascist ...and it can call on the labor movement and on liberal forces in U S, Britain, and European countries to demand that their Govts stop cooperating with him. Thus Stalin will weaken Europe by obstructing Marshall Plan, economic recovery, and rearmament. World-wide Communist propaganda will picture DeGaulle as "the new Hitler", the spearhead of a "new international capitalist drive" to destroy Stalin Russia. And to many millions of people all over the world, this will certainly seem credible.

That's why Stalin doesn't mind helping DeGaulle. If the Communists can't get into the Cabinet, a DeGaulle Govt may be the next best thing.

PARAMOUNT PICTURES HAS ANSWERED A COMMUNIST-CONTROLLED UNION in a way that might well be a model for other companies. The Screen Office & Professional Employees Guild is in Communist hands. So is its parent, United Office & Professional Workers of America, CIO. Now Barney Balaban, president of Paramount, has sent a letter to the Guild. He writes:

"The officers of your union have declined to sign and file non-Communist affidavits. Therefore, we decline to negotiate with your union.

"...As Americans, we are opposed to all that Communism represents today. As those who share the responsibility for the welfare of an industry, we are opposed to Communist infiltration into our ranks. An overwhelming accumulation of evidence convinces us that the Communist Party and its adherents are bad for our country and bad for our industry. Our position, therefore, is very simple. We propose to exercise every legal right to keep them out of our affairs.

"Under the law, your officers have the right to decline to file non-Communist affidavits. You tell us that through democratic process, you have chosen to exercise that right. However, under the same law, we are relieved of any obligation to deal with you if you fail to file the affidavits called for by Act of Congress. We now choose to exercise our right not to deal with you.

"We shall not deal with a union that protects those who may not dare to run the risk of signing a non-Communist affidavit. We cannot control your decision, much though we deplore such decision. That's your affair. But we can refuse to do business with you....

"In taking this action, we have no intention of interfering with your 'democratic rights'. We are simply exercising our own. Fortunately, democracy is a two-way street in which the traffic of ideas moves in both directions. It is false and demagogic to impute to us motives of 'interference' or 'dictation' in your affairs when we merely invoke our rights under the law to carry out the dictates of our conscience....

"If ever there were a time for each of us to stand up and be counted, this is it! Why should any American hesitate to stand up and state, 'I am not a member of the Communist Party and I'm glad to swear to it!' What opprobrium is there in the act of signing an affidavit that one is not an agent of a foreign Govt? What is this incredible attitude that stills the tongue and stays the hand from enlisting on the side of democracy?..."

Great merit of this letter is that it goes right to the heart of the question. That's more than can be said for pronouncements of some judges. Lately two U S Circuit Courts of Appeals have ruled on constitutionality of affidavit clause in Taft-Hartley Act. In both cases the courts sustained the constitutionality. But both decisions were by votes of 2 to 1. In each case the dissenting judge said it was unfair to deny a union access to the NLRB just because its officers didn't sign the affidavits.

But these high-ranking judges didn't see the meaning of the words, "access to the NLRB". What those words mean is, "the right to force an employer to deal with the union". Should the Govt force an employer to deal with a Communist-controlled union? Hasn't Congress the right to REFRAIN from forcing an employer to do this? If the two dissenting judges had ever happened to think of this simple question, they could hardly have avoided answering "Yes". Indeed, if they answered "No", there would be grave doubt whether they were men of such principle that they deserved a place on the Federal bench.

Paramount's letter is simple, clear, convincing. As time goes by, more & more companies will be sending such letters to party-line unions.

ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION HAS STARTED THE BALL ROLLING by its order forbidding recognition of United Public Workers, CIO, and United Electrical Workers, CIO, at two atomic plants. Commission's order isn't perfect, but it's a pretty good beginning. In some ways it should set an example to other Govt agencies & departments and to private industry.

The plants affected by the order are the new Knolls II Atom Power Laboratory of General Electric at Schenectady, NY, and the Argonne Natl Laboratory at University of Chicago.

Both General Electric and Philip Murray find fault with the order on various grounds. Murray has one good point...that the commission didn't give the unions a hearing. There's no reason why this shouldn't have been done. Hearings wouldn't have caused any loss of time.

The order has another defect. It makes no exception in favor of anti-Communist locals of United Electrical Workers. Such an exception should be made. But unluckily the commission can't make it, because it hasn't the personnel and other facilities for examining union affairs in detail. This should be the job of NLRB. Congress should authorize NLRB to go beyond the affidavit clause and decide whether internationals & locals are Communist-controlled. Its decisions should be binding on all Govt agencies.

General Electric points out "the problem at the Knolls is in the future when that laboratory comes into operation. The problem immediately

is, and has been for some months past, at the Peek Street Laboratory, where the UE represents employees who work on atomic energy projects. As we understand your order, we are not to discontinue recognition of UE as the bargaining representative of our employees at the Peek Street Laboratory."

Plainly the commission's order is faulty. It should apply to ALL plants where the Fifth Column may get hold of military or industrial secrets.

But GE also says it has no information about Communist affiliations of UE officers except what it reads in the press. And it declares it can't fire a man on the basis of "mere hearsay evidence in any such vital matter as this." But there's no reason why GE can't get a lot of definite information about Communist leaders of UE, even if it doesn't have access to secret Govt files. Much of such information is already available. And more can be obtained in a short time, at a cost which would be peanuts, in comparison with GE's huge resources.

Also GE is afraid of libel suits... though it doesn't mention this in its public statement. But who should be more able to get the facts, tell them to the world, and run the risk of libel suits, than GE? Counterattack runs such risks right along...and it's no secret that Counterattack is a mite less rich than GE. Now is the time for all industry, and especially such giants as GE, to take positive action on a big scale against the Fifth Column. There's no convincing reason why GE can't get together with Westinghouse and other large electrical manufacturers and with leading companies in other industries, to collect the facts about Communist leaders in unions, and disclose them to workers and general public, despite risks of libel suits.

GE rightly declares that a big point has been overlooked by the Atomic Energy Commission in its order. The Communist-controlled UE won't be recognized at the Knolls laboratory, but "the employees there will still continue perfectly free to belong to the UE, to pay their dues directly rather than have them checked off, and to engage in any other association or activity with UE officials." Some action should be taken against this in all plants where military security is a factor.

Counterattack made a suggestion June 25 about United Public Workers, which bears on this question. We said then that federal, state & local governments should "(1) deny recognition to United Public Workers as representative of employees; (2) rule that membership in this Communist-controlled union after a given date shall be incompatible with duties as public employees." A similar rule should apply to membership in ANY party-line union by workers in atomic plants and the like, unless the local is anti-Communist.

Are there difficulties in the way of doing this? Of course, but they can be overcome. Let's get going.

TOWN MEETING OF THE AIR DOES IT AGAIN. One of the speakers on its program Tuesday, Oct 5, discussing U S relations with Stalin Russia, was O John Rogge, backer of Communist fronts (Counterattack Sept 17, p 4). He defended the Kremlin's policy right down the line. And his roaring abuse of every man who dares to oppose Red Fascism was as noisy & angry as a speech by Vishinsky. When is Town Meeting of the Air going to wake up?

Yours faithfully,

October 8, 1948

*Counterattack*