

# LABOR ACTION

Independent Socialist Weekly

## THE TRUTH ABOUT GUATEMALA

The Lie About "Communist Domination"

... page 6

The Imperialist Apologetics of Max Lerner

... page 7

How U.S. Agents Swarmed over Guatemala

... page 4

JULY 5, 1954

FIVE CENTS

## ARMY McCARTHYISM: The Barry Miller Case Story

The Barry Miller case, which spotlights the scandal of the army's own "McCarthyism" in Fort Monmouth policy, has now been publicized in the press through statements by the Workers Defense League and Norman Thomas (as was briefly reported in last week's *LA*) and it is due to win widespread interest because of the issues which it involves.

After serving in the armed forces for 23 months and 18 days, Barry Miller was given an "undesirable discharge" from the army on June 8 because of his pre-army membership in the Independent Socialist League, the Socialist Youth League, and the Politics Club at the University of Chicago—the latter an anti-Stalinist, democratic socialist student organization composed of independent socialists of many movements, and officially recognized by the university. The Socialist Youth League, of which he was a leading member, was also an officially recognized club on the campus of the university.

In December of 1953, the army adjutant general informed Miller that the army had received "derogatory information" on him. It detailed this information by charging that Miller had been a member of the ISL and SYL, a subscriber to *LABOR ACTION* and the *Militant*, a member of the Politics Club, and had resided with a member of the "Socialist League."

Miller was asked to reply to these charges within 30 days. Upon failure to reply, the army would regard the failure as an admission of the charges, it said.

Miller immediately obtained the services of the Workers Defense League and Rowland Watts, its secretary, as counsel. A 30-day extension was requested and obtained and a detailed reply was sent by Miller.

The reply admitted the brief charges made by the army. (As a matter of fact, the charges made were based on information given the army by Miller long before.) The reply affirmed that there was nothing wrong

(Continued on page 3)

Eisenhower-Churchill Talks Prove They Are

## At a Dead End In Asia Policy

By GORDON HASKELL

Two diplomatic visits last week underlined the utter rout of American foreign policy on Southeast Asia. One was the visit of Churchill and Eden to Washington, and the other the visit of Chinese Foreign Minister Chou En-lai to India and Burma.

What is the American policy which has been routed? At the moment there seems to be none, because Washington is no longer talking about sending American troops to Indochina. And since American policy for the "containment" of Stalinism is so dependent on military might, when the administration is not talking about mobilizing or using military power, they have little else to talk about.

**In the broader sense, however, the United States government does have a policy for the cold war. That is to back the status quo everywhere against Stalinism.**

**It is to seek to isolate the Stalinist empire economically and politically from the rest of the world, and this applies most particularly to China. It means the support of Rhee in Korea, Chiang in Formosa, the French in Indochina, the British**

**in Malaya—anyone anywhere, no matter how corrupt or hated by the local people, who promises to oppose Stalinism on American terms.**

**MAKINGS FOR DEAL**

But the French are being slowly squeezed out of Indochina, regardless of their will. And the British recognize that if they are to save anything at all in Southeast Asia, they must seek to make a deal with Stalinist China. They also know that when you are dealing with a government which holds the trumps in its hands, you have to give something to get something.

What they hope to give is the

(Continued on page 2)

U.S. AMBASSADOR PEURIFOY PULLED THE JOB OFF IN LAST STAGE—

## U.S. Overthrows Guatemala Gov't by Force and Violence

The U. S.-sponsored interventionists have succeeded in their plot to overthrow the government of Guatemala by force and violence.

In the course of the last week, President Arbenz abdicated in favor of a military junta led by Col. Diaz, army chief of staff; and, under further pressure of the U. S., Diaz was in turn ousted by a right-wing officer, Col. Monzon, who formed a military junta satisfactory to the foreign imperialism.

While the political situation in Guatemala is still unclear and probably still in flux, four things have been luridly illuminated by these events.

(1) The miserable lie about "Communist domination" of the Arbenz government, which has been the official justification for intervention, has been destroyed beyond dispute.

Arbenz capitulated to Diaz, and Diaz to Monzon, without a peep out of the Stalinists, for the simple reason of powerlessness in the government. Anyone who can imagine a truly "Communist-dominated" government acting in this way would need a very inventive mind. There was no Stalinist coup, or even attempt at a Stalinist coup, or even rumor of a Stalinist coup, to prevent this course.

### EXPLODED STORIES

(2) Another essential part of the official justification for intervention was the cry that Guatemala's shipment of arms from East Europe had been enough to make it the dominant military power of Central America.

It turned out that this government, which was painted as bristling with fear-some armament, did not have enough military power to hold back even Castillo Armas' troops, in what all papers insisted on describing as an opera-bouffe war.

(3) It was proved that the aim of the intervention was not simply to get the Stalinists out of the government alliance, but to oust every element who in any way had supported the social-reform and agrarian-reform program of the Arbenz regime.

The shift from Arbenz to Diaz was a test of whether the former concession would be enough. But Diaz was rejected by the U. S. and the rebels because he promised to continue the social program of the government even though breaking with the Stalinists.

(4) The interventionist role of the U. S. was also evident in the ouster of Diaz. While most papers only hinted at this, a circumstantial account was sent to the *Chicago Daily News* (June 28) by its correspondent in Guatemala City, Edwin Fahey:

"Officially, the U. S. had no part of this little war, but the real hero in this business was Jack Peurifoy, our ambassador to Guatemala. . . ."

"Guillermo Toriello, the foreign minister [of the Arbenz government], broke first, and asked Peurifoy to come and see

(Turn to last page)

## United Nations Gets Kicked in the Teeth Too as U.S. Tramples Over Arbenz Regime

Whatever the fate of Guatemala, no one has any illusions about the fate which the United Nations has suffered in the course of the imperialist assault on that little country.

The United States sent the UN packing, unceremoniously, maintaining that any idea of UN interest in the Guatemalan crisis was a Russian plot or other sinister manifestation of the devil.

**Every nation in the world now understands that the U. S. has declared that its Monroe Doctrine supersedes the UN Charter. Washington has told the international organization: "UN, keep out of this hemisphere!"**

The U. S. arrogates to itself the right to intervene anywhere in the world, through the UN or unilaterally. Under the Monroe Doctrine, U. S. imperialism has always maintained that no country abroad must be allowed to do the same on this side of the ocean. Now something new has been added: the same prohibition has been applied to the UN collectively. And as Washington rages and rampages over the Guatemala issue, it has made this ban stick, with its reluctant allies bowing in dismay.

It is in this connection that Walter Millis writes (in the *N. Y. Herald Tribune* for June 24) under the title "Guatemala Is a Shock." The shock is to those

remaining innocents who still thought the UN was anything else but a talking-shop, who were not convinced by previous demonstrations of Washington's ability to put the UN in its pocket any time it wanted to exert sufficient pressure.

Specifically what shocks Millis is that "Ambassador Lodge's fiery warning to Russia to 'stay out of this hemisphere'... seems to pose suddenly a rather drastic new limit on the universality of the United Nations."

For when Lodge dramatically turned to the Russian delegate and told him to "stay out of this hemisphere," the circumstances were such that Lodge was really addressing this warning to the UN itself.

The point at issue was such that no member of the UN could possibly misunderstand the warning and implied

(Turn to last page)

# As McDonald Cuddled with U.S. Steel, That Ol' Debbil Class Struggle Intruded

By BEN HALL

A Grand New Era just died before it could crawl out of its cocoon. Nobody paid it much attention but the sad, yet inevitable, event took place when the Wage Policy Committee of the Steel Workers Union rejected the companies' contract offer and threatened to strike.

This seems like a commonplace incident; and it is; but its very routine character makes it worthy of note as a simple example of the triumph of the crude facts of class struggle over the illusions of labor peace.

Just a year ago, Benjamin Fairless, U. S. Steel chairman, and David McDonald, Steel Workers Union president, toured steel plants all over the country. They were greeted by mayors and flunkies everywhere; and they actually, as reported, deigned to enter dirty old factories and speak to ordinary workers right in the mill. We can imagine how it was. Each would extend a finely manicured plebian hand to a rank-and-filer who would uncomfortably try to wipe off the day's grease and soot on the nearest rag before completing the handshake. Don't worry about that, they would say benignly. As they passed into the next department, each would carefully rub a clean white handkerchief over his palm to avoid soiling the custom-tailored suit. This was the democratic way and thus the seeds of good-will between management and labor would be planted.

There may not be any steel strike this

year but the threat alone was enough to blow away the accumulated hot air of the good-will tour.

Some people expected great things. *Business Week* in its issue of June 19, just before the strike threat, could say, "what has been happening in Pittsburgh's William Penn Hotel may turn out to be the most promising development in industrial relations since General Motors showed management in 1948 that it was possible to take the initiative in collective bargaining. If that proves to be the case, U. S. Steel's Stephens and the union's McDonald will be more than just the 'men of the year' on the labor front."

## COZY TALK

Unlike the coarse days of the lamented past, now "the manner of arriving at the result is decidedly unusual." For in those days, implicit in all negotiations "was a theme of menace: At long last steel labor was going to make a stand against the vicious corporations." And then? "either after a strike was on or practically at the zero hour there would be a settlement and the show was over for another year or two."

But with a shrewd insight into what it imagined, *Business Week* could report that now, "both Big Steel and the union are making a valiant effort to break with the past: to conduct bargaining in a way less primitive, less nerve-wracking and less dangerous." And, as any fool could plainly see, this time "the tone of the

union arguments was mild and conciliatory. There was little or no pressure applied internally by the union calculated to inflame its membership. There was no talk of strike."

Everyone, ready for the waltz. Violins play soft music.

It was all so nice and cozy that it was unrefined for the facts of life to intrude. Just a few days later, A. H. Raskin reporting on the spot for the *New York Times*, wrote, "Few notes of amity crept into the meeting of the union policy makers. . . . They listened to a bitter report by Mr. McDonald on his wage talks with United States Steel, after which they authorized the union leaders to 'take whatever action they deem necessary in the present situation.' In a speech that was clearly audible to reporters standing outside the locked meeting room Mr. McDonald charged that some executives of 'Big Steel' were trying to push the union into a strike."

## LIFE IS RUDE

Probably the union leadership didn't try to "inflame" the membership. But it did make a big fanfare of its 1954 demands at conferences, in special reports and big banner headlines in their papers where they insisted that the laws of righteousness, if not divine Providence, proved the justice of their cause.

They were demanding: (1) higher wages; (2) improved pension and insurance plans; (3) a guaranteed annual

wage; (4) better contract terms, including 19 suggested improvements.

In place of all this, the companies proffered a wage increase of two cents an hour and fringe increases of less than three cents additional. They professed great hopes of an epoch of labor-management cooperation; but they were ready to invest in it only a nickel.

The guaranteed annual wage, the big objective posed by the CIO, was rejected outright and *in toto*. And hence the bitter talk by McDonald, who wants to cooperate, and the strike threat by the Wage Policy Committee.

After hearing talk of strike, the companies, it is reported, were quick to reconsider and are pondering the addition of a few trivia to their original offer. This may be enough to avoid the strike. If a strike does not take place, however, this will not be the happy augury of a future of blissful conciliation.

Everyone will know that they yielded, as usual, only to a threat of strike. And if the union does accept minor concessions it will do so only for the same reasons that permitted the companies to treat its main demands without contempt. The steel industry is operating at only 73 per cent of capacity; inventories are high; unemployment is rising. All this, in the words of the *New York Times*, allows "management to withstand a long seige."

In any event, the New Era turns out to be a Big Bust.

# Dead End in Asia Policy — —

(Continued from page 1)

absolute minimum: diplomatic recognition of the Stalinist government in China, trade relations with that government on an expanded scale, part if not all of Indochina. What they hope to get is a solidification in the rest of Southeast Asia of Britain's alliances and economic position, a let-up of Stalinist pressure in Malaya and in the long run, if possible, the loosening of the economic ties which now bind China to Russia.

The vast majority of the anti-Stalinist governments and peoples of Southeast Asia lean strongly to the British policy. The governments recognize the strong appeal Stalinism has among sections of their populations. They know that the Chinese Stalinists have it in their power to mobilize this sentiment to disrupt their economies and eventually to seek to overthrow their social systems.

But they also know that China has vast and complex internal problems. If the Chinese Stalinists can be convinced that there is no immediate military threat to them from the United States, or from an American-organized, equipped and dominated alliance in Asia, they may prefer to concentrate on these domestic problems while the Stalinist movements in the rest of Asia play the role not of forces seeking immediate revolution but rather of "loyal oppositions" to the existing governments which demand only that they remain friendly to the government in Peiping.

Chou's visit to India and Burma is a sign that Peiping is willing to play along with this idea. For the immediate purposes of Chinese Stalinism, the neutralization of Southeast Asia is a highly desirable objective.

The Chinese Stalinists are confident that time is on their side in

Asia, and they need time at home also. They may be quite willing to limit their victory in Indochina, regardless of the interests and desires of the Vietminh, if thereby they can assure themselves of the neutralization of the whole of Southeast Asia for a number of years ahead.

In this situation, the American government is utterly helpless. Every effort it has made to organize a military bloc in Southeast Asia for the purpose of military intervention in the Indochinese struggle has failed.

In fact, its efforts to organize such a bloc prior to the Geneva conference simply convinced its allies in Europe and its potential allies in Southeast Asia that America is determined to maintain Western colonialism in the area, and even more, to plunge it into a devastating war which would be politically and economically disastrous regardless of the military outcome.

## "LOCARNO"?

Churchill and Eden have come to Washington to try to work out some kind of common policy on Asia. Before their arrival here, Eden made a speech in the House of Commons in which he broached the idea of an "Asian Locarno" combined with an Asian counterpart of NATO.

The idea seems to be that the countries of Southeast Asia will sign mutual non-aggression pacts with China in which they agree to stand together against any aggressor in the area. As Eden did not spell out his idea in detail, it is not known whether Britain and the United States would be expected to participate in such an arrangement.

It is also not clear how such a pact would square with any alliance between the Southeast Asia countries and the Western powers along

NATO lines. Though China would no doubt be quite willing to sign non-aggression pacts with the countries of Southeast Asia, it is hardly likely that she would be willing to accept this as consistent with their entering an organized and armed alliance with the United States.

The whole idea of an Asian Locarno is in direct contradiction to the American government's announced policy of support to Chiang Kai-shek against Stalinist China. It would be in contradiction to the whole American notion that the way to defeat Stalinism in Asia is to isolate China, refuse to deal with her in any way, and organize a military system around her which will not only prevent any further expansion but will eventually "roll back" Stalinism in China itself.

But American policy has reached a dead end in Asia, for the time being at least. None of the important governments in the area agree with it or want to have anything to do with it.

## U. S. PARALYZED

Yet the Eisenhower administration seems incapable of working out any other policy, or even a variation of its policy which can gain any support in the area.

There are vast social forces in Asia which have not yet come under the influence of Stalinism. Their present neutralist attitude bespeaks not even a leaning toward it, but rather the conviction that the other bloc, the American bloc, has no social and political alternative to offer them, and that a military struggle can only lead to a tremendous setback in their own efforts to create a better life for themselves in the circumstances of their new-won independence from colonial status.

The Eisenhower administration (and the Democrats are in exactly

the same boat) is incapable of offering them the social and political alternative which they seek. Every aspect of American relations to Asia, in Korea as well as in Indochina, in India as well as in the vastly different set of problems which confront Japan have demonstrated this.

But the fact that American policy is paralyzed does not mean that social and political developments in Asia will stand still. The economic and social relations in all these countries still remain just as unsettled, just as explosive, even if a temporary neutralization of the area is achieved through some system of non-aggression pacts with both major contenders in the cold war.

The ruling class in India led by the Nehru government cannot solve these problems, and the same is true in one degree or another for the governments of all the countries involved. Thus the threat of social revolution will continue to haunt these governments regardless of what diplomatic relations they may work out with China. In the long run, the question for these countries is really: will the social revolution be led and controlled by the Stalinists, or by democratic, socialist movements?

The utter and unconcealable disaster which has overtaken American policy in the Indochina struggle has visibly shaken up some of the liberal and labor elements in this country who, up till now, have given virtually uncritical support to America's policy of military containment of Stalinism. Let us hope that this will be the beginning of a real debate in the labor movement on what social forces the American workers should look to as their allies abroad, and in what way they can support these social forces, regardless of the policies of the government.

# The Story of the Barry Miller Case — —

(Continued from page 1)

in the activities Miller had engaged in and maintained that Miller had a right to his views and activities while remaining in the armed forces without penalty of any kind.

The reply was accompanied by a number of sworn affidavits by prominent teachers, sponsors of the Politics Club, people who had spoken there and nationally-known writers, all of whom were acquainted with Barry Miller's socialist views and activity and his pronounced anti-war, anti-Stalinist opinions.

The affidavits given in his behalf testify not only to the respect which Miller earned through his forthright views and activities, but also to his personal integrity. For the affidavits were given by persons whose political views were not in agreement with his; some were in violent opposition to those he espoused.

The affidavits are also testimony to the fact that there are still a number of honest and courageous liberals and socialists of other views who are willing to come to the assistance of a person whose views were far to the left of theirs.

Daniel Bell, associate editor of *Fortune* magazine, was one of the first to sign an affidavit in behalf of Miller. Dwight Macdonald came through with a fine affidavit, as he usually does in cases involving a serious challenge to democratic practice.

David Reisman, author of *The Lonely Crowd*, not only gave a statement but endeavored to help through the American Committee for Cultural Freedom. Bert Hoselitz, professor of social science at the University of Chicago, and Milton Mayer, writer for *Life*, *Century* and the *Progressive*, sent in affidavits.

Irving Howe and Lewis Coser, editors of *Dissent*, also gave affidavits in behalf of Miller, as did Kermit Eby, former educational director of CIO, and Leon Despres, Chicago labor attorney. Novelist James T. Farrell also presented an affidavit pointing out that Miller, upon his suggestion, had organized meetings of the Politics Club for Jerzy Gliksman and Dwight Macdonald on anti-Stalinist subjects.

Apparently, the reply and the affidavits had a considerable effect upon the army, for what appeared to be the premise for an immediate hearing and expulsion produced instead the following equivocal reply:

"It has been determined that you will be retained in the service in your present grade, that you will not be promoted and that upon completion of your term of service you will be discharged with a type of discharge appropriate to the character of service you have rendered as of the date you are eligible for separation."

The difficulty in determining the meaning of this letter arose from the facts that Miller had been promoted to corporal, had a high rating in his army work and had been commended by his superiors. If his discharge was to be "appropriate to the character of service," then it seemed that his case would end well. Obviously,

## While the U.S. Is Saving Democracy in Guatemala...

MACON, Ga., June 23 (AP)—A white man and a Negro were held briefly in jail last night after the Negro had been found visiting in the white student's house. Legal sources said today there apparently was no state law against whites and Negroes visiting each other. Clifford York, 21 years old, a Mercer University graduate and ministerial student, said he and Richard Scott, a pre-medical graduate of a Negro college in Alabama, had been taken to county jail by deputies who told them they had violated "segregation laws." They were released about an hour later.

—N. Y. Times, June 24.

ORANGE, Tex., June 28—The State of Texas has refused to bring charges against four members of a Negro-baiting terror gang calling itself "The Moonlighters."

[The four] admitted Saturday that they participated in the threat-note and cross-burning activities of the Ku Klux Klan-type operation that has created tension in the Negro sections of Orange and nearby communities for three weeks. . . .

It appeared yesterday that a new crop of "Moonlighters," encouraged by the kid-glove handling of the four who confessed Saturday, could be expected to continue the Negro-baiting and vandalism. . . .

Said a leading local attorney: "What it really amounts to is that the state has no desire to prosecute. You'd have seen some fast action if the threatened people had been white Protestants instead of Negroes."

—N. Y. Post, June 28.

the army did not want to deal with the facts of his case.

On April 7 a new regulation was adopted by the army. It provided in substance for severance of any person in the armed forces regarded as a security risk with other than honorable discharge. No one interested in Miller's case has as yet been able to obtain a copy of this new regulation. Miller's counsel, Rowland Watts, has made repeated efforts to obtain a copy of this regulation, but without success.

Nevertheless, Miller's "undesirable discharge" was effected under this new regulation. Miller was normally scheduled for discharge on June 19 on completion of 24 months of service. On June 7, however, he was informed by his superior officers that he would be discharged on June 10.

On this same date, June 7, Miller got in touch with his counsel and also informed Norman Thomas of the status of his case. Then the army, instead of waiting for the 10th to discharge Miller, a date already in advance of the originally scheduled June 19, gave him an "undesirable discharge" on the very next day, June 8, and dismissed him from the army without a hearing of any kind. The new regulation did not provide for any hearing.

Thus, while a soldier given a "dishonorable discharge" may obtain a hearing and review of his case, one given an "undesirable discharge" does not have that right!

### THOMAS PROTESTS

It was this that brought the Miller case into the open. Norman Thomas, who reviewed Miller's record and became fully acquainted with his reply to the original charges and the affidavits given in his behalf, immediately protested to Army Secretary Robert Stevens. Thomas pointed out that while the army was horrified at the treatment of its General Zwicker at the hands of McCarthy, it had, in effect, done the same thing to one of its soldiers.

Miller's army record was excellent, as we have already indicated. He had been promoted twice after he had taken the initiative to advise his superiors of his political activities prior to induction. On May 19, for example, he received the following commendatory letter from his superior at the Signal School, Fort Monmouth, New Jersey:

"I wish to commend you for the outstanding services you have rendered The Signal School and, in particular, the Microwave Radio Repair Branch.

"During your tour of duty as a student and an instructor in the Microwave Radio Repair Course, you have displayed and exercised such qualities and abilities as loyalty, leadership, dependability, earnestness and other attributes of an exemplary soldier and conscientious worker.

"On your departure from this assignment, I feel that our loss may be recompensed by someone else's gain. I wish you continued success in any venture you may undertake."

During all this period, while charges were pending against Miller, he nevertheless retained his rating of corporal and continued his teaching work in the Army Signal School.

Thomas received a reply from Hugh M. Milton, assistant secretary of the army, stating that a hearing would now

be granted to Miller—now that Miller had been discharged. No wonder that Thomas commented:

"Your procedure seems to me a little like putting a man in jail on a charge of theft, and then dragging him out to find if he is guilty."

### WDL CASE

Since then, the *New York Times* has carried two lengthy stories on the Miller case. The *New York Post* carried comments on it, as well as several papers in New Jersey, Miller's home state. Others have run stories and excerpts.

The Workers Defense League and Counsel Watts are pressing the case. In a statement just issued, Rev. Donald Harrington, national chairman of the Workers Defense League, declared:

"To brand a young man subversive and stigmatize him with a discharge labeled 'undesirable' without granting him the elementary right of a hearing is an outrage upon civil liberties."

Harrington continued:

"Mr. Miller was issued an 'undesirable discharge' without the hearing he requested. In the same week, another draftee was granted a full hearing and cleared. This arbitrary granting or withholding a full hearing seem to indicate that the army has little regard for the rights of individuals."

Thomas described the army action as "a votive offering to the Grand Inquisitor, Joe McCarthy. . . . When it comes to the violation of civil rights it is clear that the army is not going to be outdone."

Miller will file an appeal to the Army Discharge Review Board, Harrington announced, and "in the event of failure the Workers Defense League will take the

case to the federal courts."

Of particular interest in the Miller case is that it arises out of the hysterical mood of McCarthyism on the basis of the attorney general's list of alleged "subversive organizations." The attorney general's list lies behind hundreds of cases arising now, including the Shachtman passport case and the efforts of the ISL to get off the "list."

The precedent set by the Truman administration in setting up a national index of organizations without charges or hearings of any kind is being followed by this administration. Government departments continue the procedures initiated under Truman whereby individuals are found guilty of "subversion" without charges and without hearings.

If Brownell, despite his announcement of procedures, does not grant the Independent Socialist League a hearing after charges and interrogatories have been presented to it, and a reply sent to the attorney general, who was then duty-bound to grant a hearing, it is not so strange that the army does likewise.

The Miller case is a highly important one in the struggle against government-by-administrative-decree and the decline in due-process and democratic procedures. These are the factors that have brought considerable support to the Miller case and others like it.

It deserves the widest support possible from all sections of the population, most particularly from the labor movement, which has not up to the present distinguished itself in the struggle against McCarthyism, the attorney general's list, and the general reactionary drift in the field of civil liberties.

## Shachtman Passport Case Appealed to Higher Court

A judge in the federal court for the District of Columbia has just handed down a decision in favor of the government's motion to dismiss the complaint of Max Shachtman, national chairman of the Independent Socialist League, against the State Department in suit against John Foster Dulles, Ruth B. Shipley, et al. for their refusal to grant him a passport.

Readers of LABOR ACTION will recall that several months ago, Shachtman, after waiting months for a reply by the State Department to his application, filed suit to compel the Department to grant him a passport. The refusal to grant such a passport was explained by Mrs. Shipley, Director of Passport Office, on the ground that Shachtman was a leading officer of an organization on the attorney general's list of so-called subversive organizations.

The fact that neither the attorney general's office nor the State Department has ever granted the ISL a hearing on the merits of its case, was freely conceded by the attorney for the government in its motion to dismiss the complaint. The motion to dismiss argued that the secretary of state had a discretionary power to refuse to grant passports which could not be revoked by any judicial action. It also denied that Shachtman's complaint stated a claim upon which relief might be granted.

We do not, at the time of this writing, have all the facts necessary to write a detailed report of the hearing. The only facts at hand are that upon the filing of the complaint and the motion to dismiss, a hearing was held on June 16. At conclusion of the hearing, the judge took all the arguments under advisement and issued his adverse decision about a week later.

Joseph L. Rauh of Washington, counsel for Shachtman in this case, advises that the case will now be appealed to the District Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia. A reversal by the Court of

Appeals would send the case back to the District Court for a hearing on the merits of the case, which has thus far been avoided by the State Department and the judge of the lower court.

If the appeal of the District Court proves unavailing, the case will be taken to the Supreme Court.

These difficulties result from the malvolent activities of the attorney general and his Department of Justice. The "subversive list," concocted in the dead of night, without a hearing of any kind, have pilloried organizations and individuals who, as yet, have been unable to obtain any hearings, to meet any charges in open court, or to legally challenge the actions of the attorney general.

In the case of the Independent Socialist League, a dozen requests for hearings have been denied it. The present administration adopted new procedures which declared that no organization would be placed on the attorney general's list without a prior hearing.

Despite that decision, Brownell took over the list set up under his predecessors, retaining over two hundred organizations without hearings. Upon the protest of the ISL, the attorney general thereupon presented charges and interrogatories to it. These were replied to in September 1953 and accompanied by still another request for a hearing.

But to date, no hearing has been held, no date has been set for such a hearing, and no promise has been given by the attorney general that such a hearing, despite his own procedures, will actually be granted.

That is where the matter now stands. As soon as additional information is received from Washington, a full report will be carried in LABOR ACTION. Right now, however, we can inform our readers that the Shachtman passport case is being prepared for appeal in the District Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia.

### READ ABOUT INDEPENDENT SOCIALISM!

In four special pamphlet-issues of LABOR ACTION, the basic ideas of Independent Socialism are vividly and simply explained.

- No. 1—The Principles and Program of Independent Socialism
- No. 2—Independent Socialism and the Third World War
- No. 3—The Fair Deal: A Socialist Analysis
- No. 4—Socialism and Democracy
- No. 5—What is Stalinism?

# YOU and SCIENCE

## A NEW TRIUMPH FOR ARCHEOLOGICAL SCIENCE

By JAMES M. FENWICK

As capitalism declines it goes down not in grandeur but in meanness, despicably. Almost everything it touches it defiles. Even fields seemingly the most remote from immediate political and economic interest do not escape the grubby touch.

The discovery of Cheops' solar boats degenerates into an intrigue of the Egyptian colonels; Dienbienphu falls and the appearance of the Russian ballet is cancelled in Paris; the arrival of the Russian chess teams in the United States is handled almost entirely on the political level. That these interventions by the capitalist state create hardly a ripple of critical interest is due not only to the unstated assumptions by which most persons under capitalism are motivated but by the enormities committed by Stalinism in the same areas.

Occasionally amid this crude economic, political, and personal aggrandizement an event occurs which by its relative disinterestedness and a classic sweep once again rekindles our pride in the human type and gives us a foretaste of what life will be like in the socialist society. It can be Roger Bannister running the mile under the legendary four minutes for the first time.

Or it can be Michael Ventriss, the young English architect and amateur archeologist, cracking the Linear B Script. Each has, in his way and in dignity, exploited the human organism's possibilities.

### FEAT

The term Linear B Script was applied by Arthur Evans to one of two types of undecipherable symbols inscribed on 1,900 tablets he dug up when excavating the palace of King Minos at Knossos, in Crete, at the turn of the century. Subsequently examples of the symbols turned up in Asia Minor, Cyprus, Syria, Palestine, and on the Greek mainland, where a big find was made at Pylos in 1939.

In 1953, using a system which retrospectively seems of crystalline precision, logic, and simplicity, Ventriss cracked the script with stunning conclusiveness. Utilizing hints provided by a Cypriot syllabary from a period a millennium later than the script he was dealing with, and working from pictorial representations of some objects, Ventriss was able to establish phonetic values for various symbols and from these to work out cognates in the earliest Greek previously known. The result was the initial recov-

ery of 200 words in the oldest form of Greek known to us. It is the Greek, in fact, of Homer's Achaean heroes of 1,300 B.C.

For everyone sensitive to the pathos of history, one whose life is a continuing interrogation as to who he is and where he has come from, a new depth has been added to the historical perspective by Ventriss' feat.

In the foreground, already lush in detail, lies the hitherto obscure prehistory of those Greeks who have exercised such a vast and continuing influence upon the world. In the background lies the tantalizing possibility that through the Linear B Script the Linear A Script may in turn be broken. The chances are good that the Linear A Script will turn out to be that of the Minoan culture, the great commercial, military, and artistic predecessor of the Achaean one, and a culture concerning which a very large number of questions remain unanswered.

### SIDELIGHT FOR MARXISTS

For Marxists the cracking of the Linear B Script has a special interest. It provides yet another confirmation of the materialist interpretation of history, this one from archeology, a field which was very young at the time Marx and Engels were developing their theory of history.

When Heinrich Schliemann, the father of archeology, made his revolutionary excavations at Troy, Mycenae, and Tiryns he did so out of a fascination with the story of the heroes of the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey*. The emphasis has shifted since the pioneer work of that renegade millionaire. There is an increasing awareness that, in Engels' words, "the economic structure of society always forms the real basis from which, in the last analysis, is to be explained the whole superstructure of legal and political institutions, as well as of the religious, philosophical, and other conceptions of each historical period."

A hundred years of wars, revolutions, depressions, trade-unionism, colonial revolts, Marxism, and the evolution of theory in archeology and collateral fields, have not been without their effect. For example, Jotham Johnson in commenting on Ventriss' discovery in a recent issue of *Scientific American* states: "Ventriss found on the Achaean tablets the names of occupations which already have provided the raw material for a sociological study. The list of occupations depicts a highly organized Bronze Age society engaged in agriculture, industry, commerce and defense, with such professional specialists as armorers and bow-makers, goldsmiths and bronze-workers, stokers, potters, cooks and bakers, harrowers, cowherds, shepherds, and goat-herds, huntsmen, shipbuilders, oarsmen and longshoremen, tanners, fullers, tailors, doctors, property owners, supervisors, overlords and kings." It sounds almost like the roster of an AFL central labor union!

### CIRCLE OF LIGHT

Schliemann himself, despite his riotous romanticism, actually sharply oriented archeology in a materialist direction. For, with a tenacity rivaled only by his brilliant successes, he refused to regard the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey* as simply productions of literary inspiration but as documents of real events as well.

The day has long since past when Marx and Engels could deplore the dearth of writing on economic subjects. In her *Medieval People*, written thirty years ago and currently republished in the Anchor edition, Eileen Power notes this change in her very first paragraphs. In regard to the past, at least, the role of the economic factor in history is much more fully realized and documented.

The present is another matter. Here vested interests—economic, intellectual, and psychological—are at stake. Thus, a Sidney Hook, who can fully admit the primary role played by economic factors in primitive society, can reject the Marxist interpretation of capitalist society as an interpolation abstracted from the economic structure of precapitalist societies.

But reality constantly asserts itself, as the brisk fumbblings of the Eisenhower administration demonstrate with daily and appalling consistency. The glory of capitalist scholarship is that it has been able, bit by bit, to extend the circle of firelight in the historic darkness. Its tragedy is that in the here and now before the impending catastrophe it has nothing to say.

## The Truth About Guatemala

# U.S. Operatives and Spies Swarmed Over Guatemala

The evidence that U. S. secret operatives were swarming over the Guatemala area in preparation for the rebel invasion has accumulated from so many different and varied sources as to be unanswerable.

Last March 16, Senator Mike Mansfield (Dem., Montana), in a Senate speech about the Central Intelligence Agency's operations, charged an "abortive effort by CIA's undercover men to start a revolution in Guatemala."

On June 20 James Reston wrote in the *N. Y. Times*: "If somebody wants to start a revolution against the Communists in, say, Guatemala, it is no good talking to Foster Dulles. But Allan Dulles, head of the CIA, is a more active man. He has been watching the Guatemalan situation for a long time."

On the same day Max Lerner wrote in his column in the *N. Y. Post*, on the basis of his visit to Guatemala at the beginning of the month, shortly before the attack: "When I was in Guatemala it was common knowledge . . . that American interests were involved. . . . As one extremely well-informed observer put to me: 'We are up to our necks in this stuff.'"

On June 23 Lerner got more explicit, perhaps encouraged by the fact that talk about this secret "stuff" was getting common:

"Our State Department representatives were not the only ones who were down in Guatemala. In my long interview with Foreign Minister Toriello . . . the foreign minister said smilingly that FBI agents were swimming all over his country. I expressed surprise, but he repeated the charge.

"I then made proper inquiries of the proper authorities, and I got a flat denial. I persisted, and from other quarters I learned that there were indeed a number of mysterious Americans in and around Guatemala. They were, however, not 'FBI men' but General Intelligence Agency men.

"This was amusingly confirmed the other day in a Washington commentary by James Reston of the *N. Y. Times*. He spoke of the current jokes about the UN 'cease-fire' for Guatemala: there were queries about whether it meant that Foster Dulles of the State Department was to ask Allen Dulles of the CIO to cease fire."

### U. S. GAVE SIGNAL

During the whole of the past year especially, anti-government elements from Guatemala had been telling the world openly that they expected and hoped that the U. S. would intervene. On November 8 last, the *N. Y. Times* correspondent Sidney Gruson reported that those seeking the "protection of their own vast economic interests" anticipated "U. S. armed intervention to overthrow" the government.

On January 29 the Guatemalan government officially informed the world that an armed intervention was brewing. Officials showed documents which they had secured, including letters from Colonel Castillo Armas, the rebel commander, to the son of Nicaragua's president, Colonel Somoza Debayle. In one of these letters Castillo Armas wrote:

"The government of the north recognized the impossibility of any other solu-

tion to the grave problem of my country, has taken the decision to let us go ahead with our plans."

In view of all collateral evidence, there is every reason to believe that this document is genuine. In that case it is documentary expression of the role of the Guatemalan rebels as unleashed dogs dependent on the "sic' em" signal of the "government of the north."

At the UN Security Council meeting on June 21, Guatemala's representative Castillo-Arriola also revealed the provocative role of a former U. S. ambassador to Guatemala, Richard Patterson.

This affair went back before Arbenz became president, to 1949 when Juan José Arevalo was still president of Guatemala. The propaganda campaign about "Communist domination" of Guatemala was already under way. As Castillo-Arriola reported, Ambassador Patterson—

"announced openly that the government then headed by Dr. Juan José Arevalo would be overthrown as the result of international pressure: incited various groups of conspirators to engage in subversive activities against the constitutional regime and expressed to high officials of the Guatemalan government the opinion that the Guatemalan problem was a matter which could easily be settled, as it represented a just claim and involved only a few million dollars, but that, if the United States were to give way in the case of Guatemala, it would be obliged to do so elsewhere, which would mean a loss of many thousand million dollars."

At the UN, the U. S. delegate Henry Cabot Lodge replied only that "Mr. Patterson does not hold office under this administration; he has never held office under this administration."

### PATTERSON'S PAST

That of course is true; Patterson was Truman's gauleiter in Guatemala, a fact which requires some meditation on the past of liberal Fair-Dealers who think there was something called a "Good Neighbor Policy."

In fact, Patterson was virtually kicked out of Guatemala, so open and brazen were his activities. As the *Foreign Policy Bulletin* put it: "The behavior . . . of some of the United States diplomats in Guatemala in the recent past—although not during the past two years—did much to aid the Communists' campaigns against the United States and American enterprises in the country. One of our ambassadors [Patterson] was virtually declared persona non grata, his behavior having been such as to arouse the passions of even the most moderate of nationalists." (Robert J. Alexander, April 1, 1954 issue.)

Incidentally, Patterson, Truman's ambassador, has now become the fair-haired boy of the Hearst press. This past week the *N. Y. Journal-American* resuscitated him as a "prophet" of the "Latin Red Peril."

According to this McCarthyite version, Patterson kept warning the Truman-Acheson Communist-coddlers about that Red Peril; then—

"Patterson was virtually kicked out of Guatemala. He had to run to escape in a plane to save his life. To this day the State Department has no official record of when Patterson left Guatemala."

### A Basic Pamphlet—

## SOCIALISM: THE HOPE OF HUMANITY

by  
Max Shachtman

Read it! 10 cents

Independent Socialist Press

114 West 14 Street, New York City



## LABOR ACTION

July 5, 1954 Vol. 18, No. 27

Published weekly by Labor Action Publishing Company, 114 West 14 Street, New York 11, N. Y.—Telephone: WAtkins 4-4222—Re-entered as second-class matter May 24, 1940, at the Post Office at New York, N. Y., under the act of March 3, 1874.—Subscriptions: \$2 a year; \$1 for 6 months (\$2.25 and \$1.15 for Canadian and Foreign).—Opinions and policies expressed in signed articles by contributors do not necessarily represent the news of Labor Action, which are given in editorial statements.

Editor: HAL DRAPER

Asst. Ed.: GORDON HASKELL,  
BEN HALL

Business Mgr.: L. G. SMITH

Labor Action FORUM

New York City

HAL DRAPER

on

## GUATEMALA — BETWEEN U.S. IMPERIALISM AND STALINISM

THURSDAY, JULY 8 at 8:30 p.m.

LABOR ACTION HALL

114 West 14 Street, New York City

Auspices of ISL and Young Socialist League

## National Tour in Summer Planned to Cover West Coast

The Young Socialist League will conduct a national tour of its major units this summer. YSL National Chairman Max Martin will visit Pittsburgh, Chicago, Los Angeles, Berkeley and the Pacific Northwest during the July 26 to August 27 period. The details of the tour and the exact schedule have not yet been determined; they will be announced in *Challenge* as soon as full information is available.

One of the highlights of the tour will be the visit to the newly formed Pittsburgh unit of the YSL. Another welcome feature will be the fact that a major portion of the tour will be spent on the West Coast. This is in contradistinction to most tours

held by socialist youth organizations in the past, tours of only the East and Midwest. One of the aims of the tour is the organization of a Seattle unit.

Comrade Martin will discuss organizational problems with the various branches, meet friends of the YSL, and address outdoor meetings and forums which are being arranged. The tour will have the effect of cementing the national character of the YSL. This result will be bolstered by the YSL Summer Camp which is being held right after the conclusion of the tour and which members and friends of the YSL from several parts of the country are planning to attend.

## New YSL Summer Camp: When, Where & How Much

The Young Socialist League proudly announces that arrangements have been completed for the first YSL Summer Camp and School. The bare facts follow, with more details to be announced soon.

**TIME:** The camp will run from Friday, August 27 (supper) to Friday, September 3 (lunch).

**PLACE:** At Mountain Spring Camp, Road No. 1, Washington, New Jersey (12 miles east of Easton, Penna.). Eighty-three acres of hills, valleys and woodlands in the foothills of the Pocono Mountains.

**RECREATION,** sports and plain fun: Swimming, baseball, volleyball, badminton, basketball, campfires, hikes, singing, folk-dancing, skits, chess, and just relaxation.

**EDUCATION:** There will be four educational classes of three sessions each—one class taking place each morning and afternoon. Topics: (1) Imperialism and the Third Camp; (2) Stalinism; (3) American Capitalism and the War Economy; (4) Socialist History. Instructors and prominent lecturers to be announced.

Rates: remarkably low in this period of high vacation prices. For cabins or rooms (for couples of privacy addicts) the rate for the full week is \$38 per person. Dormitory accommodations are slightly lower, \$35 for the full week. For the weekend only, the rate is \$12 for cabins, \$11 for dorms. For a period longer than the weekend but less than the full seven days, the rates will be \$6 and \$5.50 a day, for cabins and dorms respectively. Family accommodations are available to the "older youth." And in cases of real financial need, some partial scholarships may be available.

The reservation deposit is \$5 per person and must be paid in advance. The deposit for weekenders is only \$3. We will be able to accommodate all those who register, but it is necessary for us to inform the camp authorities in advance. Anyone planning to come should register immediately.

### SPECIAL PLANS

To those who have been around the socialist youth movement for a few years, nothing much more need be said about the Summer Camp and School. This institution has been one of the finest things in the tradition of both the Socialist Youth League and the Young Peoples Socialist League, the two organizations that merged to found the YSL.

The gathering together of friends and members from all over the country for a solid week of getting acquainted has been one of the most stimulating experiences

A Labor Action sub is \$2 a year.  
Get it EVERY week!

## First YSL Education Conference Analyzes War, Political Issues

By RUTH KAREL

The Young Socialist League Educational Conference, held in New York last weekend, June 26 and 27, was highly successful from a number of points of view. Approximately 40 members and friends of the YSL from Pittsburgh, Philadelphia, New Haven, Newark, Madison and, of course, New York, attended the conference which consisted of four discussions of the politics and problems of socialism today.

The first of the two Saturday sessions was an analysis of the Indochina conflict by Max Martin, national chairman of the YSL. Presenting some background material on the political and economic trends in that country over the last 50 years, Comrade Martin traced the development of both French imperialism and the Stalinist-dominated Vietnam and concluded with an exposition of the YSL Third Camp position calling for a genuine democratic nationalist movement to struggle against both the French and the Stalinists.

In the discussion which followed, centering mainly around the nature of the Vietnam and the question of whether or not socialists could support it, some comrades put forward a minority view of "military (though not political) support to the Vietnam."

### LIVELY DISCUSSION

The afternoon session led by Michael Harrington, acting editor of *Challenge*, was a discussion of the war question. He outlined the historical analysis of revolutionary socialists that World Wars I and II were imperialist conflicts on both sides which they could not support. Discussing the current conflict between Stalinism and capitalism he explained that,

although it is a struggle between two contesting social systems, nevertheless it is a basically imperialist conflict. Socialists hold the view of calling for a democratic Third Camp solution as the only progressive answer to an atomic war.

Much of the discussion from the floor centered around the growth and viability of Stalinism vis-à-vis capitalism and the question of pacifist and Marxist opposition to war.

Following a social the night before, the Sunday morning session of the conference heard Sam Taylor, member of the NEC of the YSL, analyze the current political trends in the American labor movement, pointing to the necessity of the formation of an independent labor party as the next step toward the development of class-consciousness among the workers. Some comrades felt that labor candidates in Democratic primaries should be supported; others discussed the prospect of a labor party today.

Gordon Haskell, assistant editor of *LABOR ACTION*, led the last session of the conference in a discussion of the role of a socialist organization today, its attitudes toward and relations with liberal and labor groups. Representing a left-wing, consistently democratic and militant civil-libertarian program, socialists look forward to a radical upsurge in the American working class.

Speakers from the floor concerned themselves largely with socialist youth perspectives and the question of orientation toward recruitment from Stalinoid as against liberal students. Many felt that this frank discussion of organizational attitudes was one of the most fruitful sessions of the conference.

Despite the torrid weather, the discussions were both lively and stimulating. The exchange of ideas and the personal contact among YSLers from various places, as well as the chance to talk to others interested in the problems facing socialists today, all contributed to the success of the conference.

## Thinking Things Through at the YSL Conference

One of the most creative aspects of the YSL Educational Conference emerged in the give-and-take of discussion from the floor. At each session, it was not only a case of lively differences on various questions, but also of clarification, a kind of group inventiveness. A typical example took place during the session on the war question.

The discussion leader for the session, Comrade Harrington of the YSL, had raised the issue of the "leader evil" in his main presentation. This was related to the question of the pessimistic attitude of American socialism with regard to prospects of success. One form which the problem took in his statement was this: Would one maintain an anti-war position even if one realized that there was not a real alternative? Would one reject the lesser evil even if there were no possibility of any real kind of a good?

In the discussion on the floor, a fairly clear difference had arisen on this question. One point of view maintained that it was absolutely necessary for an alternative to be posed. To maintain an "anti" position without a positive program was, in this opinion felt, irresponsible, a retreat into vague metaphysical absolutes.

However, another opinion from the floor took the opposite view: the total evil of the lesser evil and the greater evil was so great that one would, in a sense, go down shouting against the lesser evil even if there were not real alternatives. This line of thinking admitted the moralistic character of its analysis but defended it.

So far the discussion had brought out two different points of view and explored

their differences. But at the same time, clarification had already been made. For both sides were agreed that the question was hypothetical in the sense that the Third Camp still represented a very real possibility. In line with this, there was a discussion of various manifestations of Third Camp sentiment, which produced an agreement that an incipient Third Camp had already clearly manifested itself.

### 'LESSER EVIL' ANALYZED

At this point, Comrade Taylor made a general discussion of the problem of the lesser evil from the floor. As a result, there was a much more general agreement and understanding of the problem.

Taylor pointed out that the analysis, up to this point, had been relatively static. The very posing of the question of a "lesser evil" involved the mechanistic notion of two unrelated evils, qualitatively different from each other.

The actual situation, Taylor pointed out, was otherwise. For Stalinism demands, in a sense, as one of its preconditions the decadence of capitalism, and this emergence of Stalinism in turn accelerates and quickens certain imperialistic characteristics of a dying capitalism. Taylor's point was that the lesser-evil conception was fundamentally a schematic and unhistorical one, raising the image of two unrelated choices facing each other. But historical reality confronted us with a process in which one evil was, to a certain extent, the result of the other, and both interpenetrate in their common creation of the problem of imperialist war.

From this standpoint, Taylor concluded

ed, it was, in a very real sense, impossible to oppose one of the imperialisms without opposing the other. If, for example, Stalinism can only come into existence and prosper in a world in which capitalism is no longer a viable social system, anti-Stalinism to be meaningful must include anti-capitalism. Thus, in a concrete situation, imperialism in Indochina is not only faced with a desperate and impossible situation, from its own point of view, but is also responsible for the growth of the power of Stalinism. French policy is one of the strongest supports of Ho; anti-Stalinism in Indochina is necessarily opposition to both imperialisms.

Taylor's point was generally agreed to have isolated the most important element in the lesser-evil formulation—its static, unhistorical nature—and to have provided a stimulating direction for further thought on Third Camp problems. This was only one example of the kind of discussion which went on, and it was certainly a more successful case of group creativity than most; yet in a lesser or greater way the same kind of discussion took place at every session of the Educational Conference.

Get the Challenge  
every week — by subscribing to  
Labor Action. A student sub is  
only \$1 a year!

# THE TRUTH ABOUT GUATEMALA—I

## The Lie About 'Communist Domination'

By PHILIP COBEN

The official justification for the imperialist assault on Guatemala in which the U. S. government has participated (if indeed it did not organize it) is that the Arbenz government of Guatemala is "Communist-dominated."

This is a very crude lie. The lack of any factual basis which can even be claimed for this falsehood is a remarkable feature of the case, illuminating the extent to which the U. S. press "voluntarily" lines itself up behind State Department policy without even the need of a Propaganda Ministry to "coordinate" its frauds. For this lie can be found virtually only in the U. S. press, echoing the State Department interventionists; and in the U. S. it is a falsehood that has been picked up equally by the liberal N. Y. Post to the Chicago Tribune.

Now there is very little dispute, if any, about certain facts with regard to the Guatemalan government.

The Arbenz regime is in an alliance with the Stalinists, whose "Labor Party" is one of four parties supporting it.

The Stalinists have been given important secondary posts in government agencies, particularly the agrarian reform committees, with which they have made hay. The Stalinists' continued control over the trade unions (which they organized) is ensured by Arbenz as part of the deal. The government has made various other gestures to keep its Stalinist partners happy, as, for example, declaring a minute of silence on Stalin's death. There is little doubt that in the course of the last years the Stalinists have built up considerable influence with the government.

The main feature of this deal, or alliance, between the Stalinists and the regime is that the Stalinists are allotted the trade-union movement—and more recently, the organization of the peasantry, who in their mass are, however, apolitical and passive—in exchange for their organization of these bailiwicks to support the regime in power. In a Central American country like Guatemala, however, these are still minor sectors.

Traditionally the most active sections of the society, politically, have been the middle class and the army; and the Arbenz regime has the support of three other parties based on these latter forces. Since around 1950, it has been reported by some observers, the regime has tended to drop some influence among the middle class and to count more on labor support, but at bottom it is the support of the army which is decisive.

And no one claims that the Guatemalan army is "Communist-dominated."

### THE BACKGROUND

This is the picture. Obviously, any politically literate person knows that the Guatemalan Stalinists aim to build up their own influence toward their own totalitarian ends, like Stalinists everywhere; and that if Arbenz is using the Stalinists, the latter also think they are using Arbenz. Also, we need not discuss here (as we did in a previous issue of LA) the crucial need for a struggle against the Stalinist stranglehold on labor organization in Guatemala. What we want to disentangle is solely the lying claim that "Guatemala is Communist-dominated."

The real relations that exist between the Arbenz regime and the Stalinists, friendly as these relations are, would not do for our apologists of imperialist intervention. It would sound a little weak to say that the U. S. must help to crush an independent government merely because it is working on friendly terms with a minority CP. But when the press yells about "Communist domination," that sounds more serious. It conjures up visions of Guatemala becoming a secret base of the Russian army, navy and air force and the rest of the phantasmagoria that has been filling the newspapers.

Yet how many newspaper readers know that in this government which is supposed to be dominated by the CP, there is not a single cabinet member who is even charged with being a Stalinist or a Stalinist stooge? The jobs which Stalinists hold are all below cabinet level. In this alliance, Arbenz has not admitted his Stalinist junior partners to the tops.

How many newspaper readers know that in this "Communist-dominated" government there are only four Legislature members (out of 56) who are charged with being CPers or under the control of the CP?

*This article, held over from last week, was of course written before the ousting of the Arbenz government by a succession of military juntas.—Ed.*

How then do the Stalinists "dominate" this government? perhaps because President Arbenz is really a concealed CPer? —But how many newspaper readers know that the president has been charged by no serious observer with being in sympathy with the CP as such, but at the worst with making too many concessions to it?

(Wrote Life magazine only a few months ago, Oct. 12: "Arbenz, who is no Communist, looks upon the Reds as Guatemalans' first and Reds second. He says he is using them; the evidence is at least as ample that they are using him.")

As a matter of fact, it is important to realize that the Guatemala coalition sprang up in the years 1944-45 in the same political climate of the "Grand Alliance" with our "noble ally" Russia which sowed all kinds of pro-Stalinist illusions among the most conservative sectors of Europe and America. Even liberal columnists have forgotten that at the time the Guatemala Stalinists started worming into their place in the regime (under President Arevalo, Arbenz's predecessor), it had not been long since that Hollywood had made its movie glorifying Stalin ("Mission to Moscow"), that Eisenhower was praising Stalin, that Robert Taft had good things to say of the Russians, that big publishing houses refused to publish anti-Stalinist books, that leading right-wing conservatives were lending their names to Stalinist front organizations, etc.

All this is now shoved back to ancient times in American memories; but the sharpening of the cold war which transformed American politics could not have been expected to have the same impact on Guatemala; and it didn't. Unlike the military dictators in Latin America whom the U. S. can rely on to jump when bidden, the Guatemalan regime saw no reason of its own to go back on the alliance (or deal) with the CP, as long as the Stalinists were useful to them. And as their social-reform measures stirred the frenzied enmity of United Fruit and its allies, they were all the more forced to rely even further on alliance with the Stalinists as a counterweight.

### ONLY A YEAR AGO

What, then, is there to the claim that Guatemala is "Communist-dominated"?

In full support to the picture we have drawn, we will present the most serious attempt made in the American Party Line press to buttress the State Department claims. This was an article in the New Leader of this February, by Daniel James, an article which virtually called for foreign intervention.

But this same Daniel James had, a year before, written another article on Guatemala (New Leader, April 13, 1953). What is really instructive is to compare the two, by the same man, in the same organ of State Department "liberalism."

James' article of a year ago was written on his return from a trip to that country. It was entitled "Is Guatemala Communist?" As managing editor of the New Leader, James is considered a reliable Communist-smeller even by some McCarthyite circles.

And one year ago Communist-hunter James scouted, almost with indignation, the story that Guatemala was Stalinist-controlled:

"I spoke to government ministers, political leaders of all shades, trade-union officials, diplomats, editors, businessmen, and plain workers and peasants. I observed the ordinary Guatemalteco at work and at play, in the countryside as well as in the capital. I saw no evidence anywhere that might lead me fairly to say: Here is Communism."

He says the Stalinists are strong, a growing force, he even says that "should the present trend of affairs continue, they may soon dominate the country"—

"But they do not run Guatemala—and it is important to recognize that fact."

The country's press is "relatively free. . . . The most widely read daily is the anti-Red El Imparcial . . . El Imparcial and the equally anti-Communist La Hora and Prensa Libre are bought and read more frequently than the pro-Communist press."

"Political activity also is relatively free. . . ."

"Nor are elections unfree. In January [1953], the country went through its biennial congressional campaign without major incident, and two top Communist candidates—including General Secretary Jose Manuel Fortuny—were defeated; the seats they sought are now occupied by two staunch anti-Communists. . . ."

"To a lesser extent, there is even freedom to demonstrate. . . ."

"I was told before I entered Guatemala to expect to be shadowed and find my notes stolen or otherwise tampered with. None of this happened: I went about Guatemala City alone, daytime and nighttime, without molestation."

Now when James reports these manifestations of "relative freedom," it must be understood that hardly anywhere else among the Central American republics can their like be found.

But James was down there to smell out Communist domination, and though he had to report that it did not exist he was not behindhand in dire alarms for the near future. "An iron curtain has not descended on Guatemala," he sums up, but "other happenings clearly indicate that the curtain has begun to drop."

These "other happenings" are simply the manifestations of the Arbenz-Stalinist alliance, and that's all. The first which he lists is that "minute of silence" for Stalin. The second is his reference to Arbenz's denunciations of "anti-Communism"—the slogan already being used against his own regime. James makes it sound as if Arbenz is positively defending "Communism." The third "happening" is the simple fact of the electoral coalition among the pro-Arbenz parties, including the CP.

At any rate, while expressing these fears for the future, our Communist-smeller reported back that the Guatemalan regime was definitely not run by the Communists. And in the last part of his article he discussed the role of United Fruit, etc., in pushing the people into the arms of the Stalinists.

### HILARIOUS, ISN'T IT?

That was a year ago. Specifically it was before the State Department started its violent campaign against Guatemala in connection with the Caracas Inter-American Conference. Subsequently the temperature of propaganda against Guatemala rose in the United States and in all of its press. Washington's pressure against the little country became harder and more vicious. The American Party Line became perfectly clear.

And so in the New Leader for February 15 of this year, this same Daniel James publishes another article, "Show-down in Guatemala?" This one is not written after a trip—at least, not after a trip to Guatemala.

Now, ten months after, we find that Guatemala is "Red-ridden," the Arbenz regime is "Red-dominated," etc. However, peculiarly enough, this "Red-dominated" country has yet to "fall to Communism," that unhappy event being merely imminent.

In any case, on what grounds, factual or otherwise, does James now discover that Guatemala is "Red-dominated"?

The answer would be hilariously funny if it were not scandalous.

The most important piece of evidence which our Communist-smeller adduces ("the most disturbing of a series of unfortunate events") is the fact that on January 29 the Arbenz regime dared to charge that an invasion of Guatemala was being plotted in the neighboring dictatorships and with the help of the U. S.

This charge, argues James, is so transparently false that it can only mean that Guatemala is now controlled by the Stalinists, whose method it is to make their coups under cover of such wild accusations!

Everybody knows now, of course, that the charge was perfectly true. Let us give James the benefit of the doubt and admit that in February he sincerely thought it was so fantastic. To be sure, this would argue him to be either very dense or else an absolutely hypnotized

dupe of the State Department, since reports of interventionist plans from abroad were already very common outside of Guatemala. But if we admit his sincerity for the sake of argument, we still get the following picture:

The U. S. starts preparing and encouraging intervention. For this purpose it excites talk about "Communist domination" of Guatemala. The Arbenz regime charges that these interventionist plans are under way, as indeed they are. State Department stooges seize on this charge as itself evidence of "Communist domination," thus helping to prepare the climate for the intervention which is charged. . . .

### "EVIDENCE"

The other pieces of evidence cited by James for the fact that Guatemala had been taken over in the last few months are: (1) the fact that United Fruit was included in the charges as among the plotters; (2) the expulsion of two U. S. newspapermen; (3) Arbenz' attack on the State Department and other U. S. agencies. These, reasons James, are all designed to "disrupt" the Caracas conference. . . . Furthermore, the charge that an invasion was being plotted followed by less than a month the return from Moscow of Guatemala's CP leaders. . . . Also, Guatemala is planning to stay away from Caracas, thus "delivering a blow to hemispheric unity." (It didn't stay away; but Costa Rica did, without being "Communist-dominated.")

This type of "proof" of the "Red-domination" of Guatemala is now, at least in hindsight, a hilarious joke on the New Leader and its Guatemalan Communist-smeller. It is unlikely that the New Leader will refer to it in the issue in which it puts its anti-Communist stamp of approval on the invasion-plot which it scoffed at.

But in his February article James had a second line of "proof." And this was not in the least funny.

"The first big land expropriation under the Agrarian Reform Law, which took 234,000 acres of United Fruit Company property last February, initiated, it is now clear, a new stage in the Communist conquest of Guatemala."

Of course, this had already happened when James had written his first article, but "it is now clear" to him that it was the attack on United Fruit which proves "Red-domination." This had been clear to United Fruit itself for quite a long while now, but the Communist-smeller was a little late in catching up with that patriotic company. Having caught up, however, he embroiders the tale with some fantasies about the local committees formed under the Agrarian Reform law being "soviets."

Having thus proved that Guatemala is on the very verge of falling into complete Stalinist control—in the first place, remember, because of Arbenz' charge of brewing intervention — James proceeds openly to advocate intervention himself, as "the only sensible course" for the U. S.

Such open intervention, presumably, would be a fitting punishment for the government which had had the impudence to tell the world that such intervention was being prepared. Next time they'll know better. . . .

### OUTLOOK

The current cry of the coordinated U. S. press that Guatemala is "Communist-dominated" is a crude lie, as we have said. But it is the liars themselves who are doing their best to see to it that their falsehood becomes truth.

It is the American interventionists and their friends among the Guatemalan rebel reaction, and their helpers in the neighboring dictatorships, who may succeed in forcing the Arbenz regime further into the arms of the Stalinists in the course of this very military adventure. To be sure, that does not seem very likely at the moment; it would seem presently more probable that if the attackers seem to be winning, the Guatemalan army will change sides and doom Arbenz as well as the Stalinists, and with them also the gains of the Guatemalan social reform. If Arbenz falls, it is more likely that the army will take over, and not the Stalinists.

But, however, the relationship of forces may change in the future, there can be no shadow of a doubt that the cry of "Communist domination" is as cynical a lie as has ever been used by a stronger country to attack and dominate a weaker

# THE TRUTH ABOUT GUATEMALA—II

## The Imperialist Apologetics of Max Lerner

By HAL DRAPER

The putrefaction of liberalism in the United States has been acted out more clearly on the Guatemala issue than in any other contemporary crisis.

Outside of Stalinoids here and there, who don't count for present purposes, where is a liberal voice that has been raised in condemnation of the crime that has been committed against a small country?

We hope to be able to report that there are at least a few, but we haven't heard them yet.

There has not been a peep from the ADA. As we discussed last week, from the liberal N. Y. *Post* there came only a wretched apology for the strong-arm policy against Guatemala.

**Look at this tremendous and startling contrast: In virtually every other country of the world, all through Latin America and all through Western Europe, the press reports that right-wing and starkly conservative spokesmen and even usually pro-American newspapers are expressing disapproval in stronger or less strong terms of the putsch against Guatemala. Outside the borders of the U. S., that is a widespread view even of right-wing circles. Inside these charmed borders, the most liberal of the liberals fall on their face before State Department policy.**

So far-reaching and deep-going has been the corruption and emasculation of American liberalism in this era of cold war and witchhunt! So profound is the gulf between the whole of the world on the one hand and, on the other, the American Party-Line ideology which unites both liberals and reactionaries in obeisance to triumphant imperialism.

### A Classic Case

But maybe it's the rest of the world that's out of step? Maybe, as some liberals claim to think, even the conservatives abroad are soft-headed when it comes to fighting Communism? Maybe it's true that only "we Americans" are real smart in world politics?

A leading American liberal spokesman, Max Lerner, took a trip to Guatemala at the beginning of June, looked around, scouted the territory, learned what was going on, smartened himself up, and came home not very long before the assault broke out. As both a liberal and a new-fledged authority on the subject, he was in an unparalleled position to strike a liberal note on the issue. In a series of columns in the first part of June, and then in a number of columns after the outbreak of hostilities, Lerner held forth on his political analysis.

What came out of him was a nearly classic exposition of how to put a "liberal" face on national-chauvinism, intervention, and imperialist cynicism.

It is not just that he brings himself to justify the rape of Guatemala. It is the open grounds on which he does this that is so impressive with regard to the rottenness of liberalism in this country.

Having been to Guatemala and looked around, Lerner does not raise the cry of "Communist domination" of the Arbenz government. He knows better, and will not lie about that. But this mightily restricts the ground on which he can go along with Washington. Why is he willing to approve of suppression of a small country if he does not believe this popular pretext?

### Naive Chauvinism

Yes, he is an honest liberal in his own way. Commenting on Guatemala's charges as presented to the UN (June 21), he says "the case was a strong one." He admits that Honduras and Nicaragua "have deeply compromised themselves." He hedges on the guilt of the U. S. but admits that "American corporate money" (at best) was behind the invasion, and that "some" of the arms which the U. S. shipped to the Nicaraguan and Honduran dictators was being used by the rebels.

"But there is one big fact that more than cancels out this whole case," he winds up.

What can this fact be, which, in the eyes of this honest liberal, justifies foreigners in intervening to change the government of a small country against the will of its people?

It cannot be simply any old reason for criticism of the Arbenz government policy, or even denunciation of it. What is so intolerably evil about this government that it must be overthrown by foreigners from abroad with the OK of a liberal columnist?

**"It is the fact that the Guatemalan government deliberately welcomed into its councils the native Communist leaders who were under the discipline of the Kremlin."**

Welcomed into its councils!—that's all. That's enough for the honest liberal. This Arbenz government, which was not dominated by the Stalinists, "welcomed into its councils" the Stalinist leaders with whom it was willing to work, and therefore we foreigners are justified in overthrowing it by force and violence. . . .

Like Max Lerner, we have no hesitation in saying that the Arbenz policy of cooperation with the Stalinists was a deep-going error of political naiveté and ignorance which any Guatemalan democrat and progressive would have to denounce and fight. That's our opinion. But all that concerns the Guatemalan people. We Americans—foreigners—can advise, warn, caution, try to instruct, criticize, howl or abuse. But for our honest liberal there is no such distinction.

Just as the Washington government views itself as a police agency bestriding the world like a colossus, poised to judge and censure, overlord of the planet, bearer of life or death for any nation, so our honest liberal absorbs the same chauvinist view without even thinking about it. He does not even raise the question with himself of separately justifying the going-over from mere denunciation of the Arbenz policy to overthrow of the Arbenz government by foreign arms.

Our honest liberal is a naive imperialist-chauvinist.

### Advice to Bad Imperialists

But he is a liberal chauvinist. You don't catch him giving unqualified endorsement to the attack on Guatemala. No, on the contrary, he thinks Washington blundered. His criticism of the State Department's policy is more disreputable than the Hearst papers' brash defense of it. Here's the line along which it goes:

**"In terms of wise policy, I think the Eisenhower administration has blundered again: It should have used the slow clock [i.e., method] of diplomacy and economic measures, rather than the fast clock of the Castillo Armas attack. . . ."**

**"In his delightful book *The Old Country Store*, Gerald Carson tells of the Connecticut storekeeper who spied a customer with a stolen codfish under his coat, and told him that he should either have worn a longer coat or taken a shorter fish. I think both Dulleses might well ponder this fable.**

**"Note that I am talking here of wise and prudent political action, and not of political morality. There are some 'liberals' who never boggle at anything the Russians do, but whenever the U. S. gets mixed up in anything they cry 'intervention.'" (June 23.)**

Lerner is engaged in giving "wise" advice to a thief on how to pull the job without getting caught. It is a barometer of the putrid climate in this country that he can put it in these terms himself just as calmly and matter-of-factly as you please.

By "diplomacy and economic measures," of course, he means bringing the Arbenz government to heel by non-military intervention and arm-twisting. There was a time in this country when the most watery liberal would become indignant at the very thought that his country would so abuse its strength in the world. Today our honest liberal "wisely" and smugly urges this course on the government, pointing out how very much more clever and statesmanlike it is to overthrow a small nation's government by stealth and deceit and subtle blackmail rather than by coarse weapons like guns and bombs.

You have to be a liberal to understand these advantages; those dog-goned reactionaries just don't know how to go about running the rest of the world in our interests. That's because they are bad imperialists. . . .

### McCarthyism for Export

**In this same column of June 23, he does not boggle at again stating his justification for overthrowing the Arbenz government by foreign arms: "Arbenz . . . deliberately and with open eyes accepted Communist aid in shaping his policies and getting a popular base for his regime." Therefore, off with his head.**

The United States, for a number of years, deliberately and with open eyes accepted Communist aid in winning its Second World War, putting Stalinists in privileged position even in the U. S. in exchange for this aid. In fact, the McCarthyites have a few Lerner-like things to say about the War Deal's willingness to make concessions to Moscow and even to native Stalinists and Stalinist fellow travelers, on the basis of the exigencies of the "Grand Alliance" with Russia. Lerner systematically defends or

at least apologizes for the real coddling of Stalinism which took place during the alliance with Stalinism with the blessing both of the Fair-Dealers and the Republicans.

It is not a question of referring to this in order to justify Arbenz's policy. But where Lerner is willing to take a very mellow view of the "Grand Alliance" with Stalinism both externally and internally as long as it was necessary to win the second imperialist world war, he finds it so unthinkable, so heinous, that Arbenz accepted Communist aid that the Guatemala government must be overthrown by the imperialist watchdog of the hemisphere and with the blessing of . . . liberals.

### The Bolivian Model

It was not by accident or by simply talking himself into a corner that Lerner came out with his statesmanlike recommendation to the State Department that the way to overthrow governments of refractory countries is by stealthy ambush, by quiet deceit, rather than noisy shooting. On June 7 he published his report on his interview, in Guatemala, with the Guatemalan foreign minister, Guillermo Toriello, and in this interview we find him developing the thought in another way.

Toriello had remarked that the U. S. seemed scared by the very word "revolution." You are being unfair, answered our honest American liberal—

**"I pointed to Bolivia as a case in point. On the question of land reform, the government of Paz Estenssoro, who had been sharply critical of the U. S. and had carried through more radical land reforms and expropriations than the Guatemalan, is nevertheless enjoying good relations with us."**

LABOR ACTION has rather exhaustively documented the precise nature of the relations between the State Department and the Bolivian revolution, in the informative dispatches by Juan Rey; and so we need only note here that the course which Lerner recommended for Guatemala has indeed been that of the State Department in Bolivia: economic blackmail, unrelenting pressure and threats. The chief weapon which the U. S. has to control the Bolivian Nationalist regime is its role as buyer of Bolivia's tin, without which the country cannot live; and this it has used to the full, plus the temptation of loans and minor inducements.

This is what our honest liberal calls "good relations." Or, in a more charitable interpretation, he is merely ignorant.

### Our Liberal Sneers . . .

Toriello himself pointed to another difference between Guatemala and Bolivia, in answer to Lerner. "Toriello answered that . . . the difference lay in the fact that Patino, the owner of the Bolivia tin mines, did not operate all through Central America as United Fruit does—and (I gathered) the American government was not therefore so eager to bow to his power or protect his interests."

This is a very valid point. The situation of United Fruit is so explosive not just because of its interests in one country, Guatemala, but because if it yielded to Guatemala, this concession would set off a chain reaction throughout a number of countries.

But the most obvious difference of all is not referred to by Lerner. It was not United States finance capital that was expropriated in the nationalization of the Bolivian tin mines.

Lerner's rebuttal? Only this: "I thought the answer was weak. Yet it must be remembered that United Fruit has become not only a slogan used cynically by the Communists for their own purposes but almost the symbol of a national neurosis throughout Central America."

The measure of our honest liberal's poisonously chauvinistic outlook can be taken again in this sneering and contemptuous reference to the benighted natives' "national neurosis" against the company that has been bleeding them white for decades. . . .

### Camp-Follower

In his account of the interview, Lerner painted himself as the enlightened democratic thinker who was gently teaching a backwoods politician about freedom. The Democratic Thinker did not think to mention, at the moment, however, that he was in favor of overthrowing his fellow conversationalist's government because it "accepted Communist aid."

He did not inform Toriello that he not only disagreed with him but was for foreign intervention against his government.

Perhaps he did not even think it. Perhaps he would then have repudiated the suggestion with indignation. In fact, it would be the pattern of such types that until the reaction undertook intervention, he would be against it; once it was under way, he would find his reasons to go along. It takes reactionaries with a spinal column to launch such a crime.

At any rate, it is a certainty that once the guns started shooting, he mobilized his honest liberalism, dumped "political morality" down the drain, fudged up a few woolly principles about punishing "Communist aid" with armed intervention, and marched along in the rear of the CIA muttering "Dulles has blundered again."

# UN Gets Kicked — —

(Continued from page 1)

threat. Before the Security Council at the time was Guatemala's complaint of invasion, on the one hand, and, on the other, the U. S. stooge-bloc's motion to refer the question out of the UN and into the sole jurisdiction of the Organization of American States (OAS).

The latter motion was carried but vetoed by Russia. The sole effect of this Russian veto was to keep the Guatemala issue before the UN. It was this "crime" of keeping the Guatemala issue before the UN which was denounced by Lodge as meddling in the Western Hemisphere.

No one has any illusions as to Russia's interest in the matter, needless to say. It was a chance for the Moscow totalitarians to show up their imperialist rival—the kettle turning around to call the pot black—but this truth has nothing to do with the over-all significance of the affair.

Again on June 23 Guatemala requested Security Council action, and again Lodge (who is acting as this month's council president) brazenly replied by smearing this request itself as a "Communist plot." He could understand, he said, why Russia "should constantly seek" to raise the issue in the council, "but the government of Guatemala should not lend itself to this very obvious Communist plot lest they appear to be a cat's-paw of the Soviet conspiracy to meddle in the Western Hemisphere."

In so many words, therefore, and not very cleverly, Lodge declared that the only motivation for asking the United Nations to act on this crisis was a "Communist plot."

"UN—Keep Out," he warned.

It is perfectly clear why the U. S. wants to keep the Guatemala scandal in the OAS, and out of the United Nations. Even in the top committee of the OAS it is hard work for Washington to keep the whip cracking over its reluctant lackeys, to vote the right way. Brazil, Venezuela, Colombia and the rest have been raising their hands like beaten dogs, wondering whether they were even going to earn a bigger aid-handout as a result of their prostitution. Lodge is fighting to keep the job inside the OAS as the more easily controllable body.

Moreover, for now and for the future, the U. S. does not want to set the precedent whereby even its European allies would have anything to say about its machinations in its own backyard. For it has already been shown that France, smarting over U. S. pressure to let up on its own colonies, was gleefully ready to take a crack at U. S. imperialist domination when it had a chance.

That was the significance of the otherwise useless motion made by the French delegate Hoppenot at the Security Council for a cease-fire. Hoppenot jabbed the needle deep into Lodge's rump as he reminded the U. S. ambassador of his pledge never to tell a small country "What's the hurry?" when it appealed for aid. Lodge had originally spoken those winged words with reference to Thailand, in connection with the Southeast Asia imbroglio; and Hoppenot, remembering Americans' smug criticisms of French colonialism in Indochina, made Lodge look like a hypocritical clown before the world forum.

## WHAT'S LEFT?

That was more than merely an opportunity for delegates to enjoy a good belly-laugh at the U. S. demagogue's expense. It pointed to greater trouble that might ensue from other maverick nations if the U. S. tried to use the UN as its club over Guatemala. The best that the

U. S. can hope to get out of the UN by pressure is agreement to stay out, while the club is fashioned out of the OAS.

So the UN has capitulated to Washington's demand that it keep its snout out of Uncle Sam's garden, and in effect it has abdicated as an organization having any pretense to international jurisdiction.

At the same time, however, pundits and diplomats are wondering what juridically is left of the UN. For example—

"UN observers wonder whether State Department planners are fully aware of the danger inherent in their new doctrine that the [Security] Council must cede priority to a regional organization in the handling of a dispute, irrespective of the wishes of the nations that are the parties to the dispute.

"Suppose another Cominform state were to break away on the pattern of Yugoslavia, it is asked, and to seek the UN protection? Would the U. S. be willing to leave this new Tito to the tender mercies of an East European Monroe Doctrine?"

"The doctrine of America for the Americans is an especially dangerous one for the U. S. to articulate at the very time that its interests are deeply engaged in the Far East." (N. Y. Post.)

In his column already mentioned, Walter Millis raises an even more fundamental question regarding the effect of the new doctrine on the basic reason for existence of the UN. It is interesting enough to quote:

"... this is indisputably a war, and there is no way to deal with a war anywhere in the world, under the accepted concepts of United Nations action, except by naming the 'aggressor' and then mobilizing all parties to suppress him, regardless of which side the 'aggressor' may be on. By a coincidence, the new issue of the *Yale Review*, containing an article by Dr. Arnold Wolfers making precisely this point, has appeared at the height of the Guatemala crisis. Dr. Wolfers observes that the underlying theory of 'collective security' has never really been tested, not even in Korea, because it assumes that all should be interested in suppressing any aggression, whether favorable to friend or foe, as being a higher goal than the furtherance of any particular national interest. Korea, in which the national interests of all the UN participants were quite clearly opposed to the aggression, was not a case of 'collective security' but rather of 'collective defense' on the old pattern of any past coalition war.

"... Guatemala now presents a case in which it could be said that, if 'collective security' were a living and vivid goal in the American mind, we would cooperate with Russia in suppressing the invading rebels, though we deeply feel that our interests lie with the rebels rather than with the Communist-tinged Arbenz government.

"This is certainly not going to happen..."

This is a beautifully logical demonstration, framed in terms of liberal internationalists' illusions, of the utter futility and irrelevancy of those illusions about the UN. Millis himself dribbles off only to a conclusion that "the whole example indicates the inadequacy of the underlying UN concepts," but more need not be expected from him.

It becomes a little harder, each time that the U. S. kicks the UN in the teeth, for anyone to pretend to himself that any association of existing ruling governments can be looked to as a force for peace in the world.

## The Brass Check Chorus at Work

The un-totalitarian U. S. press has been showing how well it can do the same thing as the Russian press—namely, lie in chorus.

Last week we pointed to a N. Y. *Times* editorial which blandly charged that it was the Russian veto in the Security Council session of June 21 that prevented the Council from settling the Guatemalan fracas (when, of course, the U. S. motion which was thus vetoed was directed to taking the issue out of the Council's hands altogether!).

In a spirit of mild charity, last week we called this a "stupid deceit."

It has since been cropping up all over the press, just as if it were coming from a Propaganda Ministry in Washington.

On June 25 the more-or-less liberal Washington columnist and muckraker, Robert S. Allen, "revealed" that Guatemala had invited a Russian military mission to come; but be this revelation as it may, Allen proceeded to add sagely that this was "the reason why Russia used its veto power at the Security Council meeting to kill the U. S.-supported proposal to lay the Guatemalan issue before the OAS. Consideration by this strictly Western Hemisphere agency would have meant speedy exposure of the Communist plot."

Allen does not seem to know that the Russian veto did not and could not prevent the OAS from also taking the matter up; that the OAS *did* take the matter up; and that his exclusive "Communist plot" has not yet been exposed.

*Time* magazine (June 28 issue) writes along the lines of the same formula: "Because the [Russian] veto paralyzed the [Security] Council," the OAS got ready to take up the Guatemala question!

Truly with respect to this little episode, black has become white and white black in the U. S. press.

## The Truth About Guatemala

# World Reaction to a Crime: Brazil as a Case in Point

Dispatches from all over the world continue to emphasize that the crime against Guatemala has so implicated the U. S. in the eyes of every people that it has been many years since anything has happened to so discredit U. S. foreign policy.

Not the smallest effect has been all over Latin America itself, where anti-U. S. protest demonstrations are reported from country after country, including Honduras itself, where the Castillo Armas rebels were incubated by the government. It is hard to tell from the reports, of course, to what extent these demonstrations are Stalinist-inspired, but whether so inspired or not in any given case there is little doubt that they express wide public feeling.

One of the most detailed reports on reactions in a Latin American country came in a *Times* dispatch (June 27) from Brazil. It is especially interesting because the Brazilian representatives are among those presently acting as Washington's stooges and shills in the anti-Guatemala maneuvers in the UN and the Organization of American States; and, as correspondent Sam Pope Brewer reports, "some of the leading newspapers" in the country are even speaking up in favor of the U. S.

Yet while the official line of the government and pro-government mouthpieces of Vargas are crawling before U. S. pressure, still—

"At the same time, it is difficult to find any Brazilian who is not convinced that

## Ike Is Normal, Thank You: Knows Nothing About It

From

I. F. Stone's Weekly

June 28

UNITED NATIONS, N. Y. — Though anything about the president is news, not a single newspaper seems to have reported the extraordinary story told about Eisenhower by the Guatemalan representative at the special session of the UN Security Council last Sunday [June 21].

According to this story, the president last January proposed the formation of a joint commission to take up disputes between the U. S. and Guatemala. When informed of the role played by United Fruit and of the relations between the company and Secretary of State Dulles and then Assistant Secretary for Inter-American Affairs John M. Cabot, Eisenhower suggested these two officials be left off the commission!

Here is the story, as told by the Guatemalan delegate, Castillo-Arriola, to the Security Council:

"Mr. Toriello Garrido, Guatemalan Ambassador in Washington, had a farewell interview of several minutes with President Eisenhower [last January—I.F.S.]. It is interesting to note that in those few moments President Eisenhower knew nothing about, or had entirely different information on, the state of the United Fruit Company's business in my country.

"The former Guatemalan Ambassador [now Foreign Minister] informed him fully of the manner in which the United Fruit Company and other U. S. monopolies had been operating in Guatemala, with full control over all our ports and communications and in occupation of vast tracts of territory, with Guatemala's national economy virtually subject to their interests.

"President Eisenhower told Ambassador Toriello that that situation could not continue in the same form and that it would be necessary to come to an arrangement. Mr. Toriello then informed President Eisenhower of the implications of the fact that both Mr. John M. Cabot, Assistant Secretary for Inter-American Affairs and Mr. Foster Dulles, the Secretary of State, himself had close connections with the fruit monopoly.

"In view of that situation, President Eisenhower suggested the formation of a joint commission which would not include those officers, to study the problem and work out just solutions."

As pointed out in the last issue of the *Weekly*, Mr. Cabot's family is a major interest in the United Fruit Company Bank, First National of Boston, and Mr. Dulles's law firm, Sullivan & Cromwell, represents the United Fruit railroad, International Railways of Central America.

the United States morally and perhaps materially backed the invaders. The leftists naturally are vociferous in criticism, but even those Brazilians friendliest toward the United States take the attitude that 'it may have seemed the best thing, but it was unfortunate.'

"Newspapers that normally are sympathetic to the United States and are far from leftist have joined the criticism. One sharp critic for example was Carlos Lacerda, crusading editor of the *Tribuna da Imprensa* in Rio de Janeiro, who is anti-Communist as only an ex-Communist can be.

"He accused the United States of having made the mistake of backing governments that are 'nearly all in the hands of dictators and groups of totalitarian tendencies and therefore have no real affinity with the type of rule that the United States embodies and is defending today in the world.'...

"Senhor Lacerda urged the necessity of fighting communism but said the United States was an easy target for Communist propaganda because 'she is compromised in the view of the American peoples by her constant and unequivocal protection of the tottering authoritarian regimes that swarm in the continent.'

"Another well-known Brazilian newspaper man said privately today that sympathy toward the Guatemalan government at this moment was virtually universal in Brazil. He said he considered it primarily an emotional impulse.

"Another Brazilian defending the Guatemalan position with vehemence in a diplomatic reception two days ago turned out to be not a Communist, but a capitalist and at least a conservative if not reactionary."

In a N. Y. *Post* of June 27, a UN report declares that—

"The casualties in Guatemala have been few so far, but the damage to U. S. prestige at the United Nations could not be exaggerated.

"At least that was the view Saturday in UN circles where U. S. Representative Lodge's behavior has occasioned the greatest flurry of cynicism at U. S. expense that diplomats can remember."

## U.S. Overthrows — —

(Continued from page 1)

him Sunday morning. Toriello... told Peurifoy that he, the U. S. ambassador, could stop the fighting in 15 minutes, if he would.

"The foreign minister asked Peurifoy if a new government under a military junta would be agreeable to him. Toriello turned violently anti-Communist during the interview, and promised Peurifoy that all the Communists in Guatemala would be sent back to Moscow.

"Peurifoy, dressed in sports clothes for the golf course, dragged calmly on his cigaret holder and told Toriello that he really had no control over the situation.

"He did suggest modestly, however, that a clean sweep of the officers of the Arbenz government, including Foreign Minister Toriello himself, would seem to be in order if peace were to be restored to this anguished little republic.

"Col. Diaz next summoned Peurifoy to a meeting, which lasted most of Sunday afternoon..."

Diaz (relates Fahey) promised Peurifoy elimination of the Stalinists from the government but "Peurifoy said that this didn't sound sufficient to him. He thought the Communists literally must go." This apparently meant a demand for arrest and/or exile or death.

"Diaz agreed, and that was the beginning of the end of the so-called 'revolution of 1949' [sic] so aggressively represented by Jacobo Arbenz..."

The standard biography

KARL MARX

by

Franz Mehring

\$3.50

Labor Action Book Service  
114 West 14 Street, New York City