in union leadership offer some kind of immediate threat to "security" is pure speculation. In reality the unions most frequently charged with Communist domination are under heavy fire from employers, government, and rival organizations. Their survival can only be explained by the fact that the leadership has won and retained the confidence of an overwhelmingly non-Communist membership. Since raiding-unions are constantly hovering about to pick up any element which becomes disaffected, even a momentary lapse of confidence on the part of a substantial minority would mean disaster.

Another objection to the purported legislative aim is more fundamental. A union officer, like a Congressman, is elected to represent a constituency. The only people before whom an elected representative's political tendencies and possible future breach of trust can be discussed are those to whom he must appeal for re-election. To allow any other body to pass upon such questions is to disfranchise the electorate.

The sponsors of legislation of this kind would do well to ponder the statement of William Green, late president of the A. F. of L.:

Legislation would serve to substitute compulsion for voluntarism. Workers represent compulsion; consequently the enactment of legislation designed to prevent Communist domination of unions would have a bad psychological effect.

They might also study the words of Walter Reuther, C. I. O. president:

The Communist issue must be settled inside the unions themselves. It is up to the union membership. There is no other way to handle the question.

Clearly, opposition should be focused on the general scheme rather than on the name or details of any particular bill. This scheme is to make unions liable to ideological trials which may deprive them of bargaining rights and to subject the employees' choice of their bargaining representative to a government-wielded political veto. It was condemned by a Senate subcommittee in these words, "This ideological testing of a union's right to survive is foreign to our traditions of a free labor movement," and by the late Alan Haywood, C. I. O. vice-president, as follows:

This amounts, whether or not it is so labeled, to government licensing of trade unions. It means that the government determines which unions are legitimate and may continue to function, and which shall be proscribed...

Government licensing of unions would inevitably involve thought control, since it would turn not on acts but on beliefs and loyalties. The determination of whether a union should be proscribed would necessarily "reflect the individual political and economic views and attitudes of the government officials making the determination. Once the gate is opened to government proscribing of unions, the temptation will be present to use the device to destroy any union with whose objectives the Administration in power may happen not to agree."

Many signs—for example, the Eisenhower-Durkin break and the tough pro-business orientation given to the N. L. R. B. by recent appointments—point to another curb-the-unions build-up like that which produced the Taft-Hartley act a few years ago. The theme "this is just what we need to fight communism" is being used these days as an advertising gimmick useful for selling anything.

---

**RED HERRING—AND WHITE**

The Great Crusade Picks Up . . . by Bruce Catton

**Washington**

THE feverish exploitation of the case of the late Harry Dexter White is by all odds the most significant step that the Eisenhower Administration has yet taken. The future of the Great Crusade has been baldly staked on the theory that in the emotional climate now prevailing the anti-Communist issue is the unfailing master-key to political power.

Here is an issue, it is hoped, that may resolve all the contradictions arising from the dizzy blend of public-relations build-up, the give-away program, and the ominous gap between campaign promises and administrative performance. In it healing may be found for the political pains which have begun to afflict the Administration ten months after it came triumphantly into office.

In a way this makes sense. It at least explains various things, like the continued refusal to restrain Senator McCarthy, and the sweaty embrace from Senator Jenner to which the victorious candidate submitted out in Indiana a little more than a year ago. McCarthyism cannot be disavowed, for it pays off politically; and who but Senator Jenner provided the proper stage for the televised proceedings which got the whole maneuver back on the rails?

All of which is to say that the current investigation must be assayed in the context of the existing political situation.

Barely a fortnight ago Leonard W. Hall, Republican national chairman, bluntly admitted that the party and the Administration were in serious trouble. The details of that trouble are worth examining briefly. Some extremely significant elections had gone wrong—in Wisconsin, in New Jersey, and in New York. The party was split into reactionary and mildly liberal wings. The elections had seemed to indicate that the personal popularity of the President was non-transferable. A new session of Congress was coming up, lamentably unprepared to cope with a number of hot political issues whose settlement had been postponed to the eve of a difficult Congressional election.

As recently as November 16, Newsweek drew attention to this situation and remarked that President Eisenhower's...
associates were urging him to lay down a program with genuine vote-getting appeal. Unfortunately the program was already fairly clear, and its utter lack of voter appeal was even clearer.

There was a confused farm program which at the very least seemed to be inviting a new agricultural depression.

There was a hard-money program which had provoked so many symptoms of an economic recession that the Treasury was beginning to back-peddle.

There was an attitude toward organized labor which had driven Martin Durkin out of the Cabinet and was renewing all of labor's traditional distrust of Republican leadership.

There was a hardening attitude toward public power, reclamation, and the public domain which seemed likely to prove all the accusations made by Democrats in the last campaign.

In addition, the Republicans' airy promises to balance the budget were colliding head-on with equally airy promises to reduce taxes. And there was, and still is, for that matter, every indication that the second set of promises would presently be redeemed even if that put the first set beyond all hope of fulfillment.

On top of everything else the Republicans' pet issue of corruption in high places was back-firing badly. In Governor Dewey's own bailiwick of New York a malodorous situation was winning some highly unpleasant headlines.

It was against this background that Attorney General Herbert Brownell, Jr., took his script in hand and told a Chicago luncheon-club audience that when the Truman Administration put White on the International Monetary Fund it did so in the full knowledge that the man was a traitor.

Extravagant charges of evil-doing have been made before by the Republicans. After all, General Eisenhower got the Presidential nomination very largely as the result of loud charges that the Taft people had "stolen" various delegates in Texas—charges in whose formulation Mr. Brownell himself was generally believed to have had a prominent hand. There was also Senator Jenner, now serving as master of ceremonies in the White production, who had asserted that General George C. Marshall was no better than a front man for traitors.

Mr. Brownell's speech brought swift reactions. The first came from National Chairman Hall, who stopped wailing low and jubilantly proclaimed that "communism in government" would be a principal issue in the 1954 Congressional election campaign. The second came from Mr. Truman himself, who got radio and television time to reply.

TRUMAN'S SPEECH was a good job. But his press section, in advance of the speech, committed a tactical blunder of the first magnitude by spreading the word that J. Edgar Hoover himself, head of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, had at least tacitly approved the business of naming White to a new job so that he could be watched. This gave the Republicans full opportunity to retrieve the error which Mr. Brownell had committed, and they made the most of it.

On the day before the hearing the staunchly Republican New York Herald Tribune asserted that Hoover was refusing to accept any responsibility for Truman's action in the White case. Then F. B. I. chief, it predicted, was "likely to become a highly damaging witness as far as Mr. Truman is concerned and a very favorable witness for Attorney General Herbert Brownell, Jr." That was a very sage prediction. When the mikes and the lights were turned on, what was at issue was not the extravagance of Mr. Brownell's language but the ineffable sanctity of Mr. Hoover's reputation.

The head of the F. B. I. is Washington's one, original untouchable. No one will criticize him, no one will question him—least of all, a Senator in front of the television apparatus. He took the stand amid fervent applause, with Chairman Jenner of the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee presenting him as "the custodian of the nation's security."

The Senators accepted his assertion that the F. B. I. does not draw conclusions or express opinions and sat in awed silence while he drew extensive conclusions and expressed the most forthright opinions.

When he had finished, the question was no longer whether Mr. Brownell had wrongly accused Mr. Truman of something; it was whether Mr. Truman had wrongly accused Mr. Hoover. The Great Crusade is back in business again.

Several morals can probably be drawn from all this. One of them is that from the standpoint of practical politics the Jenner embrace has certainly paid off. It may have been hard to take at the time, but its fruits are delectable. For it was Jenner who came to the Administration's rescue when the erratic Representative Velde, rushing to get into the act, seemed to be placing a martyr's crown on Mr. Truman's brow. Jenner even got a little ammunition for his own use.

When Mr. Brownell, discussing various spies who seemed to be enmeshed in the White case, mentioned that one Harold Glasser had even served as an adviser to the Secretary of State during a 1947 meeting of the Big Four foreign

Attorney General Brownell
minister, Senator Jenner quietly asked: "Who was that Secretary of State?"
"Mr. Marshall," replied Mr. Brownell.
Another moral may have to do with the exact nature of whatever it is that the Administration is up to in this maneuver. At his press conference the day after the Hoover hearing President Eisenhower was asked whether his Administration had now embraced McCarthyism. With some asperity he replied that he would leave that to the press corps itself. The New York Times representative, accepting the challenge, managed to poll about half the correspondents immediately after the conference. The majority of those polled did indeed believe that the Administration, though perhaps not the President himself, was guilty as charged.

Not since Grant's time, when Republican politicians answered all complaints about maladministration with the assertion that unreconstructed Southerners were persecuting the colored man, has there been a tactic quite like this one. The one important question, of course, will not be answered for months to come—namely, will it work?

The Administration's political program is still what it was. The problems which the next session of Congress will have to handle, just before the members ask the voters for approval, are fully as tough as they were two weeks ago. Farmers are still unhappy; budget-balancing is still out of sight; the Korean settlement is still delayed; labor is still disturbed; and the ominous indications of a possible industrial recession are still visible. Public power, reclamation, soil conservation, and the retention or loss of the public domain are still matters with highly explosive potentials.

Can the effect of all these be offset by a simple return to the tactic of the 1870's known in those days as wagging the bloody shirt? It would take a rascal man to say flatly that he cannot. The Jenner committee is rolling, and it has the material to keep going for a long time. Mr. Brownell dumped approximately a dozen names on the table—names of alleged spies operating in the federal government during the immediate post-war years. The committee can take these one at a time, rehash all the material about each, and make a continued story without a visible last chapter.

Certainly, the Democratic strategists will have to show a great deal more skill than they have shown during the past ten days if this attempt is not to succeed.

---

QUESTIONs ON GUIANA

Dr. Jagan in Britain . . by Graeme C. Moodie

Glasgow, Scotland

Dr. Jagan, legislative leader of the People's Progressive Party and until recently Prime Minister of British Guiana, accompanied by L. Burnham, chairman of the P. P. P., have been speaking at meetings throughout the United Kingdom during the past few weeks, in spite of the great difficulty they have had in finding any organization to sponsor them. The Tories could not be expected to be sympathetic. Transport House issued an edict telling local Labor parties to have nothing to do with these men. And, obviously, the Communists would not be the most desirable sponsors, regardless of whether or not the P. P. P. is a Communist "front." Incidentally, I do not know whether the Communists offered any assistance.

Dr. Jagan and Mr. Burnham were in Glasgow on their speaking tour on November 10 and 11. They held a large number of meetings, including two at the university, finishing their visit with a public meeting attended by some two thousand people. I attended two of the smaller gatherings and in addition talked with both men on a more informal occasion, in typically British fashion, over a cup of tea.

It is impossible not to be impressed by them as men. Despite their youth—Jagan is thirty-five and Burnham only twenty-nine—they strike one at once with their poise and their charm. Later one is equally impressed by their intelligence and ability. Jagan has probably the better public manner, in that more of his warmth and personality gets over to a crowd, while Burnham strikes one as having the clearer and more powerful intellect. This personal difference may reflect the fact that Jagan is of Indian and Burnham of African stock, but I prefer to ascribe it to the influence of their education—Jagan having been trained as a dentist in the United States, and Burnham having obtained his law degree at Oxford, England. Neither of them, however, has the hard-faced, humorless, tense quality so often associated with agitators and subversives.

Are they Communists, arsonists, totalitarians, and all the other things they have been called by the Europeans in Guiana and London? I do not know. All I know is that if what they said is true, Oliver Lyttelton has still a great deal of explaining to do. They gave the impression of being sincere and honest, and in any case what they said raised questions which need to be answered.

HERE ARE some of the main points they made in their defense. First, they pointed out what should be news to no one—that British Guiana has long been run largely by, and in the interests of, the three companies in control of the sugar industry, upon which, along with rice farming, the bulk of the people depend. (As yet only a start has been made toward developing the abundant mineral resources of the colony.) Then they told us the familiar story of poverty, land hunger—the result, there, of the lack of proper drainage and irrigation rather
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