

RESTRICTED

1287

COMMUNIST INFILTRATION OF THE LABOR MOVEMENT

17 February 1949

CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
INTRODUCTION--Lieutenant Colonel Edwin G. Beggs, OMC, Faculty, ICAF	1
SPEAKER--Mr. Merlyn S. Pitzele, Labor Editor of "Business Week" ..	1
GENERAL DISCUSSION.....	9

Publication No. 149-90

THE INDUSTRIAL COLLEGE OF THE ARMED FORCES

Washington, D. C.

RESTRICTED

RESTRICTED

1080

COMMUNIST INFILTRATION OF THE LABOR MOVEMENT

17 February 1949

COLONEL BEGGS: The Industrial College perhaps is entitled to a little special interest in "cold war" because it was here that Mr. Bernard Baruch first introduced the term. I think you will agree that it is as important for officers of the Armed Forces to understand the battlefields, the tactics, and the strategy of "cold war" as it is for us to understand the more classic military arts.

Last year, in his talk, Mr. Merlyn S. Pitzele, Labor Editor of "Business Week," stated that he would have liked to discuss communism in labor unions but that his scope forbade his doing so. As the guilty party, I have waited a year to make amends, and I want to assure both you and Mr. Pitzele that his scope today is Communist infiltration of the labor movement.

Mr. Pitzele.

MR. PITZELE: I have been hearing a little, before I came in here, about what you have been told up to this point, and it makes very good sense, to me, that everything you have been studying in Manpower was scheduled to come before the subject for discussion today. It is reasonable to assume that you, as professional people, somewhat far removed from the area of labor relations, approach this whole field with the usual hazy attitude, and perhaps usual prejudice, of the citizen who has had no direct experience in it, with the result that you make certain easy assumptions about the personalities and the forces which appear on the surface to operate in a very destructive way in our society. And the imputation that all labor is tinged with radicalism, perhaps even under the influence of subversive and alien doctrines, is a very easy one to come to.

I would have hesitated very long, or at least I would have considered my problem here a much more difficult one had you not been exposed before I arrived to some material which indicates that the development of labor unions in America, as institutions, is part of the whole historic perspective and the social current of our country.

So, today, when I talk with you about Communists in the labor movement, and the problems which they present, I want to be able to feel that you understand me when I say that this is a specialized kind of problem, something which applies only to certain aspects of the American labor movement, and which does not characterize it in its broad outline in any valid sense whatsoever.

RESTRICTED

In order for us to get some insight into the problem which Communists in the labor movement present, and Communist unionism, it is necessary for us to put those activities in the broader context of which they are a part. I want to start out by taking just a few minutes to tell you about the Communist Party and some of those activities, of which the arena of labor is just one part.

The Communist Party is not a party in any sense by which that term is commonly used. The Communist Party is, in effect, a conspiracy. It is too simple and misleading to go from that and say that it is a conspiracy to overthrow the Government of the United States. If you assume that it is a conspiracy directed to that end, and always directed to that end, you will be misled. You will find that Communist activity is moving along certain lines which are apparently incomprehensible because they make no contribution to the overthrow of the Government of the United States. The aim of the Communist conspiracy is a very simple one and a consistent one. It is, in a word, to serve the interests of Russia. Now, obviously, in certain periods of history, the "interests of Russia" are served by creating confusion, tension, and friction in the United States; weakening, if you please, the social fabric of this country.

At other times, however--and the classic example, of course, is during the war when we were supplying to the Russian forces arms and munitions--it is obviously to Russia's interest to see that the United States is just as effective and efficient in her productive mechanism as it is possible to make it. In such a period, the Communist Party in this country, far from being the promoter of causes which might divide the people of the United States, took the lead in playing down such causes. For example, the Communist-led unions, without any question, had the best records in terms of man-days lost and number of strikes during the war. The labor leaders in America who put the demands of the war furthest above the very legitimate demands or interests of the workers in the war plants were the Communist trade-union leaders. They were the most effective strikebreakers, if you please, who operated in this country during the war. They suppressed any vestige of discontent which became apparent in the trade-union jurisdiction which they covered.

If you assumed at this time that the object of the Communists was to overthrow the Government of the United States, I submit you would have been bewildered by this kind of conduct. However, if you bear in mind that the national interest--the "imperial" interest, if you please--of the Soviet Union at one period and another will be different in terms of its relation to the United States, then the pattern of Communist operation in the United States will, I think, be much more intelligible and clear to you. It is always consistent in this sense. The twists, turns, and about-faces in the Communist Party line which, I am sure, you have all heard about, are not simply ideological whimsies, but are responses to a changing international situation.

RESTRICTED

1951

Within that broad context, the designs of the Communist Party in the United States (all of which are, in a basic sense, related) are, first of all, to operate as a propaganda agency among us, to build pro-Russian sentiment.

Another object of the Communist operations among us is to weaken the position of the United States vis-a-vis Russia so that in any international relations, in any diplomatic exchanges, in any conflict, the United States will be less strong.

Another object of the Communist Party--and it is a tactical as well as a strategic object--is to build party cadres and mass organizations through which the objectives of the Communist Party can be carried out, whether they be propaganda objectives or actual, more active operations.

Fundamentally, except for those historic periods, which have been infrequent in the past and presumably will be even less frequent in the future, when the interests of Russia and the interests of the United States are running directly parallel, a very important Communist function is to acerbate and intensify the economic and social tensions which exist in our society: economic relations, race relations, all the aspects of our national life wherever there is the opportunity for friction, or wherever some maladjustment in our society makes friction inevitable. At that point, you will always find a Communist organization, either a frankly and avowedly Communist organization or one disguised under some euphemistic title, working to capitalize on this discontent by intensifying it, prolonging it, and deepening it with the hope of weakening the social unity, the national solidarity, of America.

And then, of course--and this is by far the most dramatic and important aspect of the Communist operations in the United States as well as in the other countries--the objective of espionage and sabotage which are sometimes part of the Communist Party operation and sometimes maintained completely separate and apart from the Party.

I trust that, being interested in these matters, you have all read the report which came out of General MacArthur's Headquarters on the Russian spy-ring in Japan, which is, in a sense, a sort of classic case study of how the Communists work. What I advert to at this point is the very, very careful separation between that espionage operation and the Communist Party of Japan. It was felt that the espionage work was so important it could not be compromised by having any connections with the Communist Party of Japan. So it was kept completely separate and apart; but, nevertheless, it was perhaps much more important to the Russians than anything that was being done by the Japanese Communist Party.

RESTRICTED

RESTRICTED

The Communist Party operates through a good many instruments. The one with which we are here concerned is the trade-union. The trade-union organization is a natural kind of instrument for the Communists to be interested in. It is natural because the whole philosophic basis for the Communist doctrine rests on the idea of the workers coming to power. And where do you find the workers? You find them in trade-unions.

So it is tremendously important to the Communist Party to concentrate its forces in the trade-union organizations in order to influence the minds of the workers, and to help get into positions of control where they can direct the actions of these organizations of working people.

The Communists envision the day when a disciplined, militant working-class, in the language of Marx and Stalin, will take state power and bring into being the dictatorship of the proletariat which will build and create the Soviet state.

So we have, in effect--this is the kind of thing I would have hesitated to say to you earlier in the year before you had had some basic material on the American labor movement--two labor movements in the United States; not one. When we talk about labor movement, we are talking about some kind of institution which is going somewhere. The very term, "movement," bespeaks a goal, perhaps not a very clearly defined goal; but, at any rate, a direction in which that thing is driving.

We have in this country the American labor movement, if you please, the one which you have been hearing about; namely, the legitimate, bona-fide trade-unions, which were created to serve the very important and practical needs of working people who need representation, some kind of organized strength, as they deal with employers because as individuals their ability to take care of themselves in terms of their economic position is very weak indeed. There is the bona-fide trade-union movement in this country which is directed at economic and social ends that may be radical at times but are nevertheless not suspect as masqueraded objectives which are devised and promoted for purposes of national disloyalty.

And then there is the other labor movement which operates within the one I have been talking about and that is the labor movement that is Communist controlled. Now at this particular time Communist influence in the American labor movement is less than it has been at any time in the last seven or eight years. Within the last 18 months, the Communists have lost control of some very important unions, such as the union in the maritime industry, which means all merchant ships with home ports on the East Coast and the Gulf. A fight for leadership developed within that organization and the Communists were thrown out of office. There is no assurance that they are going to stay out of office but, for the moment, with the National Maritime Union talking about a strike, one doesn't have the feeling it is simply a tactic in the game of power politics which goes on in

RESTRICTED

RESTRICTED

1000

the world. If they strike, either it is because of some ill-advised conclusion which they have arrived at, or it is a legitimate strike. But, in any event, the basic reason for that strike would not be to weaken the Nation and serve the interests of Russia.

That is true in a number of other organizations; for example, the Transport Workers Union. The President of the Union, Mr. Michael Quill, whose name might be known to you, suddenly decided he would break with the Communist Party, a member of which he had been for a number of years. Because of his personal following, he was able to shift the whole political orientation of that union out of the Communist orbit. Nevertheless, in every large and important union in this country there is an active, and sometimes powerful, Communist caucus, or Communist "fraction," as it is known in the jargon of the Left, which operates for purposes of propagan-
dizing and for purposes of seizing control.

The Communists have concentrated their efforts in a number of fields which appeal to them particularly. First of all, they have been interested, of course, in the strategic industries. In the field of communications they have been amazingly successful. Or perhaps it isn't so amazing. Maybe "amazing" is the wrong word to describe it. At any rate, they have put a lot of work into it. They have put some of their most talented people into the unions which operate the telegraph system of the United States--the unions which operate the cables.

They have been successful, in a very large degree, in controlling many strategic parts of this labor organization. At one time--the situation is a little different now, but not much different--you knew full well that every commercial cable that went through New York was under the view of a Communist, or someone who was beholden to the Communists for being in that particular job.

It was a situation which the security agencies of the Government were very much concerned with, but it is--I don't want to talk about the security aspects of this thing--an example of what the Communists have been able to do by dint of dedicated effort and shrewd organizing and--we'll come to this a moment later--the general indifference of people who, one might think, would take up the cudgels to oppose them, and the general indifference of employers.

So they have concentrated in the strategic industries. Today, the important areas of Communist strength are in the communications industry; in transport and shipping; in metal mining, that is, the mining of copper, lead, zinc, nonferrous metals generally; in West Coast shipping, where the whole water front is under the domination of Harry Bridges and the apparatus in his control; and in the CIO divisions of that part of the aircraft industry which is unionized. In the Auto Workers Union, which holds some jurisdiction over aircraft plants in this country, Communist influence is still a very important though minority factor.

RESTRICTED

The Communist Party has also concentrated, not only in its trade-union work but in its other kind of work, on negroes and other members of minority groups in this country on the theory, of course, that these people were the most resentful about American society because, being the minority groups, they were exposed to certain social injustices in our society and would be the most ready and likely recruits for a movement like communism.

Interestingly enough, the Communists have also concentrated on the white-collar workers. It is easy to understand why they should be interested in the teachers. And, incidentally, they have a very strong influence in some of the teachers' unions. They have also been very much interested in sales people in department stores, in insurance salesmen, and white-collar workers, generally.

Their interest in these fields is, by and large, an accident. They are interested in these fields because no one else is. The AFL and the CIO have, for a number of years, ignored these wage earners, these white-collar workers. They have been busy in organizing the different industries. The Communist Party was able to come in with its unions, the unions it controlled, and to offer almost exclusively the only brand of unionism which was available to these people.

The Communists also have particular interest in certain geographic areas. All of you are aware--if you are not aware, you should be--that the most important trade-union organizing done since the war ended has been done by Communist-controlled unions in three geographic areas. The first is Alaska, where Harry Bridges' organization and some of the unions affiliated with it have done a terrific job of organizing the fish canneries on the coast, and of organizing the fishing boats which ply the Bering Straits and go out into the North Pacific there.

The second area in which there has been notable organizing since the war is in the Panama Canal Zone, where a Communist-controlled union, the United Public Workers, has organized a great majority of the civilian employees working in the Zone.

The third area in which there have been important organizing gains since the war has been Hawaii. Here, Harry Bridges' union, which is technically a longshore union, has organized inland, back from the coast, the sugar and pineapple workers, which are, of course the backbone of the Island's industry.

We can see that on the American labor scene, in the Continental United States, the Communist influence has abated somewhat over the last few years because workers have become a lot more sophisticated about this problem, the issues have sharpened, and the Communists have lost some ground; however in at least three strategic geographic areas--Alaska, Hawaii, and the Canal Zone--the Communists have made great gains.

RESTRICTED

1000

I have been told to talk briefly here and to leave the maximum amount of time for questioning. So I just want to tell you one more thing in what is really a very sketchy presentation in which, as you can see, I have hit only the high spots, and not nearly all of those. I hope, in your questions and discussions which will follow, we can fill in with detail the points between. I do, however, want, very briefly, to elaborate what I referred to earlier, namely, that the reason, in large part, why the Communists have been so successful is because of indifference in other quarters.

Now, of course, one of the most important of those "other quarters" are the groups of workers themselves. For the guy who works for a living in a plant, whose day-to-day problems are apt to be the only problems he has time to worry about--his pay envelope, the conditions on his job, and so on--it is pretty hard to get excited about something which is really abstract, like the difference between a Communist union and a non-Communist union. What he wants to know is: Which can do the better job in representing his interests? Which can get him more money from his employer when the contract expires? Which can get him greater job security?

The Communists have been able to compete here very well. They have been able to compete very well in these basic, practical things. They have never forgotten for one moment--and where they have forgotten, they have lost their footing very quickly--that the basic interest of a worker, of a member in a union, is what does he get in return for the dollar or the two dollars a month he pays for being a member.

So they have not only carried on these other activities I have talked about but they have done a job--there is no question about it--for their members by being smart, clever, ruthless, unscrupulous perhaps--there's no "perhaps" about the unscrupulous--always having in mind the fact that in order to keep their control of the situation they have to produce something for the members of that union. Where other labor leaders have developed a little width in the beam from sitting in swivel chairs, in offices, these Communist Johnnies have gone out there and fought for their people. And so frequently when you present to an American wage earner the choice between the Commie and the non-Commie leader, he will brush aside these, as I say, almost abstract, ideological considerations and vote for the guy who is obviously in there fighting for him.

Then, too, the employers have made a negative contribution to the fight on Communists in the American labor movement because what happens is, the term "Communist" becomes so unpopular that you apply it to anybody you don't like. In the Little Steel strike of 1937, for example, when the Republic Steel Corporation was involved in a strike with the CIO, Tom Girdler had a full page ad in the newspapers calling Philip Murray, the President of the CIO, a Communist.

RESTRICTED

RESTRICTED

1000

It's absurd. Not only is it absurd, but it is a very mischievous thing to do because every member of the Steel Workers Union knows that Phil Murray is not a Communist. When you call Murray a Communist, and then turn around and call a guy a Communist who is actually a Communist, the kind of response you get is apt to be one of indifference. Of course, the protection which is thereby offered the Communist labor leader by that kind of indiscriminate name calling is worth its weight in gold.

Take a man like Matles or Emspak, the two individuals who run the United Electrical, Radio and Machine Workers Union of America, an organization which controls the manpower in the plants of General Electric and Westinghouse. When you get out publicly and you say these people are Communists--as they are--the retort is, "Well, everybody is a Communist these days. Look; you're the kind of person who calls Murray a Communist." It provides a protective coloration for them which, as I say, is invaluable

Employers have to bear a share of this burden for the Communist influence in the labor movement being what it is because of the anti-unionism of American employers. Now what do I mean by that? I mean that American employers don't like unions. It is natural for them not to like unions. But they don't dislike only that kind of union. They like them all equally little, with the result that, despite the fact that the unions are strong and powerful organizations, today the average worker in a large plant knows that his boss doesn't like the union. So when it comes time for a union meeting once a month, instead of going to the meeting he will go bowling with the boys, or he will spend the night at home, with the result that the average meeting of a union in this country attracts less than one percent of the members.

There are approximately 200 of us in this room. We will assume we are having a meeting of a local union of 20,000 people. This could be a local union meeting of the union in the Gary Works of the Carnegie-Illinois Steel Corporation, one of the largest steel mills in the world. This is about the size of their monthly meeting. This is about how many would come out.

If you have in that union one-half of one percent of Communists, they run the thing without check or without veto, you don't need one-half of this audience. All you need is about 20 of them, disciplined, together, having had a meeting before this meeting started working out what they want to put over; spotting themselves around instead of all sitting in a clump--I mean taking strategic positions throughout the hall--so that when one gets up to make a motion and 19 others second it, it sounds as though there is a mighty clamor for the proposal.

It is a very simple matter to establish policy, to elect officers, and to run the organization if, out of the local union of 20,000 guys, only 200 come to the meetings. Perhaps the basic reason why only 200 come to the meetings is because the rest of the people know that the employer doesn't like the unions.

RESTRICTED

RESTRICTED

1957

The way to get ahead, if you want a shot some day at the foreman's job, or if some day you want to bring your kid around and introduce him to the assistant superintendent with the hope he will give him a job in the plant, is not to be too sweet on the unions. It is in that kind of context, you see, in which a small, organized, disciplined minority of Communist Party members can exercise control out of all proportion to its numerical strength.

I am going to stop there, or at least pause, because I am sure we will go back to some of these points as we come to the questions and discussion.

COLONEL BEGGS: All right; who'll ask the first question?

QUESTION: You have given the impression that the labor unions would like to get rid of the Communist element in general. I don't believe that in most organizations it is possible to get any very large turnout of people at meetings, regardless of the attitude of the employers. Most of them don't want to go to meetings and start a rumpus.

The labor unions have had, for the past year, a very good instrument to enable them to try to get rid of the Communists. I refer to the anti-Communist provisions of the Taft-Hartley Act. Yet, they seem to be doing their best to get rid of that act. Can you explain that reasoning?

MR. PITZELE: Let me address myself to various aspects of your question. First of all, it is pretty clearly established, I think, what we all would suspect--that the average American worker, presented with the choice between a Communist and a non-Communist official, will choose the non-Communist official. The Communists know this very well. So they always disguise themselves. They don't appear as open, identifiable Communists. They disguise themselves at certain periods as anti-Fascists, antimilitarists, or whatever the current of the moment may be. So that, first of all, the most important basic job that must be done, if you are going to get the Communist influence out of the labor movement, is to identify the people who are Communists because they are not self-identified.

It is possible to get people to come to union meetings; to get people to believe that what happens in the union is just as important to them, in their lives, as what happens in the shop where they work. There are notable successes to be reported where employers, working with decent, honest, loyal American elements in unions have helped to build up enough interest in the union's internal affairs so that the turnout at a union meeting is truly representative.

The Taft-Hartley Act, which is about to get a going-over by the present Congress, provides, as you should be aware, that before a union can have access to the National Labor Relations Board for purposes of establishing

RESTRICTED

RESTRICTED

its representation rights, for purposes of filing unfair-labor-practice charges, and so on, its officers must execute an affidavit in which they say, "We are not members of the Communist Party."

To a certain extent that has been useful. It has been useful in situations, mostly, where two unions covet the same jurisdiction, I had occasion before to refer to the United Electrical, Radio and Machine Workers Union of America, which is the union, as its name implies, in the electrical manufacturing plants. It is a large union, claiming a membership of about 400,000. It has under contract General Motors, Westinghouse, Philco, RCA, certain divisions of Allis-Chalmers, and so on.

This union's jurisdiction overlaps at some points with the United Automobile Workers Union. For example, in the plants of General Motors--not the auto plants but the plants where General Motors manufactures Diesels, frigidaires, and such products--both unions claim the right to represent those people. There is going on all the time a competition. Who has the bargaining right in those situations?

The officers of the United Electrical, Radio and Machine Workers Union would obviously commit perjury, or whatever the offense is--falsification of an oath--if they would sign a document and have it duly notarized saying they are not Communists.

The result has been that in these competitive situations--where the United Automobile Workers Union, which has filed an affidavit, and the UE, which hasn't, are competitive--the UAW has been able to go to the National Labor Relations Board and get an election held among the people in those plants but the UE has not been on the ballot. This has been successful, in many instances, in cutting down unions like the UE.

But the trouble with the non-Communist affidavit provision of the Taft-Hartley Act is that its effect has been broader than simply to reach Communists. For instance, John L. Lewis, who has been accused of a great many things in his time but never accused of being a Communist, refuses to sign this non-Communist affidavit. Phil Murray also refuses to sign the non-Communist affidavit. They do so not because they are Communists but because they take the position that it is a piece of discriminatory legislation aimed against the labor union people.

And, gentlemen, let me point out to you there is very grave doubt as to its constitutionality. There is so grave a question of its constitutionality that Senator Taft, whose handiwork, for the most part, is the Taft-Hartley Act, is now preparing an amendment to the law which will provide that both employers and unions which want to use the NLRB have to sign the non-Communist affidavit because it is feared that the Supreme Court will hold that this is a piece of discriminatory legislation directed at only one group; that it is not uniformly applied.

RESTRICTED

Because such obviously non-Communist labor leaders as Lewis and Murray have taken this position against the affidavit, the Communists are protected, so to speak, when they don't sign the affidavit. In other words, they say, "It isn't that we are Communists that we refuse to sign. It's that we take the same stand as Lewis and Murray. We're against this thing in principle because it is discriminatory and antilabor." Therefore, the effectiveness of the non-Communist affidavit requirement in the law has been limited.

There is a unanimous feeling, in so far as the feeling is officially expressed, by all wings of the labor movement--AFL, CIO, Independent unions, Railroad Brotherhoods--that the non-Communist affidavit will have to be taken out of the law; or, if it remains it will have to apply to all parties in the labor relations equation.

QUESTION: I think, Mr. Pitzele, we are all agreed that the teachers are grossly underpaid. But I am disturbed that in so educated a group communism has made such successful infiltration. Can you help me clear that up?

MR. PITZELE: First, let me dispose of the impression which I may inadvertently have left with you. I am not, for one moment, suggesting that the teachers in our public schools are Communists. I am not suggesting that a majority of them are, or that a large part of them are. What I say, and I want to be precise about it, is that the teachers' unions, which have the same kind of support characteristic, if you please, as other unions in terms of the number of people who are members taking an active interest, in many places are under the influence of the Communists because Communists are the active people.

Now why? Well, there are the economic reasons, which our questioner has granted. But, still, that isn't enough--to say, simply, that the teachers are underpaid. Why, then, aren't they good, militant, American trade-unionists rather than let their unions be taken over by Communists? The answer to that question is one which very quickly, as we try to answer it, gets us into the profound business of, Why does someone become a Communist?

If I had the time, I should like to talk with you about the social composition, if you please, of the Communist Party, not only in this country but in other countries of the world. I would like to point out to you that despite the fact that the Communist Party is the party of the working class, it is always, in all countries, led by intellectuals, of which Lenin himself was a classic example--an intellectual of a certain type.

By "intellectual"--I am using the word like Karl Marx used it--I do not mean an intelligent person. That is not what I mean. I mean, by

RESTRICTED

"intellectual," an economic category; someone who makes his living in the field of teaching, in the field of journalism, in the field of law, and so on. A brainworker, so to speak. I mean an economic class.

There is a psychology of the intellectual which is important for anyone to understand who wants to understand why the Communist Party is as successful as it is.

Ours is a society--I am just going to touch on it briefly--in an age of material values, in which power--and, of course, basically, this whole thing starts from the will to power in man and the will to power in social institutions--is held by people who control wealth. That is our century. In a basic sense, it is not different from other centuries. The Lenin-type, the college-trained (overtrained, perhaps) individual, has no place in this world. Lenin himself had a phrase to describe himself and people of his type. It is a very revealing phrase: a *déclassé* intellectual; an intellectual without a class.

In Russia and America, to a certain extent, there is no place for the intellectual with unbounded ambition and an insatiable will to power under a system where progress is made not in terms of intellectual values but in terms of material values. So there is about the intellectual, inevitably the quality of brooding, if you please, or reflective discontent. He invariably feels that he has qualities, talents, and skills which society is not sufficiently recognizing or rewarding. He dreams of the kind of society in which those qualities will be honored, rewarded, and accorded power.

If you are interested in this problem, I refer you to some fascinating reading: The Report of the Royal Commission in Canada and the official inquiry of the Canadian spy trials, in which a group of Ministers of the Crown and members of the Canadian Bar found themselves face to face with this precise question: Here is a distinguished physicist, a man with an international reputation, honored, accorded standing in the academic world to the limit of what it can provide. What is he doing giving samples of U-235 to Russia? What happens to a person like that?

Then here is a lady who runs a bookstore in Toronto, who prides herself on her sophistication in contemporary literature; an intellectual; a person of culture, who buys season tickets to the Toronto Symphony, and so on; a very civilized person by any standard which can be applied. Now what is she doing in a Russian espionage ring?

They took all these people, looked at them in those terms, then asked, "What leads people of this kind into that kind of treasonable activity?" That is the same question you have with the teachers. The only way it can be answered is in terms of the "lost" feeling which the intellectual has in our modern society, which makes him susceptible to appeals to change the society; gives him some kind of conspiratorial rule where he can feel himself important and influential, and where he thinks history is on his

RESTRICTED

side and he is marching with the sweep of history. That is the kind of treatment, if you please, that is the kind of psychology, which makes it possible for the Communist Party to achieve spectacular successes in recruiting among these people.

Now I don't want to leave it at that point. Let me go on and say just one further thing: The most effective anti-Communist in America are people who have gone through this and awakened; people who have been disillusioned; who have had actually this experience of being seduced, if you please, being drawn into this thing, seeing how it works; and then realizing that it isn't any more idealistic than a pair of shoelaces, and getting fed up with the whole business, coming to the conclusion that the important job to be done is to fight this thing, to expose it, to keep other people from being swindled the way they were swindled. It is that relatively small group of people who, I tell you, are the most effective anti-Communist in America, and the most effective anti-Communists in the world.

A man like Arthur Koestler, whose name should be familiar to you, who was a Hungarian journalist and a writer of books, is today perhaps the most effective anti-Communist propagandist in the world in these intellectual circles. He has been through the whole business. He has been writing about his experiences not only autobiographically but in terms of the intellectual values, in the philosophic aspect of the thing; in terms which are meaningful to people who, like him, at one time were seducible. A guy like that is worth 500 characters who get up and scream, "The Communists are bad. Let's do away with them." But a man who approaches the thing like a surgeon, exposing it, laying it bare, pointing out the syndrome of the whole disease, is, as I say, the most effective anti-Communist operating in this field.

Let me come back to the question and say this: The teacher, you see, being an intellectual in the sense I am talking about, doing, in effect, a very menial job, accorded no social status, being paid miserably (even for a teacher), would be, other things being equal, reasonably receptive to this philosophy.

QUESTION: Sir, let's drop to the lower level intellectual, then. What in the world gives these so-called Americans on the lower level the "bug" to become Communists? Do they receive money for it? Or do they get something else in the way of prestige?

MR. PITZELE: Well, of course, you must remember not very many Americans become Communists. Actually, the last time J. Edgar Hoover, who should know, put a figure out, I think last year, he said there were about 100,000 Communists in America. And he said that maybe even that is a little large. So, let's say there are 100,000 members of the Communist Party. That is an infinitesimal segment of the population. But Hoover went on to add that for every member of the Communist Party there are 20 people who follow the Communist Party line.

RESTRICTED

1702

We can understand, I think, why there should be 100,000 people so discontent, so emotionally disturbed, perhaps so neurotic, so crazy--I mean, if you want to think of it in terms of social sanity, of having some kind of an attachment to this thing, we can understand how 100,000 people out of a population of 140 million might be in a certain kind of group.

But the phenomena which is important, and which I think you are really asking the question about is, What about these other 20 who aren't members of the Communist Party but who are mobilizable, so to speak, by the Communist Party? The answer to that is that they don't know what it is all about. They are innocent. The Communist Party will go into Harlem, for example, in New York City, which is really a jungle. There is no question about it. The housing is just unspeakable. The schools are miserable.

Now New York City sets off some streets for play areas. Where there are no playgrounds, or parks, they will put up road-blocks at one end of the block and at the other end, and the kids can play freely in the street.

Well, there are precious few parks or playgrounds up in Harlem. So they have a number of these streets set aside for the kids to play. This couldn't happen any place except in Harlem. It couldn't happen anywhere else in New York. Because the area is so inadequately policed, and because life is so cheap there and no one gives it much thought, the other day, according to a piece in the paper, trucks which had deliveries to make in that general area, and commercial traffic which wanted to use that street, just simply put these blocks aside--they look like saw-horses--and opened up the street. A truck came along and killed two little girls. There was a squib in "The New York Herald Tribune."

What happened was that the following day, according to "The Tribune," 200 negro mothers, with baby carriages, came out and barricaded that street. They pushed their baby carriages in there and said, "If the police of New York aren't going to block off this street for the kids to play, as it had been set aside, any truck that wants to come through is going to have to run us down first."

Who do you think rounded them up? I don't know anything about it except what I read in the paper; but I do know you don't get 200 people doing the same thing, at the same time, out of some kind of spontaneous gesture. Somebody rounds them up. Somebody says, "Hey! Isn't this terrible? Let's do something about it. All right; what will we do? We'll all get together. Bring your baby carriages out," and so on.

I'll lay you anything you want to bet that the Communist Party in Harlem, where it is very active, or one of the organizations through which it operates--the Harlem Tenants League, or the Harlem Committee Against Discrimination, it has 12 different operational masks--went to these women and got them out.

RESTRICTED

And what do we say about this? Do we say, "It's a terrible thing"? Well, I know what I say. I don't know whether you will agree with me. I say it is a terrible thing that only the Communists are interested in doing something like this. There isn't any other group among us who can work with people on that level.

You know what the upshot of it will be. The upshot is very simple. The Police Department, which doesn't like this kind of unfavorable publicity, will assign a cop to see that that street is kept closed off because they don't want this kind of trouble. The Communist Party, or whichever organization it was, will then be able to say, "Look! Look at this demonstration of what people can do when they work together. Look what we've done here." And those 200 mothers will have a very friendly feeling and a very kindly feeling for the Harlem Tenant League (which is really a phony name for a Communist-Party operation), which demonstrated so clearly that you can do something by this kind of activity.

When the day comes that Russian and American relations deteriorate to the point where there is a possibility of conflict, and the Communist Party goes all out to undermine whatever stability there may be in the American society, you can be sure they are going to come back on these 200 mothers and say, "Now look here! Look what we did for you. Do something for us. Remember when we asserted our interest and we showed the New York police force something and the police came through and put a cop there and closed off the street?" You're right they remember. Then they will say, "Do you want your sons killed in a war, fighting against the Russians? It is an imperialistic war. The United States is attacking Russia."

Oh, you gentlemen know their line. You can be sure that it will get a sympathetic response from these mothers. That is the way the Communist Party operates. That is why for each Communist there are these, and J. Edgar Hoover is being conservative, 20 people who are willing to go along with them. They will tell you they are good Americans. If you went to these people and you told them, "Why, they're Communists. The guy who told you to bring your baby buggy out there is a Communist," they would say, "What if this guy is a Communist, he's interested in my kid. He showed us what to do in this situation." They, quite naturally, think he is a fine man. So there you are.

COLONEL BEGGS: Mr. Pitzele, I thank you for having given us a really rousing finish to the Manpower phase of the course. Thank you.

(11 April 1949-250)S.