

I. F. Stone's Weekly

VOL. VIII, NO. 28

JULY 13, 1960

101

WASHINGTON, D. C.

15 CENTS

Mr. K, the RB 47 and the Monroe Doctrine

Bertrand Russell, in a letter which the London *New Statesman and Nation* published July 2, said prophetically of the stoppage of U-2 flights over Russia, "American militarists are pretty certain soon to find something which the Russians will dislike as much as U-2 flights." The issue had hardly appeared when the news came that a U.S. RB 47 reconnaissance bomber with six men aboard was missing "while making electro-magnetic surveys for mapping purposes" in the Arctic Ocean. "A report that the aircraft had been seen near the Kola peninsula, in the extreme northwest of European Russia," said a dispatch from Bodoe, Norway, in the London *Observer* July 3, "must have been due to a misunderstanding." The misunderstanding was not too far off the mark. The Soviet government revealed on July 12 that the plane was shot down 22 kilometers (14 miles) from the northwestern coast of Russia while we claim, though without supporting detail, that it had never flown closer than 30 miles to Soviet territory. Since the Russians have claimed 12 miles as the limits of their territorial waters, it is on this quibble about a few miles that we base our self-righteous claim that the Russians "lied" and that the plane was shot down over the high seas.

We Recognize No 3-Mile or 12-Mile Air Limit

In these trigger happy times, 30 miles is much too close for a bomber to approach Soviet territory even on a purely scientific mission. That this one was interested only in electro-magnetic currents will be doubted. One need not approach Soviet territory that closely to measure them. The Associated Press reported from Washington July 2 (*New York Times*, July 3), these RB 47 customarily have their bombing equipment removed for reconnaissance purposes and "then the plane is packed with long range cameras, mapping cameras and electronic equipment for checking sites and frequencies of aircraft detection systems." The purpose of this checking is to test the anti-aircraft defenses of the Soviet Union, and is thus a form of espionage. We would accept no quibbles about a few miles and no talk about studying electro-magnetic waves if we caught a Soviet bomber that near our shores. We called attention in our issue of June 13 last to the fact that the U.S. recognizes no 3-mile or 12-mile limit on our own air defense. A special issue on space law of the *Journal of the Judge Advocate General of the Navy* (February 1959) makes this very clear. "The U.S.," Loftus Becker, then Legal Adviser of the Department of State, wrote in that symposium, "has never considered that it is limited in the protection of its security interests to the air space above our territory and territorial waters. For example 'we have established coastal air defense identification zones extending 200 and even 500 miles from our shore although our territorial sea is only three miles in

breadth.'" This flight can only be considered a provocation, perhaps the work of military men who felt frustrated by the President's ban on U-2 flights.

What If Ike Declared the Warsaw Pact Dead?

If the purpose was to worsen the international atmosphere, it was certainly helped along by the reckless remarks which Premier Khrushchov made at his Moscow press conference July 12. The grave warnings contained in his carefully written formal statement were drowned out, as so often happens in his press conferences, by inflammatory impromptu remarks. Many Americans who might have seen the justice of his complaint about the RB 47 will be antagonized by his declarations on the Monroe Doctrine. It is one thing to recognize, as so many Americans do, that the Monroe Doctrine is obsolete and must be replaced by more equal community relations in the Western hemisphere. It is quite another for Premier Khrushchov, under cover of an attack on the Monroe Doctrine and a defense of the Cuban revolution, to seem to be extending his sphere of influence into the Western hemisphere. On the heels of his earlier threat of rockets to protect Cuba (see page two), these are moves that do not fit into the pattern of the peace and co-existence he has been preaching. Soviet policy since the war has excused its refusal to allow free elections in Eastern Europe on the ground that the Russians had a right to friendly neighbors. What if Eisenhower were to hold a press conference, announce that the Warsaw Pact was obsolete, and threaten to bomb the Soviet Union if it interfered in Polish or Hungarian affairs?

Bitter Lessons for Satellites on Both Sides

The argument between the U.S. and the U.S.S.R. over Cuba is a pot-and-kettle argument. Moscow is no more willing to risk having "international capitalism" establish a base near its borders than we are to allow "international communism" near ours. The Russians kidnapped and executed the head of the Hungarian Communist State, Nagy, when he threatened to withdraw from the Warsaw Pact; it holds Gomulka on a more flexible leash but even in its relations with non-Communist Finland it imposes limits on that neighbor's freedom of action. What applies to the liberation of Eastern Europe applies equally to the full liberation of Latin America. It can only be carried out in an atmosphere of international detente in which neither of the great Powers is alarmed lest the others may make serious inroads on its sphere of influence. The smaller countries struggling for greater freedom on both sides must act with caution; Cuba can deal with Russia economically as Poland does with us, but within discreet limits. Premier Khrushchov helps neither world peace nor Cuba by challenging the U.S. in its historic sphere of influence. *Noon, July 13*

Eisenhower's Feeble, Belated "Marshall Plan" for Latin America Proves A Dud

Khrushchov Helps The Enemies of Cuba and of Peace by Rocket-Rattling

I hope that all those who, like myself, have supported the cause of peace and co-existence will find some means to express their disapproval of the offhand way in which Mr. Khrushchov in his speech to the teachers in Moscow threatened to "support the Cuban people" with rockets "should the aggressive forces in the Pentagon dare to start intervention against Cuba." This is doubly irresponsible. This sort of rocket-rattling does not advance the cause of world peace, and it does not help the Cuban people.

World War III Over Cuba?

If the threat is meant seriously, it means that Premier Khrushchov is willing to unleash World War III over Cuba; this would be pure idiocy, since Cuba is hardly a vital Russian interest; in any case, we need to develop an atmosphere in which it is recognized on both sides that no dispute today is worth a war, and that all differences must be negotiated. Mr. Khrushchov talks as if this were still the age of howitzers. If the threat was not meant seriously, and merely designed to make it look as if Russian rockets had prevented the U.S. from staging a military attack the Eisenhower Administration is certainly not planning to make, then it is an effort to bolster Soviet military prestige at the expense of exacerbating our relations with Cuba. Mr. Khrushchov cannot be an advocate of peace one day, and an irresponsible trouble-maker the next, without losing assets of goodwill. Moscow's habit, since Suez, of rattling rockets, is a bad one. If it wants to help Cuba, it will confine itself to economic aid like ours to Poland, and avoid even the appearance of seeking to make Cuba a Soviet satellite on our doorstep. Nothing could be worse for the Cubans than to become expendable pawns in the Khrushchov-Eisenhower quarrel.

In the meantime the unveiling of Mr. Eisenhower's long awaited "Marshall Plan" for Latin America will only deepen distaste below the Rio Grande and stiffen reluctance to take sides with us against Castro. The "plan" is so vague it does not merit the name; it is ludicrous to think that the Cubans will be intimidated by the threat to exclude them from it. In the sphere of development, it still suggests that they rely on

Plus Ca Change . . .

"The President's proposal seemed to reverse the long-standing U.S. policy that Latin America should depend largely on private enterprise and the Export-Import Bank for its economic development."

—New York Times, from Washington, July 12.

"The only real investment that is going to flow into countries that will be useful to them in the long run is private investment. . . . Some additional [public] sums would be probably necessary. But there are many ways in which they could be done. For example, all nations could agree to increase the capital and the lending capacity of the American bank."

—Mr. Eisenhower's press conference on his new Latin American plan, New York Times same day.

private investments though experience has richly shown that these are more interested in quick and easy exploitation of mineral wealth than in developing basic industry. The President's "plan" is most revealing in its discussion of agrarian reform, which stresses "the opening of new areas of arable land" (our italics) not the subdivision of the great latifundia. It never seemed to strike Mr. Eisenhower that his remark about leaving each nation free to "resolve its own social problems in its own way and without the imposition of alien dogmas" applies as much to U.S. style "free enterprise" as it does to Russian style Communism.

There will also be a sour humor for Latin America in the President's discovery that the U.S. "with its tradition of democracy is opposed to tyranny in any form—whether of the Left or of the Right." We had found it all too easy under both Eisenhower and Truman to shelve that "tradition of democracy" so long as we had to deal only with dictators of the right serving U.S. oil, sugar and fruit interests. It is only when a revolutionary dictator suddenly makes his appearance with a program designed to help the masses of the people that we begin to lecture Latin America on the virtues of democracy. This heavy-handed lack of imagination and sympathy is paving the way for a severe defeat of U.S. Policy in the hemisphere.

Noon, July 12

Recommending Huberman and Sweezy's "Cuba—Anatomy of A Revolution"

For readers who want an antidote to the steady stream of anti-Castro coverage in the U.S. press we warmly recommend the latest double issue of The Monthly Review (333 Sixth Avenue, NY 16) in which its editors, Leo Huberman and Paul M. Sweezy report on their recent trip, "Cuba—Anatomy of A Revolution". This 173-page volume will appear in book form July 26 at \$3.50.

The first two parts of this three part study deal respectively with the background and the making of the Castro revolution. They are superb, with that genius for vivid exposition of complex economic issues which made Mr. Huberman's *Man's World Goods* a world famous classic of its kind. Part II contains the fullest version we have seen in English of Fidel Castro's speech to the Batista court which condemned him to prison in 1953. This is an eloquent, passionate and exact picture of Cuba's past and problems by a man who will rank as one of the great revolutionaries and liberators of human history whatever the outcome of his growing clash with the U.S.

The third section of the book, which is called "The Revolution in Power" is not quite on the same level. This book is the product of a love affair. These two lifelong independent Marxists, Huberman and Sweezy, lost their heart to the Cuban revolution, and as in most love affairs this did not generate objectivity, though it provided a better frame for understanding than the obtuse dislike for social reform and socialism which marks so many U.S. reporters.

Enthusiasm and the difficulties of covering so swift and chaotic a picture as any revolution must present have created certain gaps in the book. It is curiously blank on the urban trade union movement, not entirely candid in its discussion of the Communist Party's peculiar past in Cuba, naive in its discussion of civil liberties, overanxious to prove Castro really socialistic, and fails to make the scene come alive. But these are minor defects. We found the first two parts thrilling to read, the third most informative. We believe this book essential reading for all Americans who want to understand what is happening in Cuba.

A Page of Civil Liberties News: Victory for Four Philadelphia School Teachers

New First Amendment Contempt Decisions Soft on Women, Hard on Newsmen

The dominant majority on the Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia may be a little wobbly on the Bill of Rights but no one can say it is lacking in old-fashioned courtliness. Of the nine First Amendment contempt of Congress convictions it has handed down in the past few weeks, two involved women. Their convictions were chivalrously reversed. The court held that Mary Knowles, the Quaker librarian, and Goldie E. Watson, the Philadelphia schoolteacher, were never fairly apprised (under the *Watkins* ruling) of the pertinency of the questions put to them respectively by the Senate Internal Security Committee and the House Un-American Activities Committee. The "pertinency" question is of a subtlety that would delight a medieval theologian and we shall not attempt to enter into its intricacies here except to say that to a gross and cynical eye it would appear that question pertinent enough to convict gentlemen were not pertinent enough to convict ladies.

They Wouldn't Name Others

While the gallant judges relied on *Watkins* to free the two women defendants, they refused to apply the *Watkins* ruling to the cases of Alden Whitman and Bernard Deutch. Both these witnesses, like the UAW official Watkins, were willing to speak freely of their own past relationship with the Communist party but unwilling to answer questions about other persons. The other five cases, those of Robert Shelton, John T. Gojack, Herman Liveright, William A. Price and Norton Anthony Russell, were of witnesses who refused to answer political questions, about themselves and others on First Amendment grounds. Mr. Liveright, then a New Orleans radio announcer, was subpoenaed by the Eastland committee on suspicion that he had been sent South by the Communist party to disaffect the happy Negro population of that area. Mr. Gojack, a Fort Wayne, Ind., local UE official, was subpoenaed by the Walter committee on the eve of an NLRB election, in what he charged was an effort at "union-busting."

Three of the cases involved newspapermen, Alden Whitman and Robert Shelton of the *New York Times*, and William A. Price, formerly of the *New York Daily News*. All three took the First Amendment in the hearings held by the Senate Internal Security Committee in the winter of 1955-56. These hearings seemed designed to smear our leading newspaper, *The New York Times*, as that publication charged in an editorial, January 5, 1956.

The 1st Amendment Rights of Veterans

In recent years there has been a growing tendency to punish political dissenters by depriving them of social security or veterans' benefits. An example of this trend is the case of Robert G. Thompson, which has just been decided here by a three-judge court consisting of Federal District Judges Holtzoff and Keech and Circuit Judge Fahy. Mr. Thompson, one of the Communist leaders convicted under the Smith Act, had been receiving compensation for tuberculosis connected with his service in World War II when he won the Distinguished Service Cross. The Veterans' Administration deprived him of these benefits on the ground that he had made speeches opposing the Korean war. Its action was based on a statute providing for forfeiture of disability benefits upon a showing satisfactory to the Administrator that the veteran had been "guilty of mutiny, treason, sabotage or rendering assistance to an enemy of the United States or of its allies. . ." Mr. Thompson was found culpable under the "rendering assistance" clause. There was no proof that this "assistance" went beyond speech and writing. "I am not willing to hold that in this context," Judge Fahy dissented, "Congress provided that a veteran receiving disability benefits could not criticize the Government's participation in a war. The grant by Congress of disability benefits is not to be construed as an attempt to withdraw a veteran's First Amendment rights." The case is being appealed to the Supreme Court. The ruling, if upheld, could become a dangerous precedent.

The excuse for the hearings, in the words of Senator Eastland, was the theory that the "international Communist conspiracy has as one of its primary aims the influencing of public opinion, thus carrying on its psychological warfare against the United States and its institutions from inside by methods of penetration." There are circles in Washington which really believe that such newspapers as the *New York Times* and the *Washington Post* and even *Time* magazine are run by Communists. If these people had their way, the press would be subjected to serious onslaught. Because the reasoning of these new contempt decisions would clear the way for a witch hunt in the American press, the outcome of their appeal to the Supreme Court should be of vital interest to every thoughtful newspaperman. We respectfully suggest that the American Newspaper Guild consider filing briefs *amicus curiae* when they reach the Supreme Court.

Un-American Activities Committee Suffers Defeat in Pa. Supreme Court

The House Un-American Activities Committee has suffered a defeat in the Pennsylvania Supreme Court. Chief Justice Jones in two decisions for that State's highest tribunal June 30 ordered the reinstatement of four Philadelphia school teachers who had been dismissed in 1954 as "incompetent" after their appearance before the Committee. Three of them, Angelina Intille, Thomas Deacon and Sadie T. Atkinson, had pleaded the Fifth; Goldie Watson, the First. It was Mrs. Watson's second victory in a month, coming soon after the Circuit Court (see above) had reversed her contempt conviction. Justice Musmanno was the lone dissenter in the 5th amendment cases but was joined by two others in the Watson case, which was decided 4-to-3.

The full text of the opinions may be found in the Legal

Intelligencer of Philadelphia for July 5. This discloses a novel point. The Supreme Court of Pennsylvania ruled that to discharge teachers for having invoked their constitutional rights before a Congressional committee "constituted an abridgment by State action of a privilege of appellants' national citizenship available to them in a Federal proceeding." This is believed to be the first ruling of its kind. The Court held that invocation of either the 5th or 1st amendment could not be held proof of "incompetency." It said the Philadelphia Board of Education tried to use this as a device to avoid the requirement of the Pennsylvania Loyalty Act "that disloyalty or subversion as a ground for the discharge of a public school teacher, must be proven by fair preponderance of the evidence."

At Least There Is The Promise of Bigness in Kennedy

The strongest testimony to the collective intelligence of the delegates at the Democratic convention was their indifference to the proceedings. We do not remember ever seeing before so inattentive a convention, and we regard the inattention as a sign of growing national maturity. The convention showed itself too sophisticated for the elocutionist nullities of Idaho's Senator Church, who started on the road to fame by winning an American Legion oratorical contest and demonstrated at the convention how richly he deserved that prize. Governor Collins of Florida turned out to be commonplace; Chester Bowles, without lift and unimpressive. Only Governor Pat Brown of California, with his plea that we stop pretending that Communist China does not exist, dared touch on any real issue.

Eleanor Roosevelt Overshadowed the Rest

It was not until the demonstrations for Adlai Stevenson that the convention came to life, though this was in part an illusion created by the galleries. Two speakers only, Mrs. Roosevelt and former Governor Lehman in their hopeless appeals for Stevenson, achieved a passionate and memorable sincerity. Mrs. Roosevelt drew deep down within herself for strong powers of utterance quite extraordinary for her years, and by her power overshadowed every other participant in the proceeding including Stevenson himself, who emanates an air of preciosity. By far the biggest man available—what a pleasure it would have been to see in the White House a man of stature and education suited to the dimensions of our country and its power—yet it must be admitted the man lacks something in the way of virility and fire. This unfavorable view consoles one in his defeat, as does the hope that he may become Secretary of State if Kennedy wins.

With Humphrey (if only Stevenson had his fighting energy!) defeated, Kennedy seems clearly the best of those available. Amid such empty figures as the moronic Symington and the sophomoric Jackson, and even beside so able a man as Lyndon Johnson, Kennedy shines. His grace, his tact and his intelligence are unmistakable. His press conference replying to Mr. Truman's rather wild charges was a demonstration of high skill in the management of men and events. His encounter with Johnson before the Texas delegation left Johnson

Plank Against Faceless Informers

The complete text of the Democratic platform, more than 20,000 words was not available as we went to press, but apparently it contained some civil liberties planks not mentioned in the "abbreviated text" or "basic platform" published by the New York Times July 13. According to a Washington Post story that same day, the complete platform contains a plank favoring "a full and fair hearing, including the right of confrontation, to any person whose public or private employment or reputation is jeopardized by a loyalty or security program." According to the Washington Post account the platform also opposes student disclaimer oaths and calls "for the improvement of congressional investigating procedures and for fewer restrictions on travel or trade abroad."

looking small and petty. Though his nomination is the product of money and a Madison avenue machine, Kennedy added ingredients of personal appeal and power without which he could not have succeeded. He has attracted to his banner men and women we trust—Mrs. Edith Green of Oregon, to name one. In the gamble that is the inescapable nature of every presidential choice, Kennedy is promising. He might turn out to be a big man. This cannot be said of his close rivals in the last lap at the convention, nor can it be said of Nixon. Never did our country and the world need a big man in the White House more.

The platform on which Kennedy will run is outstanding in its civil rights program, which includes a cheer for the wave of sit-ins by which Negro youth and its allies have done more for the Negro in a few breath-taking months than three generations of normal political activity. Otherwise its liberalism is of the ADA and George Meany variety, i.e. it combines social welfare measures with a stepped up arms race. We hope the Russians noticed the undercurrent of belligerence and alarm over Mr. K's latest on the Monroe Doctrine. The Democrats will be tougher to deal with than the Republicans. We hope the Russians have the good sense not to engulf our election campaign in reckless talk. The Congo affair on top of everything else as we go to press gives the world the atmosphere of a bar-room on the verge of a brawl. July 14, 9 a.m.

IFS Flying Off to Cuba For First-Hand Report

I. F. Stone's Weekly, 5618 Nebraska Ave., N. W.
Washington 15, D. C.

Please renew (or enter) my sub for the enclosed \$5.*

Name

Street

City Zone.....State.....
7/18/60

Enter gift sub for \$2 (6 mos.) or \$4 (1 yr.) additional:

(To) Name

Street

City Zone.....State.....
Shall we send gift announcement? Yes No

I. F. Stone's Weekly

5618 Nebraska Ave., N. W.

Washington 15, D. C.

Second class
postage paid
at
Washington, D. C.

NEWSPAPER

I. F. Stone's Weekly. Entered as Second Class Matter at Washington, D. C., under the Act of March 3, 1879. Post-dated Mondays but published every Thursday except the last two Thursdays of August and December at 5618 Nebraska Ave., N. W., Washington 15, D. C. An independent weekly published and edited by I. F. Stone; Circulation Manager, Esther M. Stone. Subscription: \$5 in the U. S.; \$6 in Canada; \$10 elsewhere. Air Mail rates: \$15 to Europe; \$20 to Israel, Asia and Africa.