

COUNTERATTACK

REG. U. S. PAT. OFF.

FACTS TO COMBAT COMMUNISM

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

Letter No. 68
September 10, 1948

Dear Subscriber:

AT LAST THE GOV'T IS PLANNING A NEW EFFORT TO DEPORT HARRY BRIDGES AS A COMMUNIST. This is NOT a reprisal for his action in leading his West Coast longshoremen's union into a strike last week, which tied up shipping all along the Coast. In fact the strike is likely to delay the deportation proceedings. Otherwise Bridges could pose as a labor martyr.

Decision to go after Bridges again was made some time ago, mainly because Canwell Un-American Activities Committee in Washington State had dug up new evidence to prove he was a Communist.

Bridges' divorced wife gave significant testimony before Canwell Committee...especially significant because of the kind of mud that the Communists fling at people who expose them. She testified that she began living with Bridges in 1923, and bore him a child in 1924...that she often asked him to marry her but that "he said the party didn't believe in marriage"...but that in 1934, shortly before the big waterfront strike, he told her that the strike was coming on and that he was also planning to take out his citizenship papers, and so "it would look better if he was married."

Communist Party meetings were often held in Bridges' home, according to Mrs Bridges' testimony. The meetings were in the kitchen, the party application blanks were kept in the bedroom, and Bridges usually hid his party card "underneath the linoleum in the bathroom." He never carried the card. And one day, about 1934 or 1935, there was a report that the house was about to be raided, so the card was taken elsewhere for safekeeping, and his wife never saw it again.

Jess Fletcher, a V-P of AFL Bldg Service Employees' International Union, and other witnesses identified Bridges as a Communist Party member. All these witnesses are former CP members themselves. Fletcher first met Bridges in Seattle, at home of Morris Rappaport (or Rapport), party organizer for the district. Another Communist there was Hugh DeLacy, who was later elected to Congress (1945-46). Rappaport had received instructions from party hq in NY concerning the line to be taken by Communists in unions. He transmitted these orders to Bridges, Fletcher, and the other labor leaders.

Fletcher met Bridges at other meetings of high Communists. And once they met by accident on an airplane. This was during the Stalin-Hitler Pact. They discussed the pact, and Bridges "seemed to think that Hitler might turn out to be a good Communist," Fletcher testified. "That was the party line -- that Hitler was a pretty good guy."

Govt will try to cancel Bridges' citizenship papers, which he got after Supreme Court in 1945 had rejected the effort to deport him. This effort had long been sabotaged in 1930's by Communists in Labor Dept and elsewhere in Govt. When case finally reached Supreme Court, a majority of the justices upheld Bridges. In this they showed the same general line of

thought as in earlier case of another California Communist, Wm Schneiderman. The Schneiderman decision was the subject of a blunt comment last February by Donald Richberg. This leading lawyer at different times has represented business, labor, and Govt. Testifying before Nixon legislative subcommittee of House Comm on Un-American Activities, Richberg spoke of the "error and ignorance" of the court. The justices, he said, were "very much muddled". Maybe some of them have learned a little from recent events, here & abroad.

The efforts to deport Bridges were attacked by Justice Frank Murphy in his concurring opinion in the Bridges case. The first paragraph of his opinion reads: "The record in this case will stand forever as a monument to man's intolerance of man. Seldom if ever in the history of this nation has there been such a concentrated and relentless crusade to deport an individual because he dared to exercise the freedom that belongs to him as a human being and that is guaranteed to him by the Constitution." According to Justice Murphy, Bridges had been hounded by "powerful economic and social forces". There were "vast interests arrayed against Bridges." Justice Murphy's opinion may not "stand forever", but it will be read a long time as a classic example of judicial misunderstanding of the truth about Communists.

J. PETERS DOES AN ABOUT-FACE...AND TELLS A BIT OF THE TRUTH. When the underground Communist agent known as J Peters appeared last week in the deportation proceedings against him, he denied that was his name. Mrs Carol King, Communist front lawyer, representing him, insisted he was Alexander Stevens. Several former Communist Party members testified against him, saying he was Peters. But in an interview he asserted they were "all confused".

Whittaker Chambers testified before a subcommittee of the House Comm on Un-American Activities that Peters had been the top man in setting up an underground Communist apparatus in the Govt. "Alexander Stevens" refused to answer the questions of the congressmen. He refused to admit he was Peters. His attitude was reported sympathetically by the Daily Worker, which said: "Chambers, a senior editor of Time magazine, later spun a hopped-up story about a J Peters whom he claimed was Stevens."

But several days later "Stevens" changed his tune. The deportation hearings were over then and he issued a written statement. "There is no mystery about me," he said. Also: "For many years I was an active member of the Communist Party and elected to various committees, all of which is public record." But the public record is confused by the many names he used. Mrs King, his lawyer, now admits that her client is J Peters. His previous lies on this point were a part of the legal (or illegal) maneuvering to save him from deportation.

What the Daily Worker called the "hopped-up" story told by Chambers was the truth. Chambers' entire long, complicated story about many Communists has so far proved true in every verifiable and important part.

HERE'S SOUND TALK BY A LABOR UNION ON THE SPY INVESTIGATION. As everybody can see, the dispute about the investigation is largely caused by the politics of the election campaign. Many people take a stand one way or the other, according to whether they favor or oppose Truman's reelection.

Now comes a union that supports Truman. It's the International Ladies' Garment Workers Union, AFL, headed by David Dubinsky, who was a strong Roosevelt man and is now backing Truman vigorously. The journal of this union, "Justice", is one of the best-known labor papers in the U S. And its editor, Max Danish, has now written an article mildly chiding Truman

for calling the spy investigation a "red herring". As Danish points out, "the Commies often use this term to cover up their depredations." Danish believes the Republican-controlled Un-American Activities Committee is playing some politics with the spy investigation. "But it is equally apparent," he adds, "that Moscow had for nearly two decades been burrowing into the Federal Govt with all the chicanery and cunning it could muster, trying to place trusted dupes in posts of sensitive strategy."

This is frank talk, and it should serve as a model not only for other union spokesmen but for everybody who comments on the spy investigation. Let's get the truth, no matter whom it helps or hurts politically, in election years or at any other time.

CAN LAWYERS BE DISBARRED FOR REFUSING TO TELL CONGRESS whether they were Communist Party members while holding Govt office? Counterattack raised this question Aug 27, in commenting on conduct of Lee Pressman, his partner Nathan Witt, and John Abt.

This week the American Bar Assn took action on this question.

In its convention, it first decided to EXPEL any of its members who refuse, on grounds of fear of self-incrimination, to say whether they've ever belonged to Communist Party. It also recommended to state bar associations that they begin DISBARMENT proceedings against such expelled members.

But next day it softened its position. It decided that refusal to testify shouldn't be AUTOMATICALLY followed by expulsion, but that this refusal should be regarded by the Board of Governors of ABA as a "compelling cause" for expulsion. This seems to mean that expulsion won't be automatic but will be nearly so.

The convention also dropped its recommendation of the day before that state bar associations begin disbarment proceedings against any member expelled for refusing to testify. But if a member is expelled on this ground, won't it be because his conduct is considered unethical? And in that case shouldn't he be disbarred, too?

And the same goes for lawyers who aren't members of ABA. All lawyers are officers of the courts. As such they're bound to live up to ethical standards. Was it ethical for three officers of the courts, namely Pressman, Witt, and Abt, to hide behind a fear of self-incrimination when House Un-American Activities Comm asked them whether they had been secret members of Communist Party while holding Govt office, and whether they knew Whittaker Chambers or any of the men he named as Communists in Govt?

It seems there have been one or more court rulings against disbarment of lawyers in cases that in some ways are comparable to this. But apparently these rulings aren't complete barriers to disbarment.

Every state has its own set-up regarding bar examinations, disbarment, etc. In some states certain courts are in charge of such matters. These courts sometimes delegate many duties to lawyers' boards or associations, which hear charges, make recommendations. Is there anything to prevent such courts and such boards or associations from adopting a rule to disbar any lawyer who refuses to tell a grand jury or a Congressional or legislative committee whether he has ever belonged to the Communist Party?

If such a rule is adopted, then Pressman, Witt, and Abt, and any other lawyers who have behaved in same way, can be called back to Congress and asked the former questions all over again. And if again they refuse to answer, they'll do so with full knowledge of the disbarment rule.

STALIN'S INTERNATIONAL FRONT OF LAWYERS WILL TRY TO INFLUENCE TRIAL of 12 indicted Communist leaders in U S. This week the International Assn of Democratic Lawyers held its third convention, in Prague. What is this outfit? It's a Communist front (Counterattack Aug 1, '47, pp 1, 2). It has replaced the old International Juridical Assn, which was the parent of Natl Lawyers Guild and of similar fronts in other countries. When the new international front was organized, Natl Lawyers Guild became its U S affiliate.

The Lawyers Guild had three delegates at Prague meeting, namely:

(1) Martin Popper, V-P of the Guild. To economize on space, we'll say no more of Popper than that he's been a lawyer for the 10 Hollywood Communists who face jail for refusing to answer Congressional questions.

(2) Wm L Standard. He was general counsel of Natl Maritime Union, CIO, till Pres Joseph Curran won a tremendous victory over the Communists in recent union referendum election. Then Curran dropped Standard.

(3) Mrs Bella S Abzug. She has sponsored an outfit called Citizens Committee of the Upper West Side, which Dept of Justice has labeled one of the "affiliates and committees" of Communist Party. In the Prague meeting she asserted there's a "great threat to civil liberties" in the U S. The delegates knew that already. They knew that one of their main purposes in coming there was to blast this country as "undemocratic".

Martin Popper urged this international front to "save civil liberties" in the U S. How? Why, on Oct 15, the 12 indicted members of the Communist Natl Board ("Politbureau") are coming up for trial on charges of conspiring against U S Govt. Popper called on the international front to send "observers" to the trial, who would "report to the world" on the wicked things done against the Communist leaders. And of course the front intends to do exactly that. It plans to conduct an anti-American propaganda campaign within the U S and throughout the world, during and after the trial.

Now what can YOU do about this Communist maneuver?

First of all, you can write today to your local newspapers and radio stations, and also the Associated Press, United Press and other news services, and the radio networks, notifying them the whole scheme is Communist ...and ask them to get the full facts about it and report them frankly.

Next, you can urge State Dept to refuse admission to the Communist delegates of this international front. Of course the usual hullabaloo will be raised if they're barred. But the Govt should stick to a firm rule: no Communists admitted into U S.

Besides, you can spread information about Stalin's Fifth Columns of lawyers, which he has set up in many countries. The International Assn of Democratic Lawyers is their coordinating ANTI-DEMOCRATIC organization. Natl Lawyers Guild is Stalin's Fifth Column of lawyers in the U S. Not all its members are pro-Communist. There's a small minority that has been attracted to the Guild by its pretensions to humanitarianism. But the majority of Guild membership consists of Communist Party members, other Communists, fellow-travelers, and sympathizers.

Yours faithfully,

Counterattack

September 10, 1948