

Nation Magazine Runs Exposure Of Lovestone CIA Labor Machine

THE EVIL CIA hand of Jay Lovestone in the ~~extreme~~ cold war ultra-Right position in the foreign policy of the AFL-CIO's top leadership is the main theme of the July 5 issue of the liberal magazine, "Nation."

The magazine carries a 10,000-word documentation by Sidney Lens, a labor writer, under the title "American Labor Abroad-Lovestone Diplomacy." The Nation's own editorial commenting on the article titled "Lovestone's Foreign Policy" expresses astonishment that labor should have a man like Lovestone play a "key role not merely in orienting the American labor movement well to the right on foreign policy issues, but in setting up a worldwide intelligence network which, throughout the cold war has worked in close liaison with the official CIA."

Except for The Worker and earlier the Daily Worker, that have for many years followed and documented the operations of the Meany-Lovestone-Dubinsky group in close relation with the CIA and against peace, the "Nation" is the first magazine to do a comprehensive article on the role of Lovestone.

"What the U.S. Government does not do directly because it would be flagrant meddling with the internal affairs of other nations, and what the CIA cannot do because it is suspect, the AFL-CIO does on their behalf," says the Lens article.

The "Nation's" editorial follows, in full:

LOVESTONE'S FOREIGN POLICY

In this issue Sidney Lens, most of whose adult life has been spent as a trade union organizer

and official, lifts the curtain of secrecy and silence which has long obscured the role of Jay Lovestone in what "Business Week" calls "labor's own version of the Central Intelligence Agency."

More than one observer has been astonished that a man of Lovestone's background should, for so many years, have played a key role not merely in orienting the American labor movement well to the right on foreign policy issues, but in setting up a world-wide intelligence network which, throughout the cold war, has worked in close liaison with the official CIA and unofficial militants.

On reflection, however, it is not as surprising, as it appears. After the labor movement conducted

Continued

CPYRGHT

CPYRGHT

The great post-1947 "purge" [see "Labor and the Cold War," *The Nation*, Dec. 10, 1955], the ascendancy of an embittered anti-Communist with past leadership experience in the Communist Party was a natural sequel.

But in itself this does not explain the unqualified willingness of labor's Meany-Lovestone faction to back the cold-war program.

With only isolated exceptions, labor has made its political policies conform to its day-by-day economic interests. It has dismissed as irrelevant counsel like that of Sen. Wayne Morse, its best informed and most consistent friend in the Congress.

In his eloquent assault on the foreign-aid program, Senator Morse no doubt had the Meany-Lovestone machine in mind when he said: "Too many American labor leaders seem to think that we can justify these millions of dollars in foreign aid because 80 percent of the money is spent in the United States and thereby makes jobs for American workers. Let me say to American labor, 'I do not intend to support your program in the advocacy of blood money.' I yield to no man in Congress or in the country in support of the legitimate objectives of organized labor. But if it is a make-work program for the arms industry which labor desires, what an

immoral premise on which to stand."

But Senator Morse touched on only one aspect of labor's reactionary foreign-policy position. It is not only that its Washington leadership supports the arms program as a make-work scheme; it also resists alternative policies and programs that promise to yield better long-term dividends to unions and their members.

The ironical result is that big businessmen are generally more progressive than big labor leaders. It is Thomas Gates, chairman of the board of Morgan Guaranty Trust Company, who advocates reconsideration of our China policy, not George Meany. It is the U.S. Chamber of Commerce that would explore means of expanding East-West trade, not the AFL-CIO.

Perhaps the latter's policies are too benighted to prevail much longer without stirring up opposition. In May, Lovestone found it necessary to conduct a series of regional conferences for U.S. unionists to justify the AFL-CIO views in the foreign field, and to rebut arguments that the United States should give more attention to its domestic problems.

Now and then opposition comes out into the open, as when U.A.W. treasurer, Emil Mazey, denounced American policy in Vietnam and the Dominican Republic. These voices are in the minority at the moment, but they are evidence that some sections of the labor movement have begun to feel that the AFL-CIO serves neither abstract justice nor the interests of its own members by expediting, and sometimes even instigating, the stratagems of American foreign policy.

JUL 11 1965