



You Can't Win, Walter

STATINTL

CIA

CPYRGHT

By STANLEY LEVEY
Scrivener-Howard Staff Writer

possibly was running an errand
for President Johnson?

WHERE George Meany is concerned, Walter Reuther seems to have an instinct for his own jugular.

Soon after the boycott became known, the Johnson Administration pressured Mr.

The auto union leader periodically engages the AFL-CIO president in battles he cannot win and which his strongest supporters sadly wish he had never begun. The issues almost always are short-lived and the odds against Mr. Reuther overwhelming. He has an unbroken record of defeat.

Meany to reverse it on grounds that it was inconsistent with United States foreign policy. Mr. Meany did not budge, possibly because the decision to boycott the conference was not his in the first place. But once it was made, he went along.

After several years of not burning his bridges behind him, Mr. Reuther again has taken on Mr. Meany. As usual, Mr. Meany, an astute and formidable adversary trained in the old school of Tammany politics, has counted his votes and prepared his counter-offensive. The battle will be fought on his terms and on his turf.

Copies of Mr. Reuther's letter were sent to President Johnson and other interested members of his Cabinet. It was almost as if Mr. Reuther was saying to the President: "Mission completed."

OBJECTIVE

BOYCOTT

Other observers suggest the President may have had a deeper, more complex objective. They point out that labor is irritated over its lack of legislative success in the present Congress and is threatening to stay home next election day. These observers speculate that a rousing internal fight in the AFL-CIO leadership might take labor's minds off its legislative defeats and the idea of political reprisals.

Once again the issue is narrow. Mr. Reuther objects to the American labor delegation's boycott of the International Labor Organization conference in Geneva. Last week, he fired off an angry letter to Mr. Meany calling the walkout "unwise, undemocratic, contrary to established AFL-CIO policy and unauthorized by any AFL-CIO body."

Another explanation: The letter more closely expresses the view of Mr. Reuther's brother Victor, his foreign policy adviser. This theory is based on the fact that Victor Reuther recently attacked Mr. Meany and his foreign affairs expert, Jay Lovestone, as being "involved" with the Central Intelligence Agency. When Mr. Meany asked Walter Reuther for an explanation, he received assurances that Victor Reuther had acted on his own.

The letter lectured Mr. Meany on his approach to the question of dealing with communists, and the AFL-CIO head has chosen to regard Mr. Reuther's words as an attack on his leadership. That is how he will pose the issue to a special meeting of the AFL-CIO 29-man executive council here Thursday.

It would be surprising if efforts are not being made to head off a showdown vote. Mr. Meany may be angry enough to insist on one. Mr. Reuther's supporters will want to know precisely what the issue is, and some of them will be reluctant to take a stand against Mr. Meany on a dispute which concerns them and their members.

If it comes to a vote, Mr. Meany's victory is assured. Whatever happens, Mr. Reuther has lost face and ground in his determined effort to succeed Mr. Meany in labor's top post.

POLITICAL

But Mr. Reuther is a political animal, too. And it may be that explanation. Some observers are wondering whether Mr. Reuther

CPYRGHT

enced" reporting, of "headline type coverage." He complained that it was very unsporting to use that kind of picture just when the government was trying to calm the American public about the civil warring in Vietnam.

It is this kind of response that prompted Charles Roberts, for twelve years a White House correspondent for *Newsweek*, to comment at a recent University of Wisconsin symposium that "apparently the President feels we should print the news just as he dictates it, without any explanation, interpretation, background, or 'speculation.' . . . It is hard, sometimes impossible, to get a straight, substantive, responsive answer out of him. . . . The President's purpose in holding press conferences seems to be to dominate and even intimidate the press rather than to tell reporters what he is really thinking."

CIA-AFL-CIO

For several years there have been rumblings of dissension in the labor movement over the activities of Jay Lovestone, the AFL-CIO international affairs director and one of George Meany's closest coadjutors. In the February 10, 1964, *Nation*, Stanley Meisler ("Meddling in Latin America: Dubious Role of AFL-CIO") referred to the antagonism between Lovestone and Walter Reuther and his brother Victor, president and international affairs head respectively, of the United Auto Workers. The dispute involved the American Institute for Free Labor Development (AIFLD) defined by Meisler as "an enterprise run by the AFL-CIO, partly with its own funds but principally with money made available by the Alliance for Progress and private enterprise." The ostensible purpose of the AIFLD was to train Latin American labor leaders and to build a strong anti-Communist labor movement in Latin America.

To this end, U.S. agencies were engaged at that time in efforts to unseat the leftist-leaning Premier Cheddi Jagan of British Guiana and to replace him with Forbes Burnham, now head of the newly independent Guyana. One of the steps in this operation was a bloody general strike waged against Jagan by the British Guiana Trade Union Council. In a letter to *The New York Times*, Jagan charged that "local trade unionists known to be hostile to my government—and none others—have been trained by the American Institute for Free Labor Development to overthrow my government." Meisler saw in the attacks on Jagan the imprint of Lovestone, a rabid anti-Communist since his ouster as leader of the Communist Party USA in the twenties. The *Times*, after noting the Reuther brothers' criticism of Lovestone's close relations with George Meany, president of the AIFLD as well as the AFL-CIO, commented that "to his enemies, Mr. Lovestone is a sinister figure, who, they say, has soured the relationships between the AFL-CIO and other free world trade unions by unnecessary intrigue and bitter feuding."

British Guiana was only one focus of AFL-CIO anti-Communist activity in Latin America and elsewhere. Since the Central Intelligence Agency was engaged in similar endeavors abroad, one could hardly help speculating on the possibility that there was not merely parallelism but liaison between the Communist-fighters of the two organizations.

Meisler indeed voiced the question: Does the U.S. Government really want the AFL-CIO to serve as a junior CIA? No proof could be cited at that time, but at the recent UAW convention in Long Beach, Calif., covered by Harry Bernstein for the *Los Angeles Times* and *The Washington Post* (May 23), Victor Reuther charged that the AFL-CIO is "involved" with the CIA in the political affairs of foreign countries and particularly their trade union movements, and that these intrusions are either entirely secret or only partially reported to the AFL-CIO executive committee.

Reuther cited a recent case in which A. Paulson, general secretary of the International Food and Drink Workers Federation, with headquarters in Geneva, found it necessary to abolish the Panama office of the federation because of the presence there of eight individuals who were said to be "posing as official representatives" but of whom he had no knowledge. Reuther said this "seems to be one most recent example of CIA activities." A spokesman for the AFL-CIO denied that the AIFLD had any connection with the CIA. He also denied that Lovestone had had anything to do with setting up the AIFLD—which is not the same as saying that he never had anything to do with its operations.

Despite the denial, Victor Reuther continues to take a dim view of Lovestone. "The tragedy of the AFL-CIO activities in the field of foreign affairs," he says, "is that they are a vest-pocket operation by Jay Lovestone. . . . Mr. Lovestone seems to have brought into the labor movement the working habits and undercover techniques which he learned when he was in the highest echelons of the Communist Party." Which, come to think of it, sounds very much like the working habits and techniques of the CIA itself.

Slight Thaw

Some glimmerings of sense are beginning to appear in the American policy toward Communist China—perhaps to be followed, on some distant tomorrow, by reciprocal manifestations on the part of the Chinese. The Johnson Administration, however, cannot be credited with taking the initiative in withdrawing from the John Foster Dulles position that Red China was only a passing pestilence which Dr. Dulles himself would help to eradicate. The fact is that the Administration has been impelled toward realism by Senators Edward and Robert Kennedy, George McGovern, J. W. Fulbright and Rep. Henry Reuss, and by a general feeling around the country that it was about time to cease cowering before the China Lobby and the ghost of Joe McCarthy. This change we owe also to George Kennan, John K. Fairbank and the other experts who testified before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. The fact that in 1965 the vote for admitting Red China to the UN was a 47-to-47 tie, with twenty abstentions, no doubt helped.

In his speech of May 3, Edward Kennedy suggested as an immediately feasible measure the appointment of a "blue-ribbon commission of distinguished men to make, publicly, recommendations for new directions in our China policy." In submitting this proposal Senator Kennedy lamented the fact that outstanding scholars and public servants were persecuted during the 1950s for what had hap-

AFL-CIO Aid Brings 'Puppet' Label

Dominican Unions Are Still Feuding

CPYRGHT

By Dan Kurtzman
Washington Post Staff Writer

SANTO DOMINGO—When the Dominican revolution broke out early last year, one of the first places sacked by angry mobs was the headquarters of the AFL-CIO-supported National Confederation of Free Dominican Workers (CONATRAL).

AFL-CIO and CONATRAL officials claimed that Communists had directed the destruction. But many leaders in other anti-Communist labor confederations doubt this. So many anti-Communist workers "hate" the AFL-CIO and CONATRAL, they say, that it is more likely that the attack was "non-partisan."

Whatever the truth, a large segment of anti-Communist Dominican labor is violently anti-American as well. And this bitterness is likely to continue, according to neutral labor experts here, long after the Inter-American Peace Force leaves the country.

Dominican organized labor is split largely into four groups. The largest is probably the Autonomous Confederation of Christian Unions (CASC), with ties to the Revolutionary Social Christian Party. Another is Fouspa-Cesistrado, which after recently coming under Communist control, is very weak. A third is a group of unions attached to former President Juan Bosch's Dominican Revolutionary Party (PRD). And the fourth is CONATRAL.

All Compete

All these confederations are in bitter competition with each other. But the first three have one thing in common. They accuse CONATRAL of being a tool of the AFL-CIO, the State Department, and the Central Intelligence Agency.

Victor Reuther, head of the United Auto Workers' international department, charged recently after a trip to the Dominican Republic that the AFL-CIO was backing a small, unrepresentative labor group while ignoring the mass organizations.

AFL-CIO and CONATRAL officials deny that CONATRAL is any less representative of labor than the other organizations, claiming 30,000 members. Nobody can prove who is right, since figures on union membership are unavailable.

Gained Under Reid Cabral

CONATRAL had gained considerable power under the de facto regime of President Donald Reid Cabral, who came to power after the military ousted the Bosch government in 1963. But when Reid Cabral, who had close ties with the AFL-CIO, was himself ousted at the start of the revolution, CONATRAL lost control of most of its important unions.

For although labor as a whole violently opposed the U.S. military intervention, CONATRAL leaders welcomed it. These expressions of welcome coincided with an AFL-CIO announcement condemning Bosch, the symbol of the revolution, as friendly to communism and praising Gen. Elias Wessin y Wessin, who tried to crush the revolution, as an upright, incorruptible man.

Nor had the AFL-CIO, or CONATRAL, complained when Bosch's democratic government was overthrown by Wessin in 1963.

"The AFL-CIO is supposed to represent democratic labor," commented Gustavo Salazar, an adviser to the Boschist unions sent here by the anti-Communist Venezuelan Confederation of Labor. "But it backs dictators and militarists against democrats and sets worker against worker, all in the service of the American Embassy, which wants to control foreign labor."

Terrorism Charged

Many anti-Communist labor leaders openly accuse CONATRAL of having organized "goon squads" to terrorize opposition unions, Communist or not. Although such reports have also emanated from Washington, there is no proof that they are valid.

But the tendency to believe them here is a measure of the anti-Americanism prevailing among many workers.

U.S. labor experts say that the AFL-CIO is simply trying to foster the independence of Dominican unions. They maintain they are opposed to the other anti-Communist confederations because they are attached to political parties, and are therefore more interested in political than economic ends. The argument that in most democratic countries labor organizations have ties with political parties does not impress them.

Relations between the AFL-CIO and the Boschist unions, which previously belonged to Fouspa-Cesistrado appear to be growing worse. Communists started coming to the fore of this confederation under Reid Cabral's rule partly as the result of the jailing of many Boschist labor leaders.

Last fall, as the revolution was coming to an end, the Reds, armed with rifles, packed a Fouspa-Cesistrado meeting in Santo Domingo and voted in a Communist-dominated executive board. The Boschist leaders then abandoned the confederation, together with most affiliate unions, and are now in the process of forming a new anti-Communist confederation.

The AFL-CIO has severely castigated these leaders for trying to form a new confederation, apparently disappointed that they are not throwing in their lot with CONATRAL.

Houses for Workers

To induce new unions to join CONATRAL, the AFL-CIO is working through the American Institute for Free Labor Development (AIFLD). The institute, financed largely by the U.S. government and sponsored by leading U.S. businessmen as well as the AFL-CIO, is teaching union leaders the essentials of American-style trade unionism, and building houses for "friendly" sugar workers.

The owner of one \$3000 three-bedroom house built under AIFLD auspices maintained typically that he was glad to have the house — and that he was delighted that the American troops had come. Other workers condemned such new homeowners as "Yankee puppets." A labor expert from one neutral country commented: "The AFL-CIO is lucky that so many Dominican workers are anti-Communist. But sooner or later anti-Americanism will melt the barriers between the Communists and anti-Communists."