

GENERAL HEADQUARTERS
 SUPREME COMMANDER FOR THE ALLIED POWERS
 Civil Information and Education Section

14 June 1949

UPTON SINCLAIR, U. S. WRITER, DENOUNCES "SLAVE STATE" RUSSIAOne of Communism's "Severest Critics"

WASHINGTON, (USIS)---Upton Sinclair, outstanding American novelist and one of the country's leading advocates of Socialism, has gone on record as one of Communism's severest critics, according to a recent article in the Los Angeles Times.

The California newspaper reported that Sinclair was aroused by Russian propaganda claims that he is among "writers, artists and scientists of the capitalist world who invariably have become friends of the U. S. S. R."

"Russia is a slave state," said Sinclair, "and the greatest hope for a continuation of our civilization lies in the Atlantic pact supported by free America and other free peoples."

Sinclair said he had abandoned all hope for "any good to come from the Soviet Union following the rape of the Czechoslovakian democracy."

(Sinclair's books are well known in Japan. Among his recent books published in Japan are: Dragon's Teeth, Presidential Mission, and World to Win.)

The Times article continued:

His comments were prompted by a statement made recently in Europe by Alexander Fadeyef, general secretary of the Union of Soviet Writers, in which Fadeyef listed Sinclair and several other American writers as Soviet sympathizers.

"Either Mr. Fadeyef has not read my books," Sinclair said, "or they have not been correctly translated in their Russian editions."

"American Communists, either fanatics or dupes, are helping Russian imperialists to make war on us. I had hoped that the Russians would have common sense enough to value an alliance to help reconstruct the world, but they are acting like madmen."

"For 47 years I have been advocating free democratic Socialism, to be obtained by the method of education and persuasion under our American system of government by popular consent."

"I defended the right of the Russian people to choose their own form of government, but that was when I believed they would be given the right to choose. I accepted Lenin's promise that the state would wither away."

"But it hasn't; it has become a reactionary nationalist imperialism, telling the Russian people even what music they shall listen to and what they shall believe about the inheritance of acquired characteristics."

"If I have any influence with the Russian people, I will use it to tell them that the present Communist Party line is bound to lead to another world war--many times more dreadful than the last."

#

MORE

SOVIET IRON CURTAIN NOW 'ALL PERVASIVE' THORP SAYS

Russians Steadily More Isolated

WASHINGTON, (USIS)---Understanding and goodwill between nations depends on the freest possible interchange of persons and ideas, but the Soviet Government now more than ever is keeping its people isolated from the outside world, U. S. Assistant Secretary of State Thorp said on June 12.

Thorp told the graduating class of Amherst College that "even the United Nations has great difficulty in getting the simplest statistics from Russia, with the result that its bulletins contain the phrase over and over again, 'world total excluding USSR.'"

Thorp reviewed the many futile American efforts since the war to establish cultural interchanges with the Soviet Union. He cited offers by American groups "either to visit Russia or to welcome Russians to the United States." Yet, he noted, most of these offers "were never even acknowledged".

Thorp cited as examples the offers of Texas and Columbia Universities, and Amherst College, among other educational institutions, of "tuition fellowships to Soviet students." Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Princeton University and others "expressed their desire to exchange scientific personnel", he added.

The Boston Symphony Orchestra offered to travel to the Soviet Union for two weeks at their own expense to give a series of performances, the proceeds to be used for whatever benefits the Soviet Government might select, Thorp recalled.

These and many similar offers, he said, were ignored or rejected, as well as U. S. State Department proposals that "there be instituted an exchange of ballet groups, theater groups, and orchestras, and that reciprocal exhibits of art, architecture, and handicraft be arranged as a means of increasing the mutual understanding of the Soviet and American people."

Soviet Maintains Closed System

Pointing out that the Soviet Union "maintains as far as possible a closed system," Thorp said:

"The most obvious operation of the Curtain is evident in the limited number of individuals who move across the border. Only a handful of foreigners obtain permission to enter Russia today, and as for Russians travelling outside, even the ambassadors do not keep their wives and children with them on their posts."

The Iron Curtain is now "all pervasive," Thorp said, and "ranges from jamming the air waves and censoring the reporting of foreign correspondents to barring the gates to foreign visitors and denouncing as degenerate all foreign ideas."

He noted that "even an interest in Western ideas has now become unpatriotic and disgraceful" in the view of the Soviet Government.

###

GENERAL HEADQUARTERS
 SUPREME COMMANDER FOR THE ALLIED POWERS
 Civil Information and Education Section

PRESS RELEASE:

U.S. EDUCATORS FAVOR CLASSROOM EMPHASIS ON DEMOCRATIC PRINCIPLESWould Bar Communists from Teaching Profession

WASHINGTON, (USIS) ---"The Role of Education," an editorial in the New York Times on June 9, said:

The thoughtful and penetrating discussion of the responsibility faced by the American educational system in our troubled world, which was published June 8 by the National Education Association, is an important document. Through its clear vision and practical common sense, it should wield a vigorous, wholesome influence.

The report cuts through a perplexing underbrush of confusion over the question whether Communists should be employed as teachers. It states the role that education should play in building intelligent patriotism in our youth. It establishes a reasonable course of action on teaching about, but not advocacy of, the totalitarian philosophies of foreign nations. It does not flinch from undertaking--in the midst of great traditional burdens already resting on the school system--a major additional duty of educating the young citizen to help maintain an honorable world peace.

This report is the product of about six months' study and discussion by the Educational Policies Commission sponsored by the National Education Association and the American Association of School Administrators. The Commission includes such respected leaders as President Conant of Harvard, General Eisenhower, William Jansen, Superintendent of Schools in New York City, and C. C. Carmichael, president of the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching.

It approaches with courage and wide scope the problem of what our educational program shall be in the midst of international tensions which are not likely to abate for some years. "On the one hand," says the Commission, "stands the political system and ideology which we call democracy, dedicated to the proposition that intellectual freedom is essential to worthwhile life and development of mankind. Implacably opposed to this proposition is the political system and ideology which we call Communism." The issue of intellectual liberty appears as the most basic, clear-cut and persistent difference between these two societies.

U. S. Classroom Study "May Affect Fate of World"

The Commission evaluates the influence that the United States will have in the years to come on world affairs, and decides that what happens in American classrooms "may affect the fate of the world." Teaching that peace is desirable is one thing, while disapproval of war, of any kind and under all circumstances, is another. Education must teach the ability to distinguish between different kinds of war. We are engaged now in a cold war as the surest and least costly way to insure survival of the Nation and our ideals. It is a defensive war. Our attention to world history should be increased. Our teaching of current affairs requires constant evaluation. Peace through education is a responsibility shared by every teacher.

The schools must develop strong national loyalties, and to develop "the kind of patriotism that is true to the best ideals of America" is a major task. It is not disloyal or naive, though some would try to make it seem so, to teach

MORE

anything favorable about a foreign nation. To omit such teaching would leave education incomplete, a danger in itself.

So, accurate and objective teaching about the principles and practices of totalitarianism, including those represented by the Soviet Union and by the Communist Party in the United States, is a part of wisdom. But the advocacy of such doctrines "should not be permitted in American schools." The principles of the American way of life should be vigorously taught, for there is no better way to combat Communism than to show that people can achieve a maximum of freedom and justice and well-being by supporting and bettering the American democracy. Meanwhile, we try to correct, on the American scene, the discrepancy between what we preach as democracy and the sometimes disagreeable conditions of life as they are.

Finally, the members of the Communist Party should not be employed as teachers. Here the Commission grasps with clarity the essential reason. Freedom of thought is basic to the whole spirit of American education. The Communist Party member is not free to think for himself. He has surrendered that right when he joins the party, "becoming part of a movement characterized by conspiracy and calculated deceit."

Here is a charter that should be in every teacher's hands, to fulfill with boldness, with the pride of speaking in a great cause. We do not expect our hundreds of thousands of teachers to put this charter into practice in their classrooms without making some mistakes. All that we ask is that the mistakes be honest..... Surely we can rid our schools of Communists and the indubitably subversive without paying in that process the far too costly price of losing our most cherished heritage--freedom of thought and expression.

#

WASHINGTON STAR SAYS SENATE WILL RATIFY NORTH ATLANTIC PACT AS A DETERRENT TO ANY WOULD-BE AGGRESSOR

WASHINGTON, (USIS)---"A Pact For Our Time," an editorial in the Washington Star on June 3, said:

Now that the Foreign Relations Committee has unanimously approved the North Atlantic Treaty, ratification by the Senate may be viewed pretty much as a foregone conclusion. Whether it takes place before or after final action on the labor legislation, the important thing is that it is on the way.

A vote in its favor, moreover, is expected to be resoundingly in excess of the necessary two-thirds--a fact that will lend emphasis to this Nation's avowed determination never again to follow a do-nothing policy toward threat of aggression abroad.

The significance of all this will be carefully noted by the world at large, particularly by Soviet Russia. For in subscribing to the Atlantic Pact along with eleven other free nations, the United States has decided on a profoundly historic and far-reaching change in its traditional peacetime foreign policy.

The new departure--comparable in importance to the proclamation of the Monroe Doctrine in 1823--places us in a mutual defensive alliance with like-minded countries in the West European community, whereas heretofore, except in time of war, we have limited such alliances to our own American hemisphere.

#

GENERAL HEADQUARTERS
SUPREME COMMANDER FOR THE ALLIED POWERS
Civil Information and Education Section

13 June 1949

LAST WEEK IN THE UNITED STATESVishinsky Responsible for CFM Deadlock

WASHINGTON, (USIS)---The third week of talks by the Council of Foreign Ministers achieved little in the way of agreement between the East and West, but it did fix, beyond reasonable doubt, the responsibility for the deadlock. It was unmistakably attributable to Soviet Foreign Minister Andrei Vishinsky's adamant refusal to budge from his initial position.

His insistence on the unlimited veto stalled the discussions of a united Berlin in precisely the same manner that previous discussions looking toward a united Germany had been halted by the same demand.

The American public was at a loss to account for the Soviet stand on any rational grounds. On the Berlin problem, Vishinsky favored in principle a democratically-elected council for the city, but in practice would turn the municipal government into a puppet whose control strings would be subject to manipulation by the Soviet Union.

To many, it was revealing that the only compromise proposals came from the Western representatives. U. S. Secretary of State Dean Acheson offered to give up majority control in favor of a more complicated system in which proposals relating to the administration of the city would be subject to veto if they fell within the confines of two of four general categories.

In one category, the rule of unanimity would apply before action could be taken by the Berlin municipal council. In the second category, there would have to be unanimity before municipal council action could be disapproved. In the third, each member of a Four-Power Kommandatura would have full powers in his sector. In the fourth, the municipal council could operate unfettered.

Soviet Unwilling to Have Free, Democratic Germany

That this concession should fail to alter the Soviet position was perplexing. There could be but one reason for the Soviet refusal: A Soviet distaste for the establishment of free, democratic institutions in Germany and an abiding Soviet distrust of the German people. Some felt that it also unmasked a Russian appreciation of the basic insecurity of the Communists in Eastern Europe.

To most Americans, the course of the discussions raised one major question. Why did the Soviet Union ask that the Council be convened in the first place? When the Council meeting was proposed, Acheson outlined the bases of the United States approach and set down certain principles as beyond compromise. Vishinsky has acted as though nothing had been said. Each Soviet proposal has disregarded these stated fundamentals. The public relished the irony of French Foreign Minister Robert Schuman's comment that the Soviet Union showed extreme conservatism in its desire to revert to the past.

If Acheson's hand in the negotiations needed strengthening from Congress, it was forthcoming. The Senate Foreign Relations Committee recommended the North Atlantic Treaty to the membership without a dissenting vote. Five Republicans joined the democratic majority of eight in approving it. Senate Majority Leader Scott Lucas predicted quick ratification by the required two-thirds of the Senate when the Pact comes before it for consideration.

MORE

February 1949

TO: CIVIL INFORMATION OFFICER, NARA MIL GOVT TEAM.

(1) For your information.

(2) Not to be copied - not to be used for
publicity.

WALTER THORSEN

THE NEW YORK TIMES, SUNDAY, JANUARY 23, 1949

**COMMUNIST 'LINE'
ELASTIC IN JAPAN**

**Its Anti-U. S. Propaganda, in
Moscow Style, Stretches
in Election Campaign**

BY EYTON GRANT

Special to THE NEW YORK TIMES,

TO KYO, Jan. 22.—Anti-American propaganda from Communist sources here is becoming increasingly bolder. Communist party candidates in the election campaign that ends tomorrow have been telling audiences that Japan is exporting at low prices and importing at high prices and hence is doomed to become "America's slave."

Occupation officials note that the propaganda line follows, with fidelity suggestions contained in Russian broadcasts beamed on Japan. The Japanese Communists' line will change suddenly and simultaneously throughout the country at Moscow's instance.

Sometimes, as in the case of a speech by Kyuichi Tokuda, secretary general of the Communist party of Japan before the Diet last Nov. 20, the method of presenting economic arguments is clearly Russian.

The Propaganda Line

While the public statements of the Communists show a more pronounced anti-American trend, there is still in them a certain measure of caution. But in whispering campaigns the local Communists have thrown off all wraps.

Most Red propaganda uses a recognizable fact; it is the interpretation that is twisted.

An example is the Communist statement that since the surrender at least 30 per cent of the taxes collected from the Japanese people, "who have worked with sweat and blood to earn the money," have gone for the support of the United States forces, "who have used the funds mostly to build up the military establishment for the purpose of preparing for war with the Soviet Union." The elements of error-truth in the statement are that occupation expenses take about a quarter of the Japanese budget and some of the money has been used to build airfields in Japan.

Following are examples of Communist propaganda collected by Japanese business men in the shipping, shipbuilding, coal mining, cannery and lumbering industries of the southern island of Kyushu, where the Red are strong:

"Allied dependents live on a luxurious scale that few wealthy Japanese could afford. Their luxury comes from your taxes."

"The harder we work, the more we help in preparation for war, the more we aid Allied extravagance. It is better to pay smaller taxes by sabotaging our work and thus help to prevent war."

"Americans ask our gratitude for supplying food, but the quality is generally bad or it is unsuitable."

"Laborers commute to work daily in suffocatingly crowded trolleys and railway cars, yet the occupation forces continue to run Allied coaches which the Japanese cannot enter, and they are often empty."

Allies Accused of "Waste"

"Here is a lumber mill employing 200 men, which, because of electric shortages, is allowed to use only 500 kilowatt hours of power monthly, yet an Allied dependent's home sometimes uses 9,000 kilowatt hours in the same period. With such waste how can we expect to increase Japanese production?"

"Even during the war our home electric use was never restricted, yet now, because of Allied waste, a family of five can have only forty kilowatt hours monthly."

"Fellow laborers and farmers, so long as such conditions continue, it is useless to work hard."

An element of truth in all this is that the dependents of occupation personnel live on a scale the wealthiest Japanese usually cannot or do not afford. Because of the progressive taxes, the top Japanese taxpayer last year had a net income that was the equivalent of about \$9,000; and most Japanese "policrats" make net incomes below the equivalent of an American factory worker's wage.

Moreover, it is true that occupation office buildings burn lights all night long, and the dwellings of occupation personnel, which are packed with electric heaters, consume thousands of kilowatt hours of electricity.

Most of the Japanese who hear or read this propaganda do not know enough to realize that--aside from who won the war--the occupation costs them far less than did Japan's former military establishment, and that, if Japanese coal miners, instead of sabotaging output, would dig half as much coal as they dug ten years ago, Japan could have ample power for all her needs."

HEADQUARTERS EIGHTH ARMY
United States Army
Military Government Section
APO 343

Statement by General MacArthur on letter
from Lt. Gen. Derjyanko

Issued by PIO, GHQ, 13 June 1947

"The Soviet letter, replete with inaccuracies and misrepresentations of fact, could be disregarded as routine Soviet propaganda did it not so completely unmask the Soviet role as an inciter of disorder and violence in an otherwise orderly Japanese society.

"The thorough duplicity of its apparent championship of fundamental human rights on the one hand and the Soviet callous indifference to the release for repatriation of Japanese prisoners of war on the other--its talk of greater liberality for Japanese workers and the Soviet practice of labor exploitation, is a shocking demonstration of inconsistent demagoguery.

"The purpose of the letter is obviously two-fold:

"To incite irresponsible and unruly minority elements in Japan to violence and disorderly resistance against the duly constituted Government of Japan and the lawful orders and processes thereof with a view to creating confusion, unrest and bewilderment in the ranks of the lawabiding Japanese masses, and to screen the Soviet unconscionable failure to abide by the requirements of International Law and specific Potsdam commitments in the return of over 400,000 Japanese citizens, long held in bondage, to their homeland.

"This failure to meet international commitments and maintain normal standards of human decency in the disposition of captives finds little parallel in the history of modern civilization, and is calculated so to outrage moral sensibilities that even the Japanese Communists have been moved to register a bitter and indignant protest.

"The burdened effort at this late date to challenge the number long publicly recorded as held in Soviet hands by charging mathematical error is small solace indeed to the hundreds of thousands of Japanese homes from whom no sophistry can conceal the fact that a family member in Soviet custody has failed to return; and as to whom, contrary to all international covenant respecting prisoners of war, no word whatsoever has been received during the long period of captivity.

"For the Soviet to speak in derogation of the status of labor in Japan is hypocrisy compounded. His premise is based upon such fantastic exaggerations as obviously to belie the truth. The Japanese labor laws match the most progressive in their liberality and advanced concepts, and the labor movement here, despite its immaturity has advanced more rapidly and with less friction than has its counterpart in many of the democratic countries of the world.

"Incidents of violence have been rare indeed and no segment of Japanese society has made such democratic gains as labor which enjoys rights and liberties and safeguards largely unknown to the peoples of the Soviet

*20
copies of newspaper
of this release*

Union, which, following the totalitarian concept, holds under ruthless suppression individual liberty and personal dignity.

"For the Soviet to speak of Democratic rights, 'the suppression of legal activities,' 'arbitrariness and chastisement,' is enough to challenge the late lamented Ripley at his imagination's best and leads one to conclude that now there must really be nothing new under the sun."