Y4
L 11/2
L 11/11

TO ABOLISH FORCED LABOR THROUGH ILO

GOVERNMENT
Storage



HEARINGS

BEFORE THE

SUBCOMMITTEE ON LABOR

OF THE

COMMITTEE ON
LABOR AND PUBLIC WELFARE
UNITED STATES SENATE

EIGHTY-FOURTH CONGRESS

SECOND SESSION

ON

S. J. Res. 117

TO PROVIDE FOR UNITED STATES COOPERATION WITH OTHER NATIONS THROUGH THE INTERNATIONAL LABOR ORGANIZATION TO ABOLISH FORCED LABOR

APRIL 25 AND 27, 1956

Printed for the use of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare



UNITED STATES
GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE
77294 WASHINGTON : 1956

AUTHENTICATED
U.S. GOVERNMENT
INFORMATION
GPO

COMMITTEE ON LABOR AND PUBLIC WELFARE

LISTER HILL, Alabama, *Chairman*

JAMES E. MURRAY, Montana	H. ALEXANDER SMITH, New Jersey
MATTHEW M. NEELY, West Virginia	IRVING M. IVES, New York
PAUL H. DOUGLAS, Illinois	WILLIAM A. PURTELL, Connecticut
HERBERT H. LEHMAN, New York	BARRY M. GOLDWATER, Arizona
JOHN F. KENNEDY, Massachusetts	GEORGE H. BENDER, Ohio
PAT McNAMARA, Michigan	GORDON ALLOTT, Colorado

STEWART E. MCCLURE, *Staff Director*

SUBCOMMITTEE ON LABOR

PAUL H. DOUGLAS, Illinois, *Chairman*

MATTHEW M. NEELY, West Virginia	H. ALEXANDER SMITH, New Jersey
JOHN F. KENNEDY, Massachusetts	BARRY M. GOLDWATER, Arizona

JOHN S. FORSYTHE, *General Counsel to the Committee*

CONTENTS

	Page
Text of S. J. Res. 117	2
Reports:	
Department of Labor	165
Department of State	22
Statements:	
Dallin, Dr. David, author, Forced Labor in Soviet Russia	127
Delaney, George P., International Representative of the American Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organizations	199
Devenis, Dr. Michael, of the Lithuanian-American Council	150
Dobriansky, Prof. Lev E., professor of Soviet Economics, Georgetown University	58
Greenidge, Charles W. E., director general, Anti-slavery Society of Great Britain	132
Humphrey, Hon. Hubert H., United States Senator from the State of Minnesota	14
Lettrich, Hon. Josef, chairman of the Council of Czechoslovakia	31
McGuire, Father Frederick A., C. M., Committee of One Million (against the admission of China to the United Nations)	35
Noble, John, Wheaton, Ill., former prisoner in Vorkuta Slave Camp, U. S. S. R	221
Sender, Miss Toni, United Nations representative of International Confederation of Free Trade Unions	217
Skrzypek, Dr. Stanislaus, representing the Polish Association of Former Political Prisoners, economic analyst and specialist in Polish and east European economics	153
Sulkowski, Dr. Joseph, associate professor, School of Social Science, Catholic University of America in Washington, D. C	209
Turner, Howard Haines, Friends Committee of National Legislation	234
Wilcox, Francis O., Assistant Secretary for International Organization Affairs, Department of State	166
Zissu, Iancu, member of the Rumanian National Committee	118
Additional information:	
Antislavery Society (United Kingdom)—forced labor in the Portuguese African Colonies	147
Antislavery Society (United Kingdom)—Slavery and Slave Trading in Arabia	144
Concentration camps in the U. S. S. R	60
Daily life in the Kolyma camps of death, from the Ukrainian Quarterly, vol. X, No. 2	77
Excerpts translated from article on Negro slave traffic by Emmanuel La Graviere from La Nouvelle Revue Francaise d'Outremer, January 1956	135
Forced labor in Poland	154
Hole of Oblivion, from the Jewish Frontier, July 1947	11
I Was in Siberia, from the Ukranian Quarterly, Vol. III, No. 4	94
In the Kolyma gold mine of Nizhny Khatynakh, from the Ukranian Quarterly, Vol. IX, No. 4	71
In the Vorkuta Concentration camps 50 percent are Ukranians, from the Ukranian Quarterly, Vol. XI, No. 3, summer 1955, p. 271	91
International labor organization speech of Hon. James E. Murray, of Montana, in the Senate of the United States on March 27, 1952	239
Jailed American caged in rail car—Noble tells of travel across Soviet Union cramped on a shelf for month, from the New York Times, April 4, 1955	227

Page

Additional information—Continued
Letters:
Hill, Robert C., assistant secretary (for the Secretary of State) to Hon. Lister Hill, April 11, 1956 ... 22
Mitchell, Hon. James P., Secretary of Labor, to Hon. Lister Hill, April 4, 1956 ... 165
Massacre ended 1954 rebellion in Vorkuta, Soviet Slave Camp—Detroiter who took part in incident in the Arctic tells how guards shot down a crowd of strikers, from the New York Times, April 7, 1955 ... 232
Metropolitan Slipy—the Ukranian Stepinac—in a labor battalion, from the Ukranian Quarterly, Vol. II, No. 2 ... 91
Modifications of the regime in the Tayshet Camps from the spring of 1953 to November 1954 ... 112
Murder in Tiflis, from the New York Times, April 23, 1956 ... 116
Ninety-six day strike in the Norilsk Camps ... 107
Number of inhabitants conscripted for slave labor by the Chinese Communists: typical examples ... 50
Number of slave laborers in Communist China ... 48
Number of slave laborers in labor camps: typical examples ... 48
Past and present of Kolyma's mines, from the Ukranian Quarterly, Vol. X, No. 4 ... 82
Public Law 843, 80th Cong ... 198
Record of Communist China's inhumanity to its own people—25 million slaves, article ... 56
Regime of forced labor in Rumania ... 121
Resolution of the American Bar Association ... 186
Retreat of Slave Trade, from the New York Times, April 12, 1956 ... 7
Return from Kolyma, from the Ukranian Quarterly, Vol. XI, No. 2 ... 87
Revolt in Slave-labor Camp—500 Women Massacred in Kingiri, Kazakhstan (U. S. S. R.) ... 99
Slave labor exploited in fight between State and Labor Departments, from the AFL–CIO News, April 14, 1956 ... 9
Slave labor in Red China, from the New Leader, February 16, 1953 ... 51
Slave policies of 11 nations reported, Article ... 10
Slave trade—grim Africa to Arabia traffic is reported reviving: Prices rise—How Awad El Joud found he had been used as a traveler's check, from the Wall Street Jounral, April 10, 1956 ... 3
Slavery at the United Nations ... 136
State farms and thought reform, from the New Leader, February 16, 1953 ... 52
Strike mechanism in Soviet concentration camps ... 101
Torture in Soviet jails related by American freed after decade from the New York Times, April 3, 1955 ... 224
Triumph of terror—How the Peiping regime keeps China enslaved, from the Newsletter, Committee of 1 Million ... 54
Twice: Scholmer's Vorkuta ... 97
Varied groups found in Vorkuta, Arctic slave camp of the Soviet—imprisoned Detroiter came across Reds, Anti-Reds, hardened criminals, and freemen in frigid community, from the New York Times, April 5, 1955 ... 228
Vorkuta strike shocked Sovet after disturbing events of 1954—Noble says rebellion in Arctic camp was related to the death of Stalin, Beria downfall, and East German trouble, from the New York Times, April 6, 1955 ... 230
U. N. reports Red China holds 25 million slaves, United Nations report ... 8
Washington Calling—Trouble brewing in the ILO, by Marquis Childs ... 237

APPENDIX

Page

Letter of Hon. Henry M. Jackson, to Hon. Lister Hill, March 27, 1956---- 243
Statement of James B. Carey, president, International Union of Electrical, Radio, and Machine Workers, AFL-CIO---- 244
Letter of J. D. Zellerbach, president, Crown Zellerbach Corp., San Francisco, Calif., to Hon. Paul H. Douglas, April 25, 1956---- 245
Statement of J. D. Zellerbach, president, Crown Zellerbach Corp---- 245
Statement of Hon. Henry S. Reuss---- 246
Statement of Very Rev. Msgr. George B. Higgins, director, social action department, National Catholic Welfare Conference, Washington, D. C.- 246
Statement of Philip M. Kaiser, former Assistant Secretary of Labor for International Affairs and United States Government representative of the governing body, ILO, 1949–53---- 248
Letter of Cola G. Parker, president, National Association of Manufacturers, New York, N. Y., to Hon. Paul H. Douglas, April 24, 1956---- 251
Edward P. Morgan and the News, April 24, 1956, American Broadcasting Co---- 252
Concentration camps in Soviet Russia, from the New Leader, March 29, 1947---- 253
Statement of Dr. K. A. Wittfogel, University of Washington, Department of Far Eastern and Slovac languages and literature, Seattle, Wash---- 265
Forced Labor Fiasco, article in New York Times, April 29, 1956---- 289
Reds Slave Labor Condemned by United States, article in New York Times, May 1, 1956---- 289
Are We For or Against It, article in New York Times, May 2, 1956---- 289
Letter of James B. Carey, president, International Union of Electrical, Radio, and Machine Workers, AFL-CIO, to Hon. Lister Hill, February 28, 1956---- 290
Letter of J. C. Turner, secretary, Maryland State and District of Columbia Federation of Labor, to Hon. Lister Hill, February 27, 1956---- 291
Letter of C. J. Haggerty, secretary-treasurer, California State Federation of Labor, AFL, to Hon. Lister Hill, February 21, 1956---- 291
Letter of George M. Harrison, grand president, Brotherhood of Railway and Steamship Clerks, to Hon. Lister Hill, February 20, 1956---- 292
Telegram of William A. Calvin, international president, International Brotherhood of Boilermakers, Iron Shipbuilders, Blacksmiths, Forgers and Helpers, to chairman, February 21, 1956---- 292
Telegram of Jacob S. Potofsky, general president, Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America, AFL-CIO, to Hon. Lister Hill, February 21, 1956- 292
Telegram of George J. Richardson, secretary-treasurer, International Association of Fire Fighters, to chairman, February 17, 1956---- 292
Letter of Gordon M. Freeman, international president, and Joseph D. Keenan, international secretary, International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers, to Hon. Lister Hill, February, 20, 1956---- 293
Telegram of William C. Doherty, president, National Association of Letter Carriers, to Hon. Lister Hill, February 21, 1956---- 293
Letter of F. W. Abel, secretary-treasurer, United Steelworkers of America, to chairman, March 16, 1956---- 293
Letter of Roger N. Baldwin, adviser, international work, American Civil Liberties Union, May 8, 1956---- 293

TO ABOLISH FORCED LABOR THROUGH ILO

WEDNESDAY, APRIL 25, 1956

UNITED STATES SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON LABOR AND PUBLIC WELFARE,
SUBCOMMITTEE ON LABOR,
Washington, D. C.

The subcommittee met, pursuant to notice, at 10:05 a. m., in room P–63, United States Capitol, Senator Paul H. Douglas (chairman) presiding.

Present: Senators Douglas (presiding) and Smith of New Jersey, members of the subcommittee, and Senators Murray and Lehman, members of the full committee.

Also present: Stewart McClure, staff director; John S. Forsythe, general counsel; Michael Bernstein, minority staff director; Mary DiDio, professional staff member.

Senator DOUGLAS. The subcommittee will come to order.

This morning the subcommittee has before it Senate Joint Resolution 117, which was introduced on January 12, 1956, by the Honorable Hubert H. Humphrey, United States Senator from Minnesota. The purpose of this resolution is "to provide for United States cooperation with other nations through the International Labor Organization to abolish forced labor." Its enacting clause resolves—

That the Government of the United States exercise leadership in the International Labor Organization to develop and adopt an international convention which will effectively outlaw forced labor for political and economic purposes.

In considering this proposal, the subcommittee has two problems before it: First, the substantive question of the nature, incidence, and extent of forced labor wherever it may exist throughout the world; and second, the policy question of whether or not the United States Government should take the lead in the forthcoming International Labor Organization conference at Geneva this June in drafting and bringing about the adoption of an international convention outlawing such forced labor.

To answer these 2 related but different questions, the subcommittee will receive testimony from 2 groups of witnesses. One group will testify to the matter of forced labor: what it is, where it exists, how it is carried on, how many people are subjected to forced labor and related matters.

With answers to these questions, I believe the members of the subcommittee, as well as the Senate as a whole, will be far better equipped to exercise their judgment as to the proper course for the United States to follow with respect to international action against one of the most cruel, degrading, and barbaric systems of human exploitation ever devised.

All the expert witnesses who will testify concerning forced labor are eminently qualified, some of them by bitter personal experience, to furnish the subcommitee with valuable information. Some of them are not citizens of the United States, and, of course, they have not been invited to express any opinion on the resolution before us, but rather to give us the benefit of their knowledge and experience concerning the subject of forced labor.

The other group of witnesses whom we shall hear will testify on the question of the proper United States policy with respect to action against forced labor by the International Labor Organization. They will include spokesmen for the Administration and for private organizations, and individual citizens.

I hope we may conclude these hearings on Friday this week, though of course we will hold open the record for any additional statements which may be submitted.

We have invited on Friday representatives of the Department of State. I have had a telephone conversation with Mr. Francis Wilcox, one of the Assistant Secretaries of State, in whose field this subject lies; and I told him that I expected him to be here on Friday. It is my understanding that he agreed to do so, and that he will be here.

As of the present time, the subcommittee has received no indication as to whether or not the Department of Labor will appear. The representative of the American Federation of Labor–Congress of Industrial Organizations, Mr. Delaney, representative at the International Labor Office of the free labor movement in this country will be present on Friday and will testify.

Senator Humphrey was to be the first witness this morning. He is on his way over. But I think his resolution which was originally introduced as a joint resolution, but which, as I understand it, has since been revised to be both a concurrent resolution and a Senate joint resolution, should be read into the record. And I will read that at this point.

The resolution is as follows:

[S. J. Res. 117]

JOINT RESOLUTION To provide for United States cooperation with other nations through the International Labor Organization to abolish forced labor

Whereas forced labor for political or economic purposes is abhorrent to all civilized nations and is repugnant to the constitutional and statutory concepts of the republican form of government on which life in the United States is based; and

Whereas the people of some nations are subjected to forced labor for political or economic purposes; and

Whereas the existence of forced labor in any nation is inimical to the interests of the United States and other free nations morally, politically, and economically and constitutes a threat to the security, well-being, and even the existence of democratic institutions and free economic systems; and

Whereas to meet this threat and to promote the welfare and dignity of human beings throughout the world, the United Nations and the International Labor Organization, at the initiative of the American Federation of Labor, appointed an ad hoc committee to study the nature and extent of forced labor for political or economic purposes throughout the world; and

Whereas the ad hoc committee on forced labor issued a carefully considered and well documented report detailing the existence of forced labor for these purposes in a number of nations of the world; and

Whereas the International Labor Organization is now considering the adoption of an international instrument designed to abolish forced labor for political or economic purposes wherever it may exist; and

Whereas the United States Government has exercised leadership in the United Nations to mobilize world opinion for the abolition of forced labor for political and economic purposes: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Government of the United States exercise leadership in the International Labor Organization to develop and adopt an international convention which will effectively outlaw forced labor for political and economic purposes.

(See Contents for the report of the Department of State and the report of the Department of Labor.)

Senator DOUGLAS. As I understand it, a joint resolution to be effective has to be passed by both Houses of Congress, and signed by the President, while a concurrent resolution has to be passed by both Houses of the Congress but need not be signed by the President. A Senate resolution need only be passed by the Senate.

I think Senator Humphrey is going to have a three-barreled shotgun so that the committee and the Senate may take its choice of any one of these three methods.

The chairman has been studying during the last few days the report of the Ad Hoc Committee of the United Nations and the International Labor Office on Forced Labor, which was published in 1953, and which runs to over 600 pages. And I have also studied a supplementary report of the International Labor Conference in 1956, the current year.

The Conference was unable to send field investigators into the countries to conduct the firsthand field investigation. So it operated from testimony and documents and replies of the governments about whose practice the questions were raised. I hope very much these studies will find wide circulation in this country so that we may have a factual basis for operating.

I am also going to ask to have placed in the record an article from the Wall Street Journal describing slavery in the Arabian countries and giving the market quotations on slaves.

(The article referred to follows:)

[Wall Street Journal, Tuesday, April 10, 1956, p. 1]

THE SLAVE TRADE—GRIM AFRICA-TO-ARABIA TRAFFIC IS REPORTED REVIVING; PRICES RISE—HOW AWAD EL JOUD FOUND HE HAD BEEN USED AS A TRAVELERS' CHECK

BYPRODUCT OF OIL PROSPERITY

(By Kenneth Miller, staff reporter of the Wall Street Journal)

PARIS.—One of the world's oldest and least laudable fields of commercial endeavor, slave-trading, is showing signs of limited revival.

Reports are fragmentary, to be sure. And wild rumor must be sifted from fact. But enough evidence from authoritative witnesses has piled up to make it clear that the current slave traffic across the Arabian peninsula is brisk and getting brisker. A market report on this unfortunate industry would note that prices are also rising. Matter of supply and demand, it seems.

Slave recruiting in Africa has increased with the weakening of control by Europe's colonial powers, especially France, according to Charles W. W. Greenidge, a Briton who has made himself something of an expert on the topic. But this increase in supply has been more than equaled by a rise in demand from petroleum-rich sheiks of Arabia.

Pierre Fromentin, a French physician recently returned from duty in Saudi Arabia, estimates that up to 5,000 men, women, and children, mostly Negroes, are being imported and pressed into slavery annually. Some estimates run higher; others much lower. Comdr. Thomas Fox-Pitt, secretary of Britain's 117-year-old Anti-Slavery Society, figures almost half a million persons may now be in bondage on the Arabian peninsula, and "the number is increasing."

By most reports, many Africans head for Arabia happily enough—only to find, to their surprise, that they can't return. Some are tricked into believing they are on pilgrimage to the Moslem holy cities, Mecca and Medina. Others go on this journey as servants, then as used as "living travelers' checks" by masters who sell them into slavery.

THE U. N. KNITS ITS BROWS

Rather inevitably, perhaps the matter is becoming a topic of United Nations talk. The American Government was sufficintly impressed by the evidence to raise the slave-recruiting and slave-transport problem before the U. N. Trusteeship Council last month.

And rather inevitably, perhaps, nothing much came of it. French delegate Robert Bargues argued that although evidence does indicate the existence of slavery and of slave routes which may cross the French-mandated Cameroons, none of this is on an important scale. He successfully requested the U. N. body to postpone drawing any conclusions until "more precise information" is at hand.

But now another U. N. Council—this time the Economic and Social one—is scheduled to talk about action, at its New York session starting April 14. It will consider a new charter to outlaw slavery "and practices similar to slavery" which, if adopted, would have a few more teeth than similar League of Nations measures voted in years past.

The sharpest suggested tooth: Signatory nations would be given the same right to search and seize vessels suspected of slave-running as they now have in regard to ships engaged in piracy. The present draft would confine this slave-seeking right to waters washing and approaching Arabia—the Red Sea, the Persian Gulf, and a slice of the Indian Ocean along the eastern coast of Africa.

SLAVE TRAILS

The 20th Century slave trails appear to converge on Arabia from both west and east. Published reports tell of Negroes moving from as far away as desert Mauretania, the Niger, and French Sudan (all in French West Africa), across French Equatorial Africa, and the fledgling Sundanese Republic to Red Sea ports where they sail to Arabia. Other slave recruits are said to be enticed, captured in raids or kidnapped from villages in Iran, Iraq, Oman, Eastern Aden colony and the wild Baluchistan coast of Pakistana.

Precise and up-to-the-minute price quotations are hard to come by. An official report from the French Embassy in Jidda, Saudi Arabia, which has recently leaked out, states that in 1953 girls under 15 were bringing from 2,000 to 4,000 riyals ($550 to $1,100). Men under 40 were assertedly hawked for the equivalent of $400 while "old" women were worth only $105.

Dr. Claudie Fayein, a woman doctor who served 18 months with a French medical mission in Yemen, cites $2,000 as the price tag put on a 14-year-old white Bedouin girl who was scheduled to be sold in 1951 to a visiting Arab envoy from the harem of the late king's brother.

YEMEN DENIAL; SAUDI SILENCE

It should be noted that Yemen heatedly denies any current slave-trading. Says Assayed Mohamed Ibrahim, charge d'affaires in London: "Slavery was abolished from Yemen years ago. I would also like to inform you that Yemen is in no way concerned in the increase of slave trafficking in Arabia."

Saudi Arabian officials have no official comment; their Government has never answered United Nations queries about slavery although it is a signatory of the agency's Declaration of Human Rights. But one Saudi Arabian in Paris, chatting on a hypothetic level, indicates that if there were slave marketing in his land the prices quoted by the Jidda Embassy would be too low.

Dr. Fromentin, who during his Arabian service enjoyed wide contact with many of the half-million faithful who make the Mecca pilgrimage annually, agrees. He declares that pregnant women, having proved their fertility, bring top prices—nowadays often as much as $8,000 to $10,000. They are followed by women with young children ("two for the price of one"), and then the teen-age girls, he says. He contends prices are on the rise; it's an assertion echoed by Commander Fox-Pitt and Mr. Greenidge.

More and more money is available in Arabia as native incomes from oil mount. Saudi Arabia is now getting better than a quarter-billion dollars annually as its share of the profits of the Arabian American Oil Co., jointly owned by Standard Oil of California, the Texas Co., Standard Oil of New Jersey, and Socony Mobil. Aramco of course has no right to exercise any control whatever over the use made of these revenues. In practice much of it is used for lavish living by the royal family, its relations, and its friends.

"Saudi Arabia is the main culprit," avows the short, balding Mr. Greenidge, who is honorary director of the Anti-Slavery Society. He recalls that in 1936 the late King Ibn Saud issued a decree codifying slave traffic, registering slaves and establishing an Inspector of Slave Affairs who would license brokers. It is inconceivable that a government would legislate to control slave-owning if there were no slaves and no slave-owners," reasons Mr. Greenidge. "I am informed that this law is still in operation." His associate, Commander Fox-Pitt adds: "Slavery is not regarded as a crime in Saudi Arabia; it is a well-known trade patronized by the royal family."

TOO MANY DECREES

A Saudi Arabian spokesman in Paris says he really doesn't know whether the 1936 law is still effective; "after all, the king issued so many decrees." He is of the opinion that fresh complaints are "Jew attacks" inspired by the present Israel-Arab tug-of-war in the Middle East, and comments: "They don't interest us because they don't prove anything."

An investigator's task is difficult because of the clandestine nature of the traffic and because of aroused national sensitivities. Officials don't want to be quoted, usually suggest the responsibility lies elsewhere. Some informants beg secrecy for their safety. "If you print my name, I wouldn't live for 3 weeks," one deadly serious source warns a reporter.

The antislavery steam has actually been building up for several years, fired mainly by a U. N. report which stated that without doubt the evil exists in Arabia, by the efforts of the International Confederation of Free Trade Unions, headquartered in Brussels, and by zealous missionaries and abolitionist groups.

The abolitionists conducted a foray earlier this year in the French Union Assembly, a consultative body representing France's scattered, shrinking empire. This group rejected a demand that the U. N. be invited to look into slave recruiting, many deputies saying they didn't want the world agency poking around in French territories; instead they passed a mild resolution which, avoiding the word "slavery," requested a French governmental probe.

"A burial," cried the sponsor of the original resolution. He is Reformed Church Pastor Emmanuel La Graviere, one time resistance battler and former French senator, who spent several months barnstorming in French Africa gathering material for his campaign.

Somewhere along his route—he won't say where—Pastor La Graviere snatched the confidential report of the French Embassy at Jidda, dated November 7, 1953.

CONDUCTED TOURS

According to this document, which he views as representative of current practice, Saudi Arabian merchants in Jidda and Mecca send agents, usually of French Senegalese origin, to villages in the French Sudan and the Volta and Niger River regions around Timbuktu with orders to obtain slaves. Posing as conductors of pilgrimages to Mecca, where all ardent Moslems hope to go before they die, the agents organize groups of the faithful and conduct them overland in trucks toward Port Sudan and Suakin on the Sudanese Red Sea coast. The "pilgrims" then cross in small Arab sailboats and land at Lith on the Arabian shore, 120 miles south of Jidda.

At Lith, according to the report, they are arrested as illegal pilgrims and trucked off to prison in Jidda. They assertedly are delivered to the Saudi consignee by the Jidda police after a night in jail and are sold immediately through brokers in the bazaars.

Ten of the principal traffickers specializing in Negroes from French Africa are named in the document; one, identified only as "Muhsan," was reported to be employed by an American contractor in Jidda, but there was no implication that the firm knew of his side-line activities.

The Embassy estimated the trade in French nationals at "several hundred" yearly. The figure of 5,000 overall, advanced by Dr. Fromentin, is backed by

Monsigneur F. Du Mesnil, director-general of the French Anti-Slavery Society.

Another key piece in Paster La Graviere's dossier is the saga of Awad El Joud, who escaped after 3 years' enslavement.

Awad, whom the pastor interviewed last year at Bamako, French West Africa, was a boy when he entered the service of tribal chieftain Mohamed Ali ag Attaher, holder of the French Legion of Honor. Awad received no wages, but was lodged and fed, and apparently was contented. In 1949 the chief embarked on a pilgrimage—taking with him his family, major domo and five servants including the boy.

The party took about a year to cover the 3,500 miles overland and by water, according to this account. After making his devotions in Mecca, the master informed Awad one day that he was being turned over to the Emir Abdallah Faycal, son of the Governor of Jidda. Awad says it took him a year to realize "I had been sold."

In the spring of 1953, while Awad was serving in a palace guard, the prince attempted to resell him. The youth was taken, he declares, to a long dark room in Jidda filled with others to be marketed. There potential customers came to inspect the wares. But Awad escaped and sought help at the French Embassy. Officials referred him to the town vizier, who persuaded the Emir to take him back among the 40 alleged palace slaves. Awad returned, he says, because he was not being mistreated.

A few months later he begged 3 days' leave. Mixing with returning pilgrims at the port, he hid on a ship crossing the Red Sea and finally regained Bamako in April 1954.

Why don't more slaves try to escape? Father Charles Tisserant, a missionary since 1911 in French Equatorial Africa, says a "slave mentality" is part of the answer. Furthermore, the majority are treated well, as valuable merchandise. Dr. Paul Harrison, American medical missionary in Oman for 30 years, records that he saw plantation slaves contented and well fed. "Some needed treatment for obesity," he remarks. Against this must be balanced reported cases of flogging, mutilation, and even execution.

Senator SMITH. Mr. Chairman, did I understand you to say that the State Department would appear?

I understand there is some question about the adoption of an international convention as the best way to deal with this. Of course, we know the Russians are bound to come along and make 57 different varieties of promises that wouldn't mean anything. And a convention, to be effective, would have to have some teeth so that we would know what is going on. So, I am wondering whether the State Department has a position on that. I understand they have raised some question as to the wisdom of a convention which may be meaningless.

Senator DOUGLAS. Well, I think that subject can be gone into later.

Senator SMITH. I agree with you.

Senator DOUGLAS. All I can report at the moment is that Assistant Secretary Wilcox said he hoped we would not require their attendance on Friday; that he did not think they were ready to make a statement.

My reply was that this committee is extremely busy, and has many other matters with which to deal, and that reluctantly but no less firmly we would hold our hearings on Friday and expect him to be here.

And it is my understanding, after I said that, that he agreed to come.

Senator SMITH. I am afraid I cannot be here Friday, because I have got a very important engagement in New Jersey. I am very much interested in the subject. I would like to, while we are waiting for Senator Humphrey, put a brief statement in the record here just to point out a fact that I think is important.

The testimony we are hearing today leaves no doubt that the social and economic systems of the Soviet Union and its satellites are based essentially upon slave labor, but I wish to make it clear that the exist-

ence of this type of slavery is not a perversion or distortion of what otherwise might be a benevolent and democratic form of Socialist society.

It is my firm conviction that forced labor is an essential and inevitable consequence of a completely socialized society. Even in the very early days of the Soviet experiment following the Bolshevik revolution, the leading theoreticians of the Communist Party had no illusions about the necessity for forced labor in a Socialist state. I would like to submit for the record a quotation from a book published in 1922 called *Dictatorship versus Democracy* and written by Leon Trotsky who, at that time, was the No. 2 man in the Communist hierarchy of power, and regarded as almost the equal of Lenin himself, the patron saint of the Communist revolution.

Trotsky wrote:

> As a general rule man strives to avoid labor. The problem before the social organization is just to bring "laziness" within a definite framework, to discipline it, and to pull mankind together * * *. The only way to attract the labor power necessary for our economic problems is to introduce compulsory labor service. We can have no way to socialism except by the authoritative regulation of the economic forces and resources of the country, and the centralized distribution of labor power in harmony with the general State plan. The Labor State considers itself empowered to send every worker to the place where his work is necessary. And not one serious Socialist will begin to deny to the Labor State the right to lay its hand upon the worker who refuses to execute his labor duty.
>
> We will retain, and for a long time will retain, the system of wages. Wages, in the form of money and of goods, must be brought into the closest possible touch with the productivity of individual labor * * *. Those workers who do more for the general interest than others receive the right to a greater quantity of the social product than the lazy, the careless, and the disorganizers. Finally, when it rewards some, the Labor State cannot but punish others—those who are clearly infringing labor solidarity, undermining the common work, and seriously impairing the socialist reconnaissance of the country. Repression for the attainment of economic ends is a necessary weapon of the Socialist dictatorship.

Senator SMITH. We are dealing with a doctrine which cannot succeed in a totalitarian state without having forced labor. In other words, we are fighting here a fundamental of the whole Communist plan. I think we should fight it. I am all for it. I am going to be very much interested to hear all of the testimony. But I think we ought to realize we are dealing with something that is fundamental in this Russian system, and we want to go after it as hard as we can.

Senator DOUGLAS. The Senator from Illinois agrees with the Senator from New Jersey. I would like to have inserted an editorial from the New York Times of April 12, 1956, advocating action by our Government to support efforts against forced labor; a news dispatch from the Associated Press from the United Nations dealing with the report of United Nations that Communist China is holding 25 million slave laborers in 2,000 camps; an article from the AFL–CIO News of April 14 dealing with the question of slave labor and alleged differences between the Department of Labor and the Department of State; and a UP dispatch from Geneva, Switzerland, dated April 8 of this year on slave policies of 11 nations.

(The items referred to above follow:)

[The New York Times, April 12, 1956]

RETREAT ON SLAVE LABOR

Slavery in every form is deeply repugnant to the people of the United States, yet we are now being jockeyed by our Government into a position which gives the

world an opposite impression. This is especially frustrating and embarrassing because of our previous efforts to show up and to castigate forced labor in Communist lands.

The United States was largely responsible—against bitter Communist opposition—for the thoroughgoing United Nations-International Labor Organization survey of 1953 which disclosed widespread involuntary servitude for political and economic ends in Soviet Russia and its satellites. The findings led the United Nations Assembly to pass a resolution, backed by the United States but opposed by the Soviet bloc. which condemned forced labor as "a serious threat to fundamental human rights" and which asked the ILO to continue its efforts to abolish it.

To this end a new ILO Committee has just made public the results of a supplementary survey. This confirms the findings of the first one and has added grim new evidence of forced labor in Communist China and other countries not previously covered. The ILO has also put the whole issue. including the reports, on the agenda of its meeting in Geneva next June.

In the meanwhile the ILO has sent a questionnaire to each member government asking in advance whether it favors a mere recommendation against forced labor or a convention which must be ratified and enforced. So far 47 countries, including the U. S. S. R., have favored a convention; but the United States has made absolutely no reply.

Secretary of State Dulles is reported to be delaying an answer because of his pledge to the Senate during the Bricker amendment debate of 1953 that this Government would not be a party to any treaty covering subjects, mentioning labor, that are primarily state affairs. If this be true, we refer him to amendment 13 of the United States Constitution: "Neither slavery nor involuntary servitude, except as a punishment for crime whereof the party shall have been duly convicted, shall exist within the United States." Forced labor is, without doubt, primarily a Federal concern. As a matter of fact, the Senate ratified a League of Nations convention on involuntary servitude without serious question in 1929 and updated it by amendment less than 3 months ago.

The United States Government should promptly inform the ILO that it approves a convention against forced labor; our delegates should fight for its adoption and, if approved, Mr. Dulles should lead the administration's efforts to get it ratified. Senator Humphrey has introduced a joint resolution, which deserves nationwide public support, directing the Government to take a strong lead along these lines. For the Government to do less would be an inexcusable breach of principle and of wise diplomacy. We have nothing to lose. We have the world's respect to gain.

U. N. Reports Red China Holds 25 Million Slaves

United Nations, N. Y., February 2.—A United Nations report charged today that Communist China is holding 25 million slave laborers in 2,000 camps.

A 356-page document published by U. N. Secretary-General Dag Hammarskjold contained documented charges against Communist China supplied by the United States and Nationalist China as well as information from them and four international agencies regarding slave labor in other Iron Curtain countries.

Most of the report dealt with slave labor in China and Albania. Other charges concerned forced labor in the Soviet Union, Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Poland, and Rumania.

The antislavery society also entered charges about forced labor in the Union of South Africa and in Portuguese colonies in Africa. The Portuguese Government in a formal reply denied the accusation and said the charge is "based on allegations made 50 years ago" and on an alleged investigation by one journalist in Angola in 1954.

Nationalist China charged in the report that the 25 million slave laborers in China include 1 million captured Chinese Nationalist troops and famine victims. Communist China's regime, it said, "is built on a vast pile of crushed homes." The Nationalists demanded U. N. sanctions to eliminate this inhuman system.

The United States report on China said that "proof that forced labor constitutes an important element of Chinese Communist domestic control measures can be found in the speeches of top Chinese Communist leaders. * * * And in various laws and regulations."

[AFL–CIO News, Washington, D. C., Saturday, April 14, 1956]

Slave Labor Exploited in Fight Between State and Labor Departments

(By Gervase N. Love)

A program to condemn the evil institution of slave labor in many nations is being delayed by an internal argument in this country between groups roughly defined as internationalists and isolationists within the Republican Party.

Hope that progress might be made toward ending slave-labor camps, and to give a taste of freedom to their inmates, was spurred by exposure of slave-labor conditions in the third of a series of reports by the International Labor Organization. The United States played a major role in developing those reports.

As a result of the spotlight which the ILO focused on the slave-labor camps—which are found on both sides of the Iron Curtain—there had been hope of adopting a proposed ILO convention, or treaty, to voice the condemnation of humanity against slave labor.

Now these hopes face the prospect of being bogged down in a dispute as to how the condemnation of international slave labor should be worded—a dispute that finds the United States State Department and the Labor Department on opposite sides.

The Labor Department, headed by Secretary James P. Mitchell, is holding out for the proposed convention, the strongest form of condemnation the ILO can voice. This would be in the nature of a treaty subject in this country to Senate action.

CONFLICT PART OF FEUD

The State Department and Secretary John Foster Dulles, fearful of stirring up the isolationists, want to settle for a recommendation, a milder expression of sentiment which requires no legislative action.

The conflict is part and parcel of the internationalist-isolationist feud within Republican ranks which also has found expression in the proposed Bricker amendment, limiting the President's authority to sign treaties; in the Eisenhower administration's yielding to employer demands—sparked by isolationsits—for an investigation to determine if the United States should retain membership in the ILO, and United States inaction on the proposed United Nations covenant on human rights.

The dispute came to light, ironically, as word of another United States victory in the campaign to expose slave labor was revealed in the ILO report which found that it still exists, despite some recent improvement.

The committee reported it definitely found forced labor being used "as a means of political coercion or education," and "as a regular and normal means of carrying out state plans and projects for economic development."

In the latter sense, the report continued "forced labor is used as a punishment for infringement of labor discipline, that is, failing to attain the prescribed standards of individual output or otherwise hampering the accomplishment of state plans for economic development."

"Apart from these definite systems of forced labor," it went on, "this evidence reveals that there are, in certain countries, administrative practices and legislative enactments which would, by interpretation or otherwise, permit the use of forced labor for the above-mentioned purposes."

CONFIRM CONCLUSIONS

The findings confirmed similar conclusions of a previous ad hoc committee made public in a 600-page report in 1953 and in a second report, confined to China, issued last December.

The third report covered 12 countries against which allegations had been received—most of them in the Communist orbit.

They were Albania, Bulgaria, China, Czechoslovakia, East Germany, Hungary, Poland, Portuguese territories, Rumania, South Africa, Soviet Russia and Yugoslavia.

Similar conditions, it indicated, may exist in other countries. It noted amnesties were declared in certain countries in 1953, which was the year of the worker uprising against Communist brutality in East Germany and other Soviet satellite states, and that they "may have applied to political prisoners."

"One of the means of reducing the extent of forced labor throughout the world," the committee said, "is to keep the spotlight of public opinion constantly focused on the question."

It endorsed action already taken by the ILO to place proposals for prohibiting the practice before the International Labor Conference in June.

These would prohibit forced labor as a means of political coercion or education, as a method of mobilizing labor for economic development, or as a means of labor discipline; and would impose restrictions on certain forms of work or service excluded from coverage of the ILO's 1930 forced labor convention, which the committee found is no longer adequate.

IRONY IN UNITED STATES POSITION

The committee was composed of Paul Ruegger, of Switzerland, former president of the International Red Cross; former Foreign Minister Cesar Charlone, of Uruguay, and District Judge T. P. P. Goonetilleke, of Ceylon.

The irony of the State Department's position is pointed up by the fact that even Russia, Bulgaria, and Czechoslovakia, which were among those singled out for criticism, are among the 47 of the ILO's 71 member nations which have gone on record in favor of a convention. Six other nations prefer a recommendation.

The United States alone, of the world's major countries, has not even replied to the ILO query as to which form of condemnation, if any, it favors.

George P. Delaney, AFL-CIO representative and United States worker delegate to the ILO, praised the new report for its "courage and frankness" and condemned the State Department for "not having the courage to stand up to the isolationists."

"I feel we can't help but get a convention now," he said. "The importance of this report, which again clearly demonstrates the existence of forced labor in the countries behind the Iron Curtain, only highlights the need for the Humphrey resolution calling United States attention to this issue.

"The United States can't possibly, in the face of its own evidence, fail to take leadership. The report again demonstrates ILO usefulness, dealing as it does with one of the major explosives in the world today, and not ducking it. For us not to support it seems silly."

The Humphrey resolution, introduced by Senator Hubert H. Humphrey, Democrat, of Minnesota, calls on the Senate to urge the Eisenhower administration not only to join with other nations, but "in fact to assume leadership" in getting an anti-forced-labor convention through the ILO.

SLAVE POLICIES OF 11 NATIONS REPORTED

GENEVA, SWITZERLAND, April 8.—Forced labor still exists in at least 9 Communist countries and for natives under the control of two non-Communist nations, a special committee which studied the problem reported today.

The three-man committee reporting to the International Labor Organization, said it found legislation permitted forced labor in Alabania, Bulgaria, Communist China, Czechoslovakia, East Germany, Hungary, Poland, Rumania, and Russia.

In Communist China, the committee said, "the number of persons involved represents a considerable proportion of the total population."

The committee also found that legislation and practice in the recruitment of native labor in Portuguese territories in Africa and in the Union of South Africa also constituted a form of forced labor.

The committee, headed by Paul Ruegger, of Switzerland, with former Uruguayan Foreign Minister Cesar Carlone and Ceylonese District Judge T. P. P. Goonetilleke, met in private session here March 12–17.

The panel said there had been "some improvement" in several eastern eastern European countries, but added it had received no evidence to persuade it to change conclusions reached earlier by United Nations studies on forced labor.

In the cases of Hungary, Poland, Russia, Portugal, and South Africa the committee maintained its conclusion after studying denials by the governments involved.

The committee treated Yugoslavia as a special case. It said forced labor appeared to have been greatly reduced there, but that further study and more information would be needed before a conclusion could be reached.

Senator DOUGLAS. There are two other clippings which I shall not put in the record at this time. One, the Washington Post for April

13 in which Secretary of Labor Mitchell in a speech before the International Union of Operating Engineers stated, according to the Post:

The United States' position on proposed antiforced labor convention by the International Labor Organization is still a matter for discussion.

Then, this is apparently the comment of the Washington Post:

The Labor Department is known to favor the pact.

A similar news item to the same effect from the New York Times of April 20 is the other clipping that I referred to.

I am very glad to have with us the senior Senator from Montana, Senator Murray, who has been a delegate to the conventions of the International Labor Office on many occasions. And he was a first-hand participant in some of its earlier discussions concerning forced labor.

Senator MURRAY. I am very glad to be here, Mr. Chairman. I did not know the matter was coming up. I am engaged in hearings over in the Interior Committee, and I succeeded in getting someone to take my place this morning so that I could come over here and familiarize myself with this problem.

Senator DOUGLAS. We appreciate that very much.

Senator Humphrey is on his way. I think perhaps while Senator Humphrey is coming, it might be appropriate to read into the record an article by Mrs. Hannah Arendt entitled "The Hole of Oblivion" which appeared in the Jewish Frontier for July 1947.

Mrs. Arendt is the author of the classic book on the *Origins of Totalitarianism.*

(The article referred to follows:)

THE HOLE OF OBLIVION

By Hannah Arendt

The anonymous author of The Dark Side of the Moon provides a record of the Soviet system of concentration camps and states the case of the sufferings of the Polish nation. The authenticity of the material is vouched for by T. S. Eliot and Mme. Helen Sikorski; the author was given special facilities for her work by General Sikorski.

The record is as important for contemporary history as other similar reports—Arthur Koestler's book on the French brand of concentration camps is Scum of the Earth, the account of the German extermination camps contained in the Black Book, and Eugen Kogon's report in Der SS. Staat, on the general system of the Nazi concentration camps (not yet available in English) which is the most comprehensive of all. The statement of the sufferings of the Polish nation, drawn up in this case by an intensely patriotic Pole with not a few symptoms of just ordinary Polish nationalism, remains as much "beside the point" as similar attempts of Jewish authors. Suffering has never been an argument in politics; and if the horros surpass all possibilities of human imagination, so that even those who had to endure them were no longer able to realize them or to respond to them with adequate emotions, and thus were changed from human beings into "uncomplaining animals," then political arguments and demands for compensation tend to sound phony and even cynical. The impassibility, the incapacity to communicate ("they record but they do not often communicate"), the complete extinction of feeling—which are the hallmark of all trustworthy reports from survivors—are likely to seize upon the reader and to burn out of him all those sentiments of pity and sympathy through which the champions of the oppressed have been able to mobilize their fellow men for specific causes during past centuries.

T. S. Eliot emphasizes so insistently in his preface that "it is not for Britain to forget Poland" that one can't help wondering whether he would have cared to introduce such a book if the victims had not happened to be Poles. He goes on

to say that this is not "a book only about Poland; it is now a book about one instance of a general problem," the system of concentration camps as such. It is all the more fortunate, therefore, that he adds that "the problem in its most general form is not merely the problem of the U. S. S. R.," so that for once we are spared the stupid complacency which would avoid the realization of what man is capable of by implying that only Germans or Russians or Asiatics can establish a hell on earth.

The most common and the most important motive of the system of concentration camps is not even to inflict suffering. The main purpose is to make people disappear from the face of the earth, and to make those they left behind forget that they ever existed. In contrast to prisons, which even in civilized countries are still a part of society, concentration camps cut off their inmates more definitely than death ever could; since they are established invariably for innocent people, whom accident rather than any specific deed chooses, every communication must necessarily develop into a violent accusation and therefore be made a criminal offense. The Soviet police officers, used to this system since their birth, could only stare in amazement at those Polish people who tried desperately to keep in touch with their families or their friends under arrest. "One examining magistrate, genuinely at a loss, exclaimed to the wife of a prisoner: 'What extraordinary women you are here. In our country when the husband is arrested, the wife sues for divorce and looks for another man. But here you come along, begging and pleading on the prisoner's behalf, which, after all, can only result in your getting sent away yourselves also!'"

Compared to this new invention for doing away with people, the old-fashioned method of murder is inefficient indeed. The murderer leaves behind him a corpse and he effaces only the traces of his own identity. He does not pretend that his victim never existed at all; he has no power to erase his name from the memory of those who loved him or to prevent them from mourning. This, however, this uncanny disappearance of a person who, very frequently, is not even known to be alive or dead, is the result of all concentration camp systems and in order to achieve it, the inmates do not necessarily have to be exterminated.

Hand in hand with what one may call a negation of creation itself goes the most complete destruction of freedom that history has ever witnessed. This destruction is obtained through the method of selection for concentration camps, which invariably overlooks everything a man may have done in his life and concentrates, instead, on something which is an unchangeable fact. In Soviet Russia "the accused * * * very often is established as a counterrevolutionary before any question as to his behavior has arisen at all." He is arrested because his very existence is judged to be "undesirable." Without any other accusation being brought forward at all, the fact of at any time having owned a shop or a house, or having had parents or grandparents who owned such things, automatically qualified you for 5 to 8 years. While this kind of accusation might still be counted as an exaggerated form of class struggles, none of the following reasons, all of which suffice to cast you into the hole of oblivion, could be explained on such grounds: You may live in an apartment house in which an authentic opponent of the regime happens to dwell; this may (or may not) result in deportation of all its inhabitants.

You may happen to belong to one of those regiments of the Red army which stayed too long abroad and therefore were no longer considered trustworthy. You may have "won a prize for dancing" and a "wife of an Italian diplomat had congratulated and talked with you"; as result: a charge of "contact with foreigners," for which a concentration camp is the appropriate punishment. You may be a peasant in a village which for some reason is singled out for liquidation; and liquidation is accomplished by deportation and forced labor for those deported. You may be in the management of some factory which for some reason has failed to produce its required norm. You may be a "Russian of Polish origin;" then between the years of 1936 and 1938 you certainly had very good chance to come to a bad end. You may have been or (even worse) still be a member of a Communist Party abroad, driven into Soviet territory; this makes you more dangerous than anything else (and this especially during the years following the Moscow trials).

This consistent arbitrariness negates human freedom more efficiently than any tyranny ever did. At least one had to be an enemy of the tyrant in order to be punished. The only free deed which is left is actual opposition to the regime—which makes you get with certainty what everybody else may get anyhow. And this means, of course, that the scope of free action has dwindled down to the last and apparently still indestructible guaranty of freedom in general: the possibility of suicide.

That this consistent and well-planned arbitrariness is established as a method of government in the Soviet Union, can be seen from the fact that it not only determines the choice of the victims but rules supreme in the interior camp system as well. Except for the fact that criminals always are better treated than "politicals" and such "politicals" are in their vast majority peasants who hardly know what politics is about, there is not the slightest trace of a code according to which the length of your sentence, the all-important question of the geographical location of your lagier, the amount of your food ration, the kind and length of work, or the eventual move from one lagier into another are decided.

It is possible—as this and other recent publications on Soviet Russia have tried to prove—that we are confronted here with a huge slave system in which the slave has not even a price, which disposes of an inexhaustible labor supply for which the police play the role of a recruiting agency. It has been suggested that this system is the Soviet way of doing the necessary pioneer work in Siberia and that the whole thing may turn out to be one of those massive cruelties with which history so often has paid the price of colonization. Another assumption is that the whole police force is living from the revenues of this slave system, and pays no attention to the well-being of its victims because the slave, a complete outlaw, may be "finished off quickly * * * after a certain inevitable stage of exhaustion and physical deterioration has been reached."

These explanations may be partially correct; but they do not get to the core of the matter, and they are not borne out by the facts of these reports. It is obvious that the arbitrariness in the lagiers themselves, coupled with a fantastic system of corruption, results in nothing so productive and profitable as slave labor. The police occasionally may derive profits from the inmates' work, especially when they are leased to normal factories; the building of canals and roads may sometimes be achieved. But on the whole the waste of human as well as other material rather reminds one of the kind of work which the inmates of Buchenwald were forced to do: to dig ditches and then to fill them up again with the same earth, repeating this performance indefinitely. In the Soviet case, it is obvious that arbitrariness, willful lack of organization, and deliberate omission of all rules necessary for efficiency, are far more basic in the system than profit or greed.

Nor are cruelty and violence the dominating passions behind this consistent, calculated arbitrariness, whose agents display the same fantastic impassibility as its victims. Such passions still respect the victims whom they consider worthy of hostility and attack. The driving motive behind the Soviet prison system is indicated by T. S. Eliot's term of "planned ignorance," which is as little innocent ignorance as the Nazi brand. In both cases, the responsible ones are motivated by a fanatic ideology with a logic and consistency of its own. For the adherents of such ideologies the only relevant thing on earth is to be right, and the only relevant motive for actions is the determination to destroy and exterminate every fact and every person that may prove them wrong. Their education brings about that modern type of feebleminded smartness which knows exactly everything, understands every event, is surprised by nothing, and won't stand for anything or anybody that does not fit into the ideological system:

"To an admission that one had ever been outside Poland the next question invariably was: 'And for whom were you spying' * * * One man undergoing this kind of examination asked, 'But you, too, have foreign visitors. Do you suppose they are all spies?' The answer was, 'What do you think? Do you imagine we are so naive as not to be perfectly aware of it?' " Just so, in Germany, no single educated Nazi ever was (or for that matter is) so naive as not to be perfectly aware of the conspiracy of the Elders of Zion.

The trouble with these ideologies is that they are all logical. From the assumption of the necessary superiority of the Soviet system (which of course can be proved scientifically) it follows that without this system people never could have built such a wonderful thing as a subway; consequently anyone who knows of the existence of the Paris subway is a suspect, a counterrevolutionary, because he may cause people to doubt that one can do things only in the Soviet way. This, in turn, leads to an equally cogent conclusion, namely that, in order to remain a loyal and convinced revolutionary, you have to destroy the Paris subway. For, no matter what happens, you have to be right, you have to prove that you hold the key to history; nothing matters but consistency.

With these new structures, built on the strength of ideologies and driven by the motor of fanaticism, we are indeed at the end of the bourgeois era of

profits at the end of the imperialist dream of expansion for expansion's sake. Russia expands neither for expansion's sake nor for profit—as matters stand today, she probably suffers from her expansionist ventures, which prevent her economic recovery and the further exploitation of her tremendous territory, as much as do the countries in her "zone of influence." She expands for ideological reasons, to make the world consistent, to prove that her rulers are right.

To attain this complete consistency it was and is necessary to destroy every trace of what we commonly call human dignity. (And a better system of such destruction than complete arbitrariness, under which all are equal because nobody matters anyhow, has not yet been worked out.) For, respect for human dignity implies the recognition of my fellowmen or our fellow nations as subjects, creators of worlds or cocreators of a common world. No ideology, no ism which aims at the explanation of all historical and political events, can bear the unpredictability which springs from the fact that all human beings are creative and can bring forward something so new that nobody ever foresaw it. If the Soviet Union tries to hide from its subjects the existence of the Paris subway, it is actually denying the existence of those who built that subway, the French people. What makes the people of France the French nation is precisely the fact that, among many other things, they were the first to build a subway.

Since it is true that man can change the world according to his ideas, it is also possible that someday it will be changed according to ideologies, that someday those who sincerely believe in this humbug (and all ideologies are humbug and therefore dangerous) will be able to make the world what they think it. The "planned ignorance" of the Soviet Union's people about the achievements of other peoples is a direct challenge to these peoples, a more terrible threat to their existence than fleets and armies.

The concentration camps which the Soviet Union has established were organized and planned as holes of oblivion explicitly to make people disappear, to destroy people's capacity of memory and with it their ability to be loyal, which is one of the fundamentals of all human relationship. "Planned ignorance" is only one phase in this whole process, insofar as it makes facts disappear into the same hole of oblivion into which, later, disappear those who know them and prove reluctant to forget them.

It is a matter of course that nobody keeps track of the number of people who disappear from the surface of the earth without leaving behind them even such ordinary traces as a body and a grave. But it is probably safe to place their number well in the millions, in the territory of the Soviet Union alone. Even more frightening is the fact that, in an unplanned way, without specific purpose, the habit of establishing concentration camps for people who are judged "undesirable" is spreading over most countries. In the face of this development, it might be useful to remember that it is almost invariably an accident by which someone stumbles into one of these readymade holes of oblivion, and that it is an accident whose rate of probability, for any of us, has become distressingly high. The Dark Side of the Moon gives an excellent description of what one may expect from one of the more common accidents of our time.

Senator DOUGLAS. Senator Humphrey is here now.

I will now ask our colleague, Senator Humphrey, the author of this resolution, to come forward and present his statement in behalf of the resolution.

Senator HUMPHREY. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

STATEMENT OF HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, UNITED STATES SENATOR FROM THE STATE OF MINNESOTA

Senator HUMPHREY. Mr. Chairman, the committee has before it this morning Senate Joint Resolution 117, which would call upon the Government of the United States "to exercise leadership in the International Labor Organization to develop and adopt an international convention which will effectively outlaw forced labor for political and economic purposes."

Now, it has occurred to me since the introduction of Senate Joint Resolution 117 that an alternative form for expressing the sense of Congress on this matter without requiring a Presidential signature or involving the possibility of a veto, would be a concurrent resolution. Hence, the committee also has before it this morning Senate Concurrent Resolution 75, which would achieve this purpose.

Since the Senate has a special role in the coordination of foreign policy with the Executive, a third alternative might also appeal to this committee, the alternative of a simple Senate resolution. However, may I suggest that I think that is the least desirable of the alternatives. Nevertheless, I intend, Mr. Chairman, to introduce this third alternative, recast in that form, too, in the session today, so that the committee may have it also for consideration in executive session.

Mr. Chairman, the primary question we must ask ourselves this morning is this: How can the United States expect to assert leadership among the world's forces for freedom, while refusing to cooperate in the efforts of the International Labor Organization to stamp out slave labor?

As I shall show during the course of my remarks, almost all interested and articulate groups in America, with the exception of our own State Department, enthusiastically support our cooperation with the ILO on this forced-labor issue.

The American Federation of Labor initiated the whole international study of this question by its request to the United Nations in 1947. Following that request, a U. N. –ILO ad hoc committee conducted a comprehensive survey of forced-labor conditions around the world. It completed and released a well-documented report in 1953. I have that report here in my hands, and I see the chairman has a copy of it.

It runs approximately 618 pages.

Senator SMITH. Is there any compilation of that in shorter form?

Senator HUMPHREY. There is a supplementary report, Senator, issued in 1956 on forced labor, Report No. 6.

Senator SMITH. Is that a summary of the longer report? Or is that an additional one?

Senator HUMPHREY. The earlier one is brought up to date. Basically, however, it represents the replies from governments on the questionnaire that was sent out by the ILO.

Senator DOUGLAS. I may say to my good friend from New Jersey that if he will look at pages 19 to 130 of the 1953 report, he will see a summary and the conclusions.

Senator HUMPHREY. The conclusions start on page 79.

Senator SMITH. Thank you.

Senator HUMPHREY. I believe you will find that this report is an authoritative work on the subject of forced labor. It shows in detail that the Soviet Union and its satellites have used forced labor on a major scale as an instrument of political terrorism and to provide a cheap organized work force for major economic development program.

We know that Communist China has done the same. The account also shows that workers in Africa have in certain instances been subject to forced labor, but that the conditions in many parts of Africa have improved in recent years.

Since its release, this U. N.–ILO report has been the basis for discussions in the Economic and Social Council in which the United States has joined.

It has been the basis of a United Nations General Assembly resolution which we have supported. It has provided the documentation for our anti-forced-labor information programs, a constant element in our overseas broadcasts. Yet, when the ILO now prepares to implement its findings by circulating questionnaires among its member governments preparatory to proposing a new instrument or convention against forced labor, the Government of the United States refuses to respond.

Senator DOUGLAS. Senator Humphrey, I noticed that this morning in looking over the introduction to this report, report VI, entitled "Forced Labor, International Labor Conference," that in the introductory statement there is a report on questionnaires communicated to governments and other states which were invited to send their replies to reach the office by October 6, 1955. At the time of the drafting of the present reports, replies have been received from the following 44 members: Afghanistan, Australia, Austria, Burma, Canada, Ceylon, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Egypt, Finland, Federal Republic of Germany, Honduras, Hungary, Ireland, India, Iran, Iraq, Iceland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Lebanon, Mexico, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Pakistan, Peru, Philippines, Portugal, Sweden, Switzerland, Syria, Thailand, Turkey, Union of South Africa, U. S. S. R., United Kingdom, Uruguay, and Yugoslavia.

Now, was it a misprint that the Government of the United States did not appear?

Senator HUMPHREY. It is not a misprint, Mr. Chairman, to my knowledge.

I think it is fair to say that the failure to reply represents not an absence of policy, but a firm policy. At least at this moment it is a firm policy.

Senator SMITH. Mr. Chairman, I feel that when we initiate these proceedings we should not start with an attack on our own Government until we have had a chance to hear from them.

Senator DOUGLAS. I am not initiating any attack.

Senator SMITH. Well, it is a suggestion that our Government is deficient in this matter. I do not believe they are at all. It is a question of procedure. I think we should hear them before we condemn them.

Senator DOUGLAS. I think the Senator is justified in proceeding as he wishes. It is his resolution.

Senator HUMPHREY. Mr. Chairman, may I say I am not attacking our Government. I am stating a fact. I would welcome the opportunity for both the Department of Labor and the State Department to be called before this committee at the same time so that the committee might ask them for frank opinions as to the views of the respective departments, and ask how they can reconcile their contradictory views.

Senator DOUGLAS. Invitations have been extended both to the Secretary of State and Secretary of Labor to appear on Friday.

Senator HUMPHREY. I want to be most kind and fair about this. I introduced this amendment because of the desire of people who participate in the ILO to have this matter brought to the attention of the public and to see if we could not crystallize 1 point of view in our Government instead of 2 points of view in the same Government.

Now, what kind of leadership is this in our fight for freedom in the world when we have failed to reply or have taken no action? How does this place us in the eyes of countries looking for leadership against communism, and even more important, in the eyes of countries still uncommitted, still weighing us in the balance?

Mr. Chairman, I most respectfully say that I think the administration's foot-dragging on this issue is unpardonable. I think that Congress should so indicate. The arguments for our participation in the ILO Forced Labor Convention are manifold but they can be summarized under three headings: the moral arguments, the legal arguments, and the practical arguments.

Let me briefly summarize all three.

Mr. Chairman, I think the following moral arguments should persuade us to cooperate with the ILO on the Forced Labor Convention. By the way, we were one of the earliest members of the ILO, and it is one of the oldest of the international organizations following the creation of the League of Nations.

Now, under the moral arguments:

1. We must not abdicate our moral leadership on an issue that goes to the heart of the struggle between democracy and communism. Yet the State Department is putting us in the preposterous position of resisting the most practical proposal we have had for dealing with the most brutal of Communist practices, and for focusing a steady international spotlight on the abuse of basic human rights.

2. The United States should assume leadership in the fight for human dignity if it is to be true to its own tradition. We fought a war to abolish slavery. Our statutes prohibit slave labor now. Indeed, we prohibit the sale of goods in the United States which are produced by forced labor anywhere in the world.

3. We cannot ignore 15 million persons in inhuman slave-labor camps behind the Iron Curtain and elsewhere, merely as a gesture of political expediency toward neoisolationist rightwing, domestic agitators who entertain misconceived views about the United States Constitution and the treaty power.

4. The Catholic Association for International Peace has recently stated:

> Our Government, employer, and worker delegations should seize the opportunity to use the ILO as a forum to promote social progress and to stimulate the improvement of social and economic conditions in the less developed countries. It is a time to go forward and assume leadership not to withdraw and allow the Communist bloc to benefit from our default. Our Government should accept—

and I am still quoting—

> not evade, this responsibility in the matter of conventions on labor standards.

Mr. Chairman, I think the following legal arguments should persuade us to cooperate with the ILO on the Forced Labor Convention:

1. If the United States Government really believes that the ILO convention would undermine our constitutional practices, we should oppose, not merely abstain, from the adoption of such conventions.

2. In the ILO, the convention device is the major function of the ILO conferences, and a principal form of international cooperation provided for in the ILO constitution. To say that we cannot participate in ILO conventions is tantamount to saying that we cannot participate in half of the ILO's work. I would suggest a very careful study of the charter or the constitution of the ILO.

Under it the adoption of conventions can be considered to be recommendations, expressions of opinion. They need not be formalized treaties.

Senator DOUGLAS. They are not binding upon the signatories.

Senator HUMPHREY. They are not legally binding. But they set the moral standard by which we are to guide ourselves, the moral standard that we would like to advance for the rest of the world.

Senator SMITH. You mean then, that they would be a statement of principles rather than an international treaty, you would say?

Senator HUMPHREY. Yes.

Senator SMITH. I am trying to see what destination you are arriving at.

Senator HUMPHREY. I am coming to that point, Senator, if you will bear with me, and then I should be delighted to discuss it with you.

3. The ILO constitution provides that convention is dealing with federal-state matters shall be regarded as recommendations by the United States and not considered for ratification.

This special provision was made for member countries with federal constitutions to avoid the very problem that is posed by the so-called Bricker amendment.

The ILO conventions dealing with subjects within the authority of states or other political subdivisions rather than the federal government, can also be referred to the states for consideration as recommendations instead of receiving ratification at the federal level. The ominous fears that an ILO forced labor convention would supplant our domestic legislation and circumvent our constitutional processes are unfounded for various reasons, and the administration's acquiescence to pressures from the champions of such arguments, I cannot but help but believe, is inconsistent and most unfortunate.

4. The State Department position disregards the provisions of the ILO constitution which was accepted by the President in behalf of the United States on August 2, 1948, pursuant to Public Law 842, 80th Congress, 2d session. This public law authorized the President to accept the 1946 instrument of amendment to the ILO constitution. Congress noticed and approved the ILO constitutional provisions providing for conventions to have the status of recommendations on federal-state matters.

5. Hence under these circumstances, an ILO convention, even if it is adopted, cannot legally proceed further toward fulfillment in the United States unless it is framed in such a manner as to be acceptable by us.

No alien philosophy can be engrafted on a country without its consent. The ILO has no means of imposing its decisions.

6. The American Bar Association's standing committee on peace and law through the United Nations endorses the ILO convention procedure as appropriate.

7. The house of delegates of the American Bar Association has not only endorsed such convention procedure, but expressly advocated that the ILO convention framework be used as a model for other participation of the United States in international measures to promote human rights.

8. Inconsistently the President and the State Department as recently as May 26, 1955, have transmitted 4 conventions and 8 recom-

mendations to the Congress, pursuant to our obligations under the ILO constitution with language expressly agreeing to the ILO provisions that these conventions and recommendations need not be ratified.

The administration now takes the opposite position regarding the forced labor convention and refuses to explain why, at least it has up to date.

9. Moreover, it is supposed to be official administration policy to encourage the elimination of substandard conditions elsewhere in the world, which may be promoting unfair competition in international trade. The Government's attitude toward the ILO convention contradicts this policy.

10. It is supposed to be the official policy to support measures to improve working and living standards in other countries.

The administration's attitude toward the ILO convention, I believe, contradicts this policy.

Now, Mr. Chairman, those are the legal arguments. May I say that the State Department may have other arguments that I have not heard of. But if there is any argument, to be based upon the constitutional provisions either of our own Constitution or the constitutional provisions of the ILO relating to conventions as an obstruction to the participation in this forced labor convention, then I say that the burden of proof rests upon the State Department to prove why we abstain. We have already entered into a number of conventions under the very same article in the ILO constitution that concerns us now. As I have indicated, what we are doing in an ILO convention is to express the official attitude of our Government. It is not a treaty as such, but it is an expression of an official position.

Senator DOUGLAS. Senator Humphrey, I wonder if it would not be helpful to have printed in the record at the conclusion of your remarks the appropriate sections of the constitution of the International Labor Office dealing with the treatment of conventions and recommendations? And with your consent, I would like to have sections 5, 6, and 7 of the Constitution of the United States printed at the conclusion of your testimony; section 5 deals with conventions; section 6 deals with recommendations; section 7, deals with the particular problem of federal-states of which the United States is one. And in order to verify this, I may say that this is taken from the 1955 edition, Constitution of the International Labor Organization, pages 12, 13, 14.

Senator LEHMAN. Mr. Chairman, I am not a member of the subcommittee. May I ask a question?

Senator DOUGLAS. Yes, indeed.

Senator LEHMAN. Did I understand you to say that originally the State Department took the position that no confirmation of the convention was necessary?

Senator HUMPHREY. It is my understanding, Senator, that generally, no confirmation is necessary; that is, Senate confirmation.

Senator LEHMAN. Since when have they taken the position that confirmation is necessary?

Senator HUMPHREY. I was referring to the fact that on May 26, 1955, 4 conventions and 8 recommendations of the ILO were forwarded to the Congress pursuant to our obligations under the ILO constitution

with language expressly agreeing to the ILO constitutional provisions that these conventions and recommendations need not be ratified.

Senator LEHMAN. Thank you.

Senator DOUGLAS. As I understand the constitution of the ILO, the obligation is to formulate and submit a convention as a recommendation to the legislative body; but it is not binding upon the legislative body. The legislative body has its free choice of action.

And in the case of the federal state, it may be submitted either to the legislature of the federal body or to the legislatures of the states, depending upon the judgment of the government as to which is the appropriate field for action.

Senator HUMPHREY. That is my understanding, Senator.

I want to say that in the instance of the ILO forced-labor convention, the pending forced-labor convention, I do not believe our Government has made a definitive statement one way or the other relating to ratification or nonratification.

I was merely pointing out the sections in the ILO constitution to which we have agreed and which have been the subject of appropriate notice in the Congress, in the 80th Congress—and I cited the public law, Public Law 843. This authorized the President to accept the 1946 instrument of amendment to the ILO convention.

Congress noticed, as I said, and approved the ILO constitutional provision providing for conventions to have the status of recommendations on federal-state matters.

Now, I want to say further—so that I do not do the State Department an injustice—that insofar as I know there has been no public announcement of their position. However, there has been a good deal of press commentary and a good deal of material printed as to why the State Department has not acted.

Senator SMITH. Does the Senator want to be interrupted at this point, or would you rather I wait until you finish your statement?

I want to call some material to your attention.

Senator HUMPHREY. I would be happy to be interrupted now, Senator.

Senator SMITH. I want to ask the distinguished Senator whether he has read the letter of April 11 from the Secretary of State addressed to the chairman of this committee, Senator Hill.

Senator HUMPHREY. No; I have not.

Senator SMITH. It is a reply to an inquiry from Senator Hill with regard to Senate Joint Resolution 117. Have you seen that letter?

Senator HUMPHREY. I do not believe we received a copy of it.

Senator SMITH. I want to call attention to certain things in this letter and then ask that the entire letter be put in the record. This says clearly that the Department of State is in complete accord with the objectives of Senate Joint Resolution 117 for United States leadership in the effort to promote the abolition of forced labor wherever it is practiced.

Then it goes on to say:

> It is the view of the Department that a convention on forced labor would from a practical standpoint not be the most effective way of achieving the desired results. Experience in matters of this type indicate that in the absence of adequate enforcement machinery good faith and sincerity of purpose will determine the extent to which countries accepting a commitment to abolish forced labor will take steps in that direction. It is interesting to note in this connection that the U. S. S. R. has embraced the idea of a convention and has called upon

the International Labor Organization to "adopt as broad and radical an instrument as possible." Endorsement of the convention form by the U. S. S. R. is indicative of what might be expected from the adoption of this form of action.

Then it goes on to say:

The most effective method of stamping out forced labor is through exposing and publicizing such vicious practices and marshalling public and world opinion to demand their elimination. The mobilization of a worldwide body of opinion alerted to the various guides which forced labor may take could be accomplished even more dramatically through other form of action, such as a declaration which would strongly condemn the practice of forced labor and would pledge governments to undertake its elimination. Such a declaration would serve as a standard and rallying point for all nations devoted to the principle of freedom and would offer as much practical promise as a convention for remedial action.

Then it goes on to say:

Since the resolution specifically calls for the adoption of an international convention, however, the Department does not favor passage in its present form for the reasons indicated above.

I am bringing that up because it seems to me the Senator is endeavoring to open his whole case by an attack on the Department of State. I do not think that is proper until we hear directly from the witness for the Department of State and the Department of Labor. I agree with the Senator that we should hear from the Government on this thing. But I wanted to do that before the case is prejudged against the State Department.

Senator HUMPHREY. Senator, I had not intended to open my testimony by a criticism of the State Department, but I shall do so now, because I consider this letter to be a glorious example of pettifogging the whole issue. What this letter really says is: We are for it, but we are not. What this letter really says is: we are for the objectives, but not this method, even though nation after nation is for the method, even though the International Labor Organization has as one of its express purposes the very objective of mobilizing world public opinion.

Am I to assume that somehow or other we are going to mobilize it through the Voice of America, or unilaterally through our State Department? Am I to assume that the United Nations and the ILO are less capable of mobilizing world opinion through the established instrumentalities and organs which are international in complexion and in organization?

Am I to assume that we can do this alone? I frankly cannot see the validity of the State Department's argument at all except to conclude that they are for it, but they won't do anything about it.

This is the whole reason for this resolution. And I want to say quite candidly that I think it is shocking that the Government of the United States drags its feet on this issue.

Senator SMITH. I gather that is the Senator's position. We do not all have to agree on it.

Senator HUMPHREY. No. I am stating my position.

Senator SMITH. I think we have got to approach this in an objective way if we are going to have hearings on this that are going to be of any value whatever.

Senator HUMPHREY. Well, Senator, the purpose of a hearing is to express one's point of view and to express that point of view in this instance toward a particular policy or particular resolution. The resolution was introduced primarily because our Government has failed

to act. Yet we are supposed to be leading, seizing the initiative. And we fail to act. We are a long-time member of the ILO. Our labor organizations in this country, which have more at stake on forced labor as a matter of principle than any other single group, are really beside themselves over why the Government of the United States puts them in such an impossible position in the International Labor Organization.

I would note in the State Department's letter that it is signed by the Assistant Secretary, Mr. Robert Hill, that it says:

> It is the view of the Department that a convention on forced labor would from a practical standpoint not be the most effective way of achieving the desired results.

Senator SMITH. I read that.

Senator HUMPHREY. Yes; I know. Well, the whole purpose of this resolution is to get to the practical point of view. If we want to mobilize public opinion on this, one way to assert public opinion is through a resolution of Congress. That will assert American public opinion. So I would like to comment briefly now on some of the practical arguments without having ever seen this State Department document before.

The State Department did not forward me a copy of it, as the author of this resolution. Nevertheless I would like to make the comments that I have in mind in reference to practical arguments as to why we ought to cooperate with the ILO on forced labor conventions.

Senator DOUGLAS. Will the Senator withhold that for a moment? Since certain passages from this letter have been read, I think it is apropriate that the letter as a whole should be inserted in the record.

(The letter above referred to follows:)

APRIL 11, 1956.

Hon. LISTER HILL,
Chairman, Committee on Labor and Public Welfare,
United States Senate.

DEAR SENATOR HILL: This is in reply to your letter of January 16, 1956, which enclosed a copy of Senate Joint Resolution 117, and the receipt of which was acknowledged by the Department's letter of January 17, 1956. The joint resolution is directed toward general United States cooperation with other nations through the International Labor Organization to abolish forced labor. Specifically, this bill would call upon the Government to "exercise leadership in the International Labor Organization to develop and adopt an international convention which will effectively outlaw forced labor for political and economic purposes."

The question of the abolition of forced labor is one to which this Department has devoted a great deal of time and thought. Needless to say, the United States Government has always done and will continue to do everything possible to encourage and promote human rights and fundamental freedoms. The abolition of forced labor is clearly one such endeavor. As you may recall, the United States has taken the leadership, both in the United Nations and in the International Labor Organization, in promoting action to expose and eliminate the practice of forced labor wherever it may exist. The United States was a prime mover in the establishment of the joint United Nations-International Labor Organization Ad Hoc Committee on Forced Labor whose report in 1953 drew special attention to the existence in Communist countries of systems of forced labor as a means of political coercion and for economic purposes and called for the total abolition of such systems. The United States also gave strong support to the recent action by the International Labor Organization in establishing an independent Ad Hoc Committee on Forced Labor to analyze the material received by the ILO dealing with the use and extent of forced labor throughout the world.

There are, however, certain difficult problems relating to the proper and effective methods of combating forced labor and the form of action the International Labor Organization should take in this field which have been raised by Senate Joint Resolution 117.

In testimony before a subcommittee of the Judiciary Committee in 1953 and again in 1955, Secretary Dulles said: "I do not believe that treaties should, or lawfully can, be used as a device to circumvent the constitutional procedures established in relation to what are essentially matters of domestic concern and hence not to be within the traditional scope of United States treaties."

Furthermore, it is the view of this Department that a convention on forced labor would, from a practical standpoint, not be the most effective way of achieving the desired results. Experience in matters of this type indicate that in the absence of adequate enforcement machinery, good faith and sincerity of purpose will determine the extent to which countries accepting a commitment to abolish forced labor will take steps in that direction. It is interesting to note in this connection that the U. S. S. R. has embraced the idea of a convention and has called upon the International Labor Organization to "adopt as broad and radical an instrument as possible." Endorsement of the convention form by the U. S. S. R. is indicative of what might be expected from the adoption of this form of action.

The most effective method of stamping out forced labor is through exposing and publicizing such vicious practices and marshalling public and world opinion to demand their elimination. The mobilization of a worldwide body of opinion alerted to the various guises which forced labor may take could be accomplished even more dramatically through other form of action as a declaration which would strongly condemn the practice of forced labor and would pledge governments to undertake its elimination. Such a declaration would serve as a standard and rallying point for all nations devoted to the principle of freedom and would offer as much practical promise as a convention for remedial action.

The Department of State is in complete accord with the objective of Senate Joint Resolution 117 for United States leadership in the efforts to promote the abolition of forced labor wherever it is practiced. Since the resolution specifically calls for the adoption of an international convention, however, the Department does not favor passage in its present form for the reason indicated above.

The Department has been informed by the Bureau of the Budget that there is no objection to the submission of this report.

Sincerely yours,

ROBERT C. HILL,
Assistant Secretary
(For the Secretary of State).

Senator DOUGLAS. I may say that I intended to put that letter in the record when the Department of State appeared. But we will be glad to have the Senator proceed.

Senator HUMPHREY. Thank you.

I shall comment on one other paragraph in this letter in just a moment. But I shall first complete my statement.

Now, there are what I consider to be the practical arguments to persuade us to cooperate with the ILO on the forced labor convention matter:

1. The whole idea of action through the U. N. and the ILO was an American idea, initiated by the American Federation of Labor in 1947 and endorsed officially by the United States Government in the Economic and Social Council session in 1949. Forced labor was condemned by the U. N. General Assembly vote on a resolution of which we were the main sponsor.

2. The evils of forced labor in Communist countries have been a major theme of United States propaganda for years.

3. The U. N.–ILO ad hoc committee issued its comprehensive report on forced labor in 1953. Since then the ILO has been intimately

involved with the assignment to implement its findings and it will have to resolve the issue with or without the cooperation of the United States.

4. Every European country, Communist and non-Communist, except France and Poland, has replied favorably to a questionnaire from the ILO inviting support for a forced labor convention.

France and Poland are expected to reply favorably soon. ILO sources believe that the United States will soon be the only major industrial country not on record in favor of a convention outlawing forced labor. There is a remarkable unanimity on the need for action and the majority favor the convention method.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I want to say that I recognize that Communist countries that sign this convention may very well have no intention of implementing it. But I want to say very candidly that just because the Soviet Union is for the United Nations is no reason we should be against it. And just because they signed the charter of the U. N. and abrogate that charter, is no reason that we should withdraw. Nor is it any reason why, if we remain in, we should violate the charter.

Thank goodness we do not violate the charter. What I am trying to say is that the fact that a Communist country may for purposes of public relations or purposes of propaganda join in some kind of a program, the objectives of which seem to be directed against the Communist countries is no reason at all why we should say that this is an argument for our remaining out.

At this point I would like to note that the letter of the State Department says:

> The most effective method of stamping out forced labor is through exposing and publicizing such vicious practices and marshaling public and world opinion to demand their elimination. The mobilization of a worldwide body of opinion alerted to the various guises which forced labor may take could be accomplished even more dramatically through other forms of action such as a declaration which would strongly condemn the practices of forced labor and would pledge governments to undertake its elimination.

Now, Mr. Chairman, if all that is wanted is a simple declaration, this resolution is a declaration. May I point out that the "whereas" clauses in this resolution are plenty strong in terms of being a declaration of condemnation of forced labor. But if you wish to mobilize public opinion, it seems to me that one of the first things that you need to do is to have an instrumentality through which you work. It would be better in this instance in light of the recent statements of high officials that we cooperate with the international agencies to mobilize public opinion.

Very frankly we have not been able to mobilize public opinion alone with our Voice of America or our Overseas Information Service. Good as they are, it requires more than that. There is nothing in this convention, nor is there anything in the procedures suggested here, which would prevent the Government of the United States from making 25 statements a day over our information programs, or from doing whatever we could to mobilize public opinion.

All of us, I am sure, recognize the fact that in international organizations it is very difficult to have enforcement powers as such, except through the international court, through economic sanctions, and through peaceful methods which are outlined in the Charter of

the United Nations and in the constitutions of the related or supplementary agencies.

Let me continue to enumerate the practical arguments.

5. Mr. Chairman, the governing body of the ILO has decided to place the question of forced labor on the agenda of the 39th session of the International Labor Conference which will meet in June in Geneva. I think it is imperative that our position be clarified before then.

6. The ILO will support its proposed forced labor convention by the overwhelming vote of a majority of the world's worker, employer, and government delegates, regardless of the opposition of the United States Government.

7. The United States has nothing to fear internally from a ban on forced labor for economic and political purposes. I am sure that we have nothing to fear internally. I would hate, however, to have our abstaining from participation be developed by the Communist propagandists throughout the world to mean that we did have something to hide. I was so surprised when I heard that we were abstaining in this matter of the convention that I just could not believe it.

8. The Secretary of Labor, James P. Mitchell, has expressed himself as favoring United Government support of an ILO convention against forced labor. Yet he, despite the fact that he has more reason to appreciate the value of such a convention than any other high administration figure, has been constantly overruled. His position has the practical endorsement of all articulate American labor groups.

9. The official administration position generally is supposed to be one of support for increased United States participation in the ILO, now that the U. S. S. R. has returned to that organization. That was until the other day, may I say, in the Senate. We upset that by a vote in the Senate. I regret that, too, may I say.

I think that the Senate took a most unfortunate action. I do not believe that this is the time to dissipate our influence.

10. The administration position here, however, in this instance of the forced-labor convention, will isolate the United States at the forthcoming ILO Conference. I believe it will disillusion others about our motives and objectives. It may foster Soviet leadership. It will undermine our efforts, public and private, to fight Communist influence in the trade-union movement everywhere.

11. The United States failure to support the adoption of a forced labor convention on alleged legal grounds will be taken to mean that we do not support the substance of the anti-forced-labor position, and that we are seeking a technical way of avoiding such a commitment.

Soviet propaganda will assiduously foster this impression. My colleagues, may I say this is like trying to explain a vote to your constituents when you are trying, on a substantive matter, to say, "Well, I was really for it, but there were technical problems involved; there were procedural matters; and, therefore, I voted 'No.' "

You have tried to do that. I have. And it has never gone over. It will never go over. The public just does not understand some of this procedural gobbledegook that we sometimes get tied up with. They want to know how you stand on the issue. I would say that if we had never participated in an ILO convention, if the Congress

had never taken cognizance of the fact of ILO conventions, if those things had never happened, then I would say that the Department would be on more legitimate ground today. But I repeat that in 1946 we expressly, by act of Congress, stated that we were prepared to enter into this kind of convention.

Furthermore, in May of 1955, conventions under the federal-state provision of the ILO constitution were presented to the Congress of the United States for our review and whatever action we wished to take.

Now, Mr. Chairman, whichever way you look at it, morally, legally, practically, the administration's position on the ILO forced-labor convention is in my humble opinion indefensible. I endorse the judgment of the New York Times editorial of February 7, 1956, which said in part:

> How ironic for the United States to be on the outside looking in while the Soviet Union and the Communist bloc solemnly register their opposition to the forced labor of which they are the world's prime exponents.
>
> Whatever the Communist motives for endorsing this convention, what reason could there possibly be for the United States to disapprove or even to drag its feet as it is now obviously doing? How can the State Department put this country in the position of opposing, or blocking, or hesitating on a convention against forced labor? Such a policy may satisfy Brickerism, but it happens to put the United States in an absurd and untenable position.

Mr. Chairman, I suggest that the New York Times editorial makes sense. I suggest that it is the prevailing public opinion any place in this country that you go. If you want to test public opinion, you ask whether or not we are for forced labor; you ask whether or not our country ought to go on record against forced labor; you ask the great business organizations, the great labor organizations. I am sure that almost to a man and to a group they will say that this is indeed a grevious sin and inequity in the world.

I suggest, therefore, Mr. Chairman, that it is not yet too late for our Government to extricate itself from this "absurd and untenable position."

If it refuses to do so, at least through the means of this resolution this committee has before it, the Senate or the Congress can register its disagreement and protest and help reassure the world of the decency of American intentions.

Mr. Chairman, that is my testimony. There may be questions that you want to ask. I want to repeat again that I find the letter of the State Department unsatisfactory. They have developed a legal loophole in order to escape responsibility. If those are sharp words, they are intended to be just that. On these matters of human rights, on these great matters of moral leadership, I want to say that lawyers should take a second place to the morality of the country anyway. But even from a legal viewpoint, we have already, as I said earlier, taken this matter under official review. We have acted officially by public law, by our acceptance of the ILO constitution, by our long-time participation in the ILO and its agencies. We have generally been the leader in the ILO, and now we find ourselves to be the obstructionists, or at least the ones that are delaying and holding back.

My counsel just mentioned to me—and he is a lawyer—that the American Bar Association agrees to this too. The only lawyers who seem to be in disagreement are in the State Department. The Ameri-

can Bar Association, its house of delegates, and its standing committee on peace and law, agrees with this method.

Senator DOUGLAS. Despite the fact that the American Bar Association is supporting the so-called Bricker amendment?

Senator HUMPHREY. That is right.

Partly because in this instance of ILO, there are special provisions made for federal-state types of governments. And may I say further that we have already, by official congressional action, and by executive interpretation, understood that these conventions are not required to have ratification, and that they are recommendatory, rather than binding or compulsory.

Senator DOUGLAS. Senator Murray?

Senator MURRAY. I was wondering what is the attitude of the national Chamber of Commerce and the National Association of Manufacturers on this problem?

Senator HUMPHREY. May I reply to that that I am not sure whether they have officially resolved on this this year. But it is my understanding that the employer delegate to the ILO in former years has supported the ILO convention idea. If I am wrong on that, I will stand corrected.

Senator MURRAY. The employer-delegate makes reports and speeches in this country in which he condemns the ILO, and seems to desire that we withdraw from the ILO; that it is being dominated and controlled by Communists or socialistic countries.

Senator HUMPHREY. May I just interrupt, Senator, to say that after the visit of Mr. Khrushchev with the British Labor Party officials, and particularly Mr. Gaitskill, of the other night, there ought not to be any further association between Communists and Socialists; because, if ever the Communist leaders took a slap in the face in terms of their popular front objectives and wooing of the free Socialist Parties, they took it in Great Britain. I think that was one of the milestones in recent history of drawing a sharp line between the totalitarian Communist forces and the so-called Democratic-Socialist forces, to the eternal credit of the British Labor Party in the recent meeting with Bulganin and Khrushchev.

It was made crystal clear that there will be no cozying up and no popular fronts and no cooperation on the part of Democratic-Socialist movements with that of the Communist Party.

Senator DOUGLAS. The committee invited the United States Chamber of Commerce and the National Association of Manufacturers to send representatives to testify on this resolution. I am informed that the United States Chamber of Commerce stated that it did not care to appear.

The National Association of Manufacturers stated that it would not be able to appear, but that it would perhaps file a statement for inclusion in the record.

Senator HUMPHREY. I hope that it shall. I hope, Mr. Chairman, that they will read this record before they file their statement. I hope that regardless of the views of the chamber of commerce and the National Association of Manufacturers as to our participation in the ILO, those great business organizations will go on record for a firm statement on the part of the Government of the United States through conventions which are authorized under the ILO constitution, to put

once and for all the statement of American policy on record as being unalterably opposed to forced labor through any means that we can find at our command. I do not want to see our country in the position of trying to explain that it is for something in substance, but the method is wrong, when the method has previously been acceptable.

If this is the majority method, I do not see how we can find ourselves abstaining on the basis of a technicality, particularly when other great countries that are freedom-loving countries, such as the United Kingdom, are standing for the convention method of declaring opposition to forced labor.

Senator MURRAY. Well, what disturbs me is the fact that the employer-delegates have always condemned the International Labor Organization. They have made reports to this country that have been published widely. And here is a quotation from Mr. McGrath which was made last year. He says in the case of the United States and Canada, the Government delegates sent to the conference merely reflect to all intents and purposes the dominance of the labor influence in our present respective administrations and go right down the line of state socialism.

That is the language of the American delegate.

Senator HUMPHREY. It is regrettable, Senator. I, of course, disagree with that interpretation of our participation in ILO. I would hope that after sober reflection that the representatives of the greatest employers in the world, the greatest management in the world, the American employer, would be a strong supporter of these worthy objectives that are outlined in the ILO and in particular of the ILO convention on forced labor.

I really feel that we in Congress ought to appeal strongly to our employers to take the lead on this thing and not just to rely upon the official representatives of government or even upon our fine representatives from the greatest free trade unions in the world. We in America have got the greatest free trade unions in the world, and we have the greatest employers. They ought to be standing together on these great issues.

Senator MURRAY. I agree with you.

I think the American employer should be right out in front on this matter. Low wages and even working conditions in other parts of the world affect the employers in this country. And by upholding the high standards for labor, they are protecting themselves and protecting this country from the encroachment of communism or socialism.

So, I believe that if the American employers had this matter brought to their attention, that they would come out strongly in support of the ILO as the only way we are able to gain influence in the world—through the operation of the ILO.

I have been there several times. And I find that the delegates from other countries are extremely friendly to the United States. And they are always anxious to cooperate with us. Of course, there are instances where some Communist will get up and make a violent speech. But no one pays any attention to them. And soon afterward the speech just the opposite from what he has dealt with will be said by other delegates to the ILO.

Senator HUMPHREY. Senator, I know that you have been a delegate or a representative of the Congress to ILO conventions or ILO meetings; and I know that you have participated with distinction and

with credit to our country. I happen to believe that every time the Communists are brought into contact with representatives of free countries that we win the argument. The only time they win the argument is when we hide behind bushes and stay away. I want to not have coexistence; I want to have competitive existence. I want to engage the enemy; I do not want to just stand alongside of him; I want to win every one of these struggles. I happen to believe that it would be to our advantage to participate in every conceivable conference such as the ILO and to show by the logic of our argument and by the persuasiveness of our facts to the representatives of the peoples of the world that we have a better case. I know no better way to do it than in face-to-face debate.

It is like a political campaign, Senator. There is nothing more enjoyable in my life in a political campaign than having my opponent on the platform right with me. I have sometimes found that my opponent feels the same way when he has me on the platform. Because then you can expose any misstatement of fact, or you can expose any misconception or any allegation. To the public it is much more desirable. I happen to believe that we ought to welcome the opportunity to meet these fellows headon.

We have nothing to lose. We have never lost an argument when we have met the Communist representatives headon. We have won every one in the United Nations. The only time they win is when we back away. Then they take over the stage.

Senator MURRAY. That states my views on it very clearly.

Senator HUMPHREY. I would just conclude on this, Mr. Chairman, by calling your attention to a third paragraph of the letter of the State Department, which I must say, with all respect, I consider to be not applicable to the present resolution, or to the objective of the ILO as to a convention on forced labor.

It reads as follows:

> In testimony before a subcommittee of the Judiciary Committee in 1953 and again in 1955 Secretary Dulles said, "I do not believe that treaties should or lawfully can be used as a device to circumvent the constitutional procedures established in relation to what are essentially matters of domestic concern."

Of course, everyone knows that treaties cannot do what the Constitution prohibits. But then the statement goes on and makes this explanation:

> In the present case, it seems likely that any convention on forced labor which might be adopted by the International Labor Organization would affect primarily matters of domestic concern and hence not be within the traditional scope of United States treaties.

Well, Mr. Chairman, this is not a treaty. Mr. Chairman, under the federal-state provision of the ILO Constitution, this very situation is encompassed. Furthermore, this is a glorious opportunity for the United States to take the lead and to expose the hypocrisy of those who still practice the nefarious trade of slave labor, and to get out in front. I repeat that the State Department's letter in this instance is almost irrelevant. It does not go to the point.

And I will welcome the opportunity to appear before this committee again with a representative of the State Department, because I do not approve of this kind of misconception and misguidance. What is more, I say right here as a Senator of the United States,

that the State Department cannot prove their point on this matter.

Senator DOUGLAS. Well, we hope and believe that representatives of the State Department will be here on Friday. If you care to be present, Senator Humphrey, we will be very happy to have you here.

Senator HUMPHREY. I will certainly try to join the fray on that particular occasion.

Senator SMITH. Mr. Chairman, I want to say to the Senator that I am always happy to hear him hold forth, because no one is left in any doubt as to where he stands.

I want to say also that he is aware of my attempt of the recent debate on the floor to protect the rights of the ILO and I stood firmly on votes there. I did not approve of the action that was taken.

My position is clear on that. And the only thing I am saying is that I did not like the idea of the Senator attacking the State Department before they came here and we asked some questions from them, to see what their position is. My mind is not made up on this. I am not defending the State Department. I am just asking to have a hearing before they are condemned.

I think they should have a chance to be heard first. There are some difficulties here, and I would like to ask the Senator one question. In your resolution you say "which will effectively outlaw forced labor for political and economic purposes." I do not know any way to effectively outlaw forced labor in the Soviet Union. And yet that is what you are trying to do with this. I am entirely in accord with what you are saying. This reads—

adopt measures unilaterally, bilaterally, or multilaterally which will effectively outlaw forced labor.

I cannot see how there would be any question raised at all which has the nature of a treaty. We do not want to get mixed up with any constitutional trouble.

Senator HUMPHREY. May I say you may have a point there. As you will note in my resolve portion of the resolution, I think the Government of the United States should exercise leadership in the International Labor Organization—

to develop and adopt an international convention which will effectively outlaw forced labor for political and economic purposes.

Now, it may be that we cannot effectively outlaw it, but I think we ought to exercise leadership to that effect. This would be an expression of the sense of Congress, that Congress would like to see our Government's representatives and our employer and employee representatives really exert leadership on this matter.

I respectfully admit that it is possible that we cannot effectively outlaw it, but we ought not to limit our efforts. We ought to seek to effectively outlaw it and to exercise leadership to effectively outlaw it. Now, if the word "effectively" is a Humphrey adjective that asserts my position a little more dramatically than some may think it should be asserted, then may I suggest that a technical amendment would not upset me too much, as long as we say that we seek to outlaw forced labor for political and economic purposes.

You would not want to ineffectively outlaw it. Since you are going to outlaw it, I thought maybe it would be good to effectively outlaw

it. But the controlling words are "to exercise leadership," and I want America to exercise leadership for effective purposes.

Senator SMITH. I will say to the Senator, I always enjoy his adjectives. I may not agree with them, but as I say, I like the way he expresses himself and goes after his point and if I have to take issue, I enjoy the privilege of doing that.

I am hoping to be here when we have the State Department state their position because there is a little more to it than I think even Mr. Hill's letter says here. I did not see this until yesterday, so I am not familiar in detail with it.

Senator HUMPHREY. I shall try to be here, Senator, and may I say if I could join ranks with the distinguished Senator from New Jersey, this fight would be won almost immediately. I have the warmest regard, affection, and respect for the Senator from New Jersey, as he knows, and I know that if he takes this issue up and talks to the State Department about it, because of their great respect for his judgment, it will be an accomplished fact.

Senator SMITH. I thank the Senator for his kind words.

Senator DOUGLAS. Thank you very much.

Senator HUMPHREY. I want to thank the chairman and my Senate colleagues here for this audience and for the chance to state my views.

Senator DOUGLAS. We are now going to hear a series of witnesses who will testify about the facts concerning forced labor, and these subjects are more or less distinct from the discussion of the resolution itself.

Our next witness is Hon. Jozef Lettrich, Chairman of the Council of Czechoslovakia, who will speak I presume on conditions in that country since the Communists have taken over.

Mr. Lettrich, we are very glad to have you here.

STATEMENT OF HON. JOZEF LETTRICH, CHAIRMAN OF THE COUNCIL OF CZECHOSLOVAKIA

Mr. LETTRICH. Mr. Chairman, I have prepared a statement. With your kind permission I would like to read it.

Senator DOUGLAS. Please do so.

Mr. LETTRICH. Czechoslovakia under Communist dictatorship established forced labor already in 1948. Forced labor serves as a means for the political and also for the economic goals of the regime.

In furthering their political aims, Czechoslovakia Communists use forced labor to get rid of all democratic, anti-Communist social elements, such as political opponents, former independent businessmen, intellectuals, et cetera.

The people's courts and Communist justice see to it that the labor camps are always full to capacity. As to their economic goals, the Communists try to make up for the shortcomings and fluctuations on the labor market and in production, particularly in mines and in construction work, wherever the regular workers left for lighter work elsewhere.

Last but not least, the regime uses forced labor to exploit the workers economically by paying them as little as one-tenth the normal wage. One form of forced labor in Czechoslovakia is the so-called labor obligation of normal employees assumed on such occasions as holidays, celebrations, the so-called voluntary brigades, Sunday shifts,

involuntary work overtime without pay ordered by the Communist Party and totalitarian labor unions. In order to carry out the 2-year economic plan in 1948 the Labor Office assigned 54,167 new workers to mines, 121,644 new workers to steel plants, 21,915 new workers to chemical plans, 18,953 new workers to foundries and 34,215 workers to potteries.

Senator DOUGLAS. Dr. Lettrich, I have made a hasty recollection that they come to a total of 250,000.

Mr. LETTRICH. I would like to state, Mr. Chairman, that shows the data up to 1951, but we have no correct data up to the present time.

Senator DOUGLAS. You do not have it?

Mr. LETTRICH. No.

Senator DOUGLAS. Do you believe the number greater or less?

Mr. LETTRICH. Oh, much greater.

Senator DOUGLAS. Much more than a quarter of a million?

Mr. LETTRICH. Yes, sir.

Senator DOUGLAS. Of the total population of how many?

Mr. LETTRICH. About 13 million.

Senator DOUGLAS. Would you say they have half a million?

Mr. LETTRICH. I beg your pardon?

Senator DOUGLAS. Half a million forced laborers?

Mr. LETTRICH. I think one-quarter million.

Senator DOUGLAS. One quarter of a million.

Mr. LETTRICH. One quarter. Well now, 1 out of every 50, approximately; about 250,000.

Senator DOUGLAS. Yes, sir; I understand.

Mr. LETTRICH. The Czechoslovak Communist regime tries to give forced labor a semblance of legality and cites provisions of constitution, laws, Government decrees, et cetera. The Communist Constitution of May 9, 1948, provides in article 32 that—

> Every citizen shall work according to his ability and contribute through his labor to the prosperity of the whole nation.

By the act of July 21, 1948, No. 175 of the Collection of Laws, forced labor was practically established as a legal institution, affecting every citizen regardless of sex and limited to 3 years. Since the Communists do not feel compelled to abide by any law, they ignore the time limitation, and forced labor continues so long as the organs in charge see fit.

The 8-hour day and the 48-hour week exist more or less only on paper.

Czechoslovak employees, especially workers, are not free to choose their vocation or employer. The state organs can assign anyone anywhere they want, to whatever work and place. This is done formally on the basis of provisions of the law for mobilizing labor for the 2- and 5-year economic plans.

The law concerning URO—the single, unified trade union organization—makes it impossible for Czechoslovak employees to organize freely in the union. They can only be members of the totalitarian Central Union and its subsidiaries. The Central Labor Union—URO—is nothing but a branch of the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia, not by any means an independent trade union in which employees are given autonomy.

Under the Communist regime in Czechoslovakia a strike is a criminal act of sabotage according to the law for the defense of the People's Democracy, sections 36 and 38, act of October 6, 1948, No. 231 of the collection of laws.

Workers are forced to meet the work norms set up under exceptional, so-called Stachanov norms, by which a worker's output is divided into 8 categories depending on the type of work and working conditions. Compensation is measured accordingly. It is not necessary to point out that the working conditions are so drastic that the worker must exert himself to the fullest and that he suffers a cut in wages.

It was the Forced Labor Camps Act of October 25, 1948, No. 247 of the collection of laws, implemented by a decree of the Ministry of Interior of September 1, 1950, which introduced the forced-labor camps in Czechoslovakia for citizens who "endanger the safety of the state." Section 2 of the act reads:

The following persons shall be subject to confinement in forced labor camps:

(a) persons over 18 years of age and under 60 years, who are physically and mentally fit, but who avoid work or those who threaten the success of the people's democratic regime or of the national economy and persons who assist those above.

(b) persons validly convicted of offenses under the Defense of the People's Democratic Republic Act (No. 231 of October 6, 1948), the Black Market Suppression Act (No. 15 of February 13, 1947), Two Year Plan Protection Act (No. 27 of February 13, 1947) or the National Enterprises Protection Act including nationalized industries and enterprises under state administration (No. 165 of July 18, 1946).

Punishment for administrative offenses under existing laws may be confinement exceeding 3 months at labor in a forced labor camp.

Senator DOUGLAS. Dr. Lettrich, generally in a statute such as this, you find a provision saying that the punishment shall not exceed a given amount. Now, I notice that this provides that they must be set for at least 3 months, but there is no upper limit on the period during which they may be confined.

Mr. LETTRICH. Mr. Chairman, this is only on the paper. But in practice the Communist regime doesn't respect the law.

Senator DOUGLAS. What I am saying is that the law itself furnishes no protection.

Mr. LETTRICH. Yes, sir. I agree.

Section 3 of the act reads:

A commission of three members appointed by the regional national committee shall make decisions on detention and the period of confinement in a forced labor camp for persons listed in section 2, paragraph 1 (a), and on the period of confinement in a forced labor camp for persons listed in section 2, paragraph 1 (a), and on the period of confinement of those listed in paragraph 1 (b) (2). Confinement of persons listed in section 2 may be for periods of 3 months to 2 years.

As can be seen, the commission of three members counts as an administrative body, not as a judicial organ, nor does it abide by any judicial procedure. The afflicted persons can be confined to a labor camp without trial and without witnesses. By far the largest number was sent to forced-labor camps without any proven offense, simply on personal or political charges, mostly of the class enemy.

The law on forced-labor camps states further in section 4:

A commission appointed under section 3 (1) may, where the nature of the case requires—

(a) forbid a person detained in a forced-labor camp to reside after his release in designated administrative districts or places, or may confine him to a designated place or residence;
(b) order the dwelling of a detained person vacated;
(c) impose national administration upon his real property, business, or trade;
(d) cancel the license of a confined person to conduct his trade or business after release.

Thus, the administrative authorities in the Communist regime of Czechoslovakia wield an unlimited power to dispose of any man's freedom, livelihood, and property. The forced-labor camps have become one of the worst means of political, economic, and social terror.

The Czechoslovak democratic exiles succeeded in ascertaining that by 1953 there were 57 camps of forced labor in Czechoslovakia: 42 in Bohemia and Moravia—7 of them for women—and 13 in Slovakia. The camps were located as follows:

Bohemia-Moravia (for men): Pardubice, Semtin, Soubravice, Ceske Budejovice, Trinec, Sternberk, Libkovice, Jirotin, Starkov, Frenstat, Plzen, Hodonin, Ruzyn, Dubi, Pribram, Oslavany, Klokoty, Valtice, Hrusov, Marianka u Marianskych Lazni, Vseborice, Vitkovice, Klattovy, Mirov, Vykmanov u Jachymova, Nove Benatky, Horni Litvinov, Horni Briza, Drin, Brno, Ostrava, Uherske, Hradiste, Svaty Jan pod Skalou, Blansko, Kuncice, Benesov, and Eska u Chebu.

Bohemia-Moravia (for women): Dlazkovice, Lnare u Blatne, Valtice, Trebice u Zatce, Stod, Jaroslavice, and Uhercise u Znojma.

Slovakia (for men): Novaky pri Topolcanoch, Sabinov, Nitra, Svaty Jur, Ilava, Ustie and Oravou, Handlova, Dubnica, Cop, Sastin, Presov, Leopoldov and Podolinic.

The place and number of inmates of the camp are subjected to changes. In 1951 the number was estmiated at 89,400.

Senator DOUGLAS. That is an addition to people compelled to work in mines, steel plants, chemical plants, foundries, potteries, and so on?

Mr. LETTRICH. Mr. Chairman, at first I have stated that some 10,000 people were only transferred from offices to the plants, but now, the number, 89,400, is the number of inmates of labor camps.

Senator DOUGLAS. Of the camps themselves?

Mr. LETTRICH. Yes, sir.

Senator DOUGLAS. Then in addition, there are others who have been forced to go in to the mines, the steel mills, munitions plants, chemical plants, foundries, and potteries, and so forth?

Mr. LETTRICH. That is correct.

The worst forced-labor camp is Vykmanov by Jachymov, where the persons are assigned heaviest manual labor in the uranium mines under conditions highly detrimental to health. In these mines the chief supervision is done by Russians. Moreover, the conditions are made even more unbearable by strict security regulations, carried out especially in the living quarters. Many persons became sick and died because of radiation, malnutrition, and physical exhaustion. The Vykmanov by Jachymov camp is also used as a penal camp for those transgressing against disciplinary measures in other camps.

The working and sanitary conditions, living quarters, and food in forced labor camps are infinitely worse than conditions for free workers. Furthermore, persons confined in the camps suffer from the supervision of primitive and brutal guards, all fanatical Communists,

anxious to earn recognition by carrying out their orders relentlessly to the extreme.

The compensation given the persons in the forced labor camp is but symbolic.

Forced labor camps are one of the most inhumane institutions of the present Communist totalitarian regime in Czechoslovakia. They are not only a brutal violation of basic human rights and freedoms, thereby of the Charter of Human Rights itself, but also a disgrace to human civilization in this century. These camps have turned progress back into the unknown darkness of the distant past.

Senator DOUGLAS. Thank you, Doctor, we very much appreciate this testimony. It will be very helpful.

Our next witness is Father Frederick A. McGuire of the Committee on One Million—Against the Admission of China to the United Nations.

Father, it so happens Senator Smith and I are members of the steering committee of that group, so we are especially glad to welcome you here this morning.

STATEMENT OF FATHER FREDERICK A. McGUIRE, C. M., COMMITTEE OF ONE MILLION (AGAINST THE ADMISSION OF CHINA TO THE UNITED NATIONS)

Father MCGUIRE. Thank you Mr. Chairman. May I say that while I am a charter member of the committee, I have also had the privilege of spending 18 years in China and have watched communism develop from 1932 through 1950, and so I speak with a good deal of feeling in this mater.

I appear before you, Mr. Chairman, as a friend of this committee and on behalf of the Committee Of One Million of which I am a member. The Committee Of One Million is a bipartisan organization dedicated to mobilizing American public opinion against the admission of Communist China to the United Nations.

I appreciate this opportunity to bring some of the available facts and figures before this committee today. The material contained in this testimony has been extracted from the report made by the Secretary General of the United Nations and the Director General of the International Labor Office for the 21st session of the United Nations' Economic and Social Council. Included in this testimony are three appendices which contain documented material relative to the types, numbers, and locations of slave laborers and camps.

In addition, you will find attached to this testimony the second and third issues of the Newsletter of the Committee Of One Million. On the center pages of issue 2 is a precis of this testimony. On the center pages of issue 3 is further information excerpted from the March 5, 1956, issue of Time.

Senator DOUGLAS. These will be made a part of the record.

Father MCGUIRE. They have all been made available to the committee through Mr. McClure.

The facts which I am about to bring to your attention offer overwhelming proof that the Peiping regime has marked for elimination all those who offer any resistance whatsoever, no matter how minor, but not until that regime wrests every last bit of strength and labor from these pitiful victims of Communist tyranny.

Totalitarianism and greed for aggression are the characteristic features of a Communist state. A reign of unparalleled terror combined with an insatiable appetite for aggression constitutes the chief expression of a totalitarian regime. In areas under a totalitarian rule, people are deprived of human rights and freedom. Humanity is destroyed. People are exploited for their labor and drained of their blood and sweat. It can be said that a Communist regime is built on nothing but a vast pile of crushed bones. It cannot exist without using terroristic measures against its own people or engaging in aggression against other countries. This is the natural and destined relationship between the Chinese Communist regime and forced labor. This is the unprecedented catastrophe of mankind.

Mr. Chairman, basically, there is very little difference between the compulsory labor practice in Soviet Russia's labor camps and that in Hitler's concentration camps. Ever since the Chinese Communists overran the mainland of China in 1949, they have put into practice a policy of compulsory labor, which is modeled after the Soviet system, only more ruthless and cruel, thereby plunging mainland China into an era of bloody rule.

On the 1st of July 1949, Mao Tse-tung said in his article on The People's Democratic Dictatorship that reactionary groups, such as landlords, bureaucrat capitalists, and their accomplices should be eliminated and punished either by mass slaughter or by compulsory labor.

On the 1st of October of the same year, the Political Consultative Conference adopted a common program on the eve of inauguration of the Chinese Communist regime, article VII of which reads:

> Counterrevolutionary elements, feudal landlords, and bureaucrat-capitalists in general must be deprived of their political rights within a necessary period according to law after they have been disarmed and their special power has been eliminated; however, they shall at the same time be given a means of livelihood and compelled to reform themselves through labor.

Therefore, compulsory labor has become one of the basic policies of the Chinese Communists. In mainland China, not only those who were branded as counter-revolutionaries were condemned to slavery, the great mass of law-abiding citizens, and even the workers, whom the Chinese Communists called the leading class of the country, had also become slaves under this policy of forced labor.

In September 1954, while the Chinese Communists made such fuss about the convocation of a National Congress of People's Representatives, adoption of a constitution and reorganization of guiding organs in an effort to put up a facade of democracy, they betrayed themselves with the promulgation of the Regulations Governing Reform Through Labor, which were adopted at the 222d meeting on the 26th of August 1954 of the State Administrative Council on the eve of convocation of the National Congress. These notorious Regulations Governing Reform Through Labor, which condemned people to slavery with a bloody hand, deprived people of all their freedom and rights, and operated in direct contravention of human rights, were approved by the Congress of People's Representatives. With this confirmation by the sole legislative organ of the Chinese Communist regime, the Regulations Governing Reform Through Labor were vested with all legality in order to exploit Chinese people, and openly instituted the system of forced labor.

Even before the promulgation of the Regulations Governing Reform Through Labor, the free world had deduced that there existed a vast number of labor camps or concentration camps in Communist China for the purpose of controlling and punishing nonconformist elements, and exploiting them as unpaid labor.

This fact was confirmed by an open admission of the Chinese Communists. Lo Jui-ching, vice chairman of the Political and Legal Commission of the State Administration Council, confessed in his Explanatory State on the Draft Regulations Governing Reform Through Labor that the drafting of the said regulations had been started long ago with the help of Soviet legal experts, and had undergone several revisions. He said it was necessary to have the regulations promulgated as soon as possible in order that the task of reforming criminals through labor could be better and more correctly performed, and that better results could be achieved.

The Regulations Governing Reform Through Labor consist of 77 articles, grouped into 9 chapters, with detailed provisions on production, supervision, reward and discipline, expenditure and so on. The salient points are as follows: (1) Reformatory labor institutions are recognized as one of the instruments for carrying out the people's democratic dictatorship. They are the institutions for the punishment and reform of all counterrevolutionary criminals and other criminals. They shall be under the direction of the public security bureaus and under the supervision of the procurator's office. In legal matters, they receive guidance from courts at various levels.

Two, there are four kinds of reformatory labor institutions: (*a*) Houses of detention: these are primarily for the detention of prisoners who have not been tried, or who serve a sentence of imprisonment of less than 2 years, but cannot properly be sent to the reformatory labor corps. They shall be established at various administrative levels, and shall be under the direction of security bureaus at various levels. Each house shall have a director, from 1 to 2 deputies, and a number of assistants and guards.

(*b*) They are primarily for the imprisonment of counter-revolutionary prisoners and criminal prisoners convicted of a grave offense, who have been sentenced to death—with sentences stayed—or life imprisonment, and who cannot be properly employed for labor outside the prison.

And, adding something which is not here in the record, I may say that these conditions under which Americans, missionaries, and others have been taken and detained, thye are not usually sent to slave labor camps but confined in prisons, of course, without trial.

Prisons shall be established as required at the levels of province and municipality, and shall be under the direction of the public-security bureaus. Each prison shall have a director and from 1 to 2 deputies, under whom there shall be established sections on control and education, production, general administration, etc.

(*c*) Reformatory labor corps: they are for the disciplinary control of counterrevolutionary prisoners and criminal prisoners who have been convicted and who can be properly employed for labor outside the prison. Corps shall be established as required at the levels of province and municipality, and shall be under the direction of the public security bureaus. The size of the reformatory labor corps

can be that of a division, regiment, battalion, company, or platoon. Each unit shall have a commanding officer and a number of deputies with subsidiary working organs.

(*d*) Houses of correction for young prisoners: these are for young criminals between the ages of 13 and 18. The houses shall be established at the levels of province and municipality, and shall be under the direction of the public security bureaus. Each house shall have a director, from 1 to 2 deputies and a number of correctional personnel.

Now, the Regulations Governing Reform Through Labor provide only a faint hint of the crimes against humanity which are disguised as labor and reeducation. First, I shall read to you a short synopsis of the regulations governing the administrative setup of slave labor administration, organization, and procurement; next, I shall read the five basic regulations governing, on paper, the treatment of the prisoners. Finally, I shall read testimony of the actual conditions and treatment of the prisoners.

Administration and organization of slave labor has been placed, after certain experimentation, under the public security administration. After the promulgation by the Chinese Communists of the Regulations Governing Reform Through Labor, the administration of slave labor became chiefly the responsibility of the public security authorities, though the latter had already been responsible for its administration long before. When the mainland first came under Communist control, other authorities had also shared responsibility. For instance, when Pastor Peter Jen was arrested at Shanghai by the Communists in February 1951 and condemned to slave labor, it was the military administration commission that was responsible. The labor camp to which Fei Yu-ming belonged was under the jurisdiction of the court of Liaotung Province.

It seemed that in the initial period, several Government authorities had their own slave laborers. It was not until the promulgation of the Regulations Governing Labor Through Reform that the public security authorities took charge of slave labor and the hierarchy of the Reformatory Labor Production Committee gave its unified leadership.

Organization, according to the Regulations Governing Reform Through Labor, slave labor is organized into divisions, regiments, battalions, companies, and platoons. Though the military pattern of the organization was already in existence before the promulgation of the regulations, there was no unified system.

According to Fei Yu-ming, the labor organization to which he belonged had the following structure: Division, battalion, company, platoon, and small unit—for instance, the Anshan division and the Cha-tse-yao battalion. The organization controlled almost 10,000 men. In general, each battalion has 3 companies; each company, 3 platoons; each platoon, 9 to 12 men; and each small group, 3 men. However, the number of men varies greatly and depends upon the needs of the particular production unit. The hierarchy also varies.

A large force is used to guard the slave laborers. For instance, though there were only about 30 laborers on the Ssu-fan-tai vegetable farm, there was a platoon of guards, and there were directors, company leaders, and platoon leaders. We can see that slave labor is not economical although there is no remuneration.

Regulations concerning production and control state that the productive activities of reformatory labor shall be under the coordinated direction of financial and economic commissions at various levels, and shall receive specific guidance from departments concerned with agriculture and forestry, industry, finance, communications, water conservancy, commerce, and so forth.

In other words, to interpolate, they are actually using the slave-labor camps to further all of the projects under the various ministries.

That committees on reformatory labor production shall be formed at several levels and shall be composed of representatives of departments concerned with financial and economic affairs, public security bureaus and courts and shall direct and supervise the implementation of the slave-labor production plan. Finally, that the Ministry of Public Security may formulate plans for the distribution of slave labor, to be carried out after approval by the state administration council. Temporary allocation, involving only a small number of prisoners, may be authorized directly by the Ministry.

In other words, the number of slave laborers must be determined by the necessities indicated by the departments of the financial and economic commissions with specific guidance from departments concerned with agriculture, forestry, industry, finance, communications, water conservancy, commerce, and so forth. How many thousands of innocent farmers, victims of disasters, so-called counterrevolutionaries and starving people have been conscripted to fulfill the demands of these financial and economic commissions can be determined from the appendixes of this report.

The regulations governing the treatment of the prisoners are quite decent—to read. However, how they are carried out is a much different matter.

The regulations state: (*a*) The prisoners' clothing and diet shall conform to the uniform standard. (*b*) Supply centers shall be established to supply prisoners with supplementary food and articles of daily use. (*c*) A clinic or hospital shall be established in each institution. (*d*) Attention shall be paid to hygiene and sanitation in the institution, such as bathing, hair cutting, clothes changing, disinfection, and immunization. (*e*) Actual working time in a day shall be from 9 to 10 hours; seasonal work shall not exceed 12 hours a day. A day of rest shall be granted twice a month. Young prisoners shall have a day of rest each week.

Actually, it is difficult for outsiders to know how slave laborers are treated, for it is not easy for them to escape. Those who manage to escape are either inarticulate or reluctant to speak for fear of jeopardizing the safety of the members of their family who are left behind. However, we are able to get some idea of the situation by piecing together the fragments of information that come to us occasionally.

In his book I Came From a Slave Labor Camp in the Northeast, Fei Yu-ming, a slave laborer who escaped to Hong Kong, wrote about his 2 years of imprisonment from February 1948 to February 1950 when he was released. From the description he gave of his detention in the public security bureaus at Yingkow and Liaonan, and of the conditions in the slave labor camps at the following places: Cha-tze-yao in Fu Hsien, Anshan oil refinery, Ssu-fan-tai vegetable farm at Anshan, Kan-tse mines at Antung, and Hsing-lungkou lumber yards,

we are able to tell how the Chinese Communists treat the slave laborers.

Food: In general, the quality of food was poor and the quantity small, especially during the period when the slave laborers were in prison waiting to enter the slave-labor camps. In the prison at Yingkow, they were given two meals a day consisting of Kaoliang congee and two slices of turnip the size of a finger. They were always hungry.

At the public security bureau at Liaonan, they ate very coarse low-grade corn flour which caused constipation among many slave laborers. During this period, they were given poor food and little of it because they had not yet started to work. At Cha-tse-yao in Fu Hsien, they ate steamed bread made of Kaoliang and corn flour with salted beans. In the oil refinery at Anshan, they had 2 meals a day, 1 in the morning and 1 in the evening, of Kaoliang congee with shredded turnip soup. They were later given an additional meal at noon. On the vegetable farm at Ssu-fan-tai, they ate fritters made of corn flour and leftover vegetables. Once a slave laborer was caught eating a piece of raw turnip he planted himself. He was forced to wear a banner on his back for 6 days with the characters: "I stole food."

Clothing: Slave laborers were allowed to bring their own clothes. A group of cultural workers once came to a slave labor camp to give a performance. A member of the group brought some clothes for his uncle who happened to be a slave laborer in that camp. Accused of delivering the clothes to the inmate without reporting first, he was criticized at a public meeting and made to confess. For fear of being punished, he tried to escape, but was caught and tortured. In 2 days, the man died. Just before they were sent to the Hsing-lung-kou lumber yard in the Changpai Mountains in the winter of 1949, the slave laborers were allowed to write home for winter clothes. A slave laborer was ordinarily given a prison garment which had to be returned when he was released. By that time, the garment was already in shreds.

Shelter: In the prison at Yingkow, 41 slave laborers were put in two cells. The rooms were illuminated by one electric lamp hung from an opening on top of a wall that separated the chambers. The jail was damp, dirty, gloomy, and ill ventilated. They were allowed to go to the toilet only twice each day. Owing to the soft congee diet, the prisoners urinated frequently; very often they had to do it on their cotton garments. In the daytime, they had to sit up straight. They were not allowed to sleep or to converse with each other. At the public security bureau at Liaonan, they were also allowed to go to the toilet only twice each day. They had to urinate in the cells. Each cell was supplied with only 1 basin of water and 1 towel to be shared by all the prisoners. The rooms were infested with fleas and bedbugs.

At Cha-tse-yao in Fuhsien, the cells were dark and damp. The slave laborers slept on the ground using corn stalks as mattresses. At the oil refinery at Anshan, they slept on cement floors with hay as pillows. They were not allowed to use any grease remover to clean their bodies which were covered with dirt and grease after working in the refinery. When they slept, the grease melted and stuck to the floor. When they got up, the grease on their bodies solidified again and became icy cold. On the vegetable farm at Ssu-fan-tai, they

lived in the landlord's home which was surrounded by a stone wall with barbed wire netting on top. They slept on clay beds. At the Tung-kan-tse prison, more than 40 prisoners were accommodated in 1 room where 3 small bowls were placed, 1 for stools, 1 for urine, and 1 for water.

Physical labor: In general, they worked from 8 to 14 hours a day. Competitive methods were often used to spur them to further exertion. At Cha-tse-yao, the slave laborers were engaged in extracting coal. They got up at 4 in the morning, ate breakfast, started at 5 to walk to the mines 3 li—a li being about a third of a mile—away. Each slave laborer spent half of a day digging coal and the other half carrying it out of the pit.

They exchanged shifts. They had to climb down steps for 1 li, a third of a mile, before getting to the coal vein. The lights in the pit were very dim and the jagged pieces of coal often tore their skin. They dug in 3 or 4 inches of water and had to carry at least 40 kilograms of coal. Dragging the coalbag with one hand, they would crawl out of the pit, practically on all fours, and struggle to the top of the pile where they deposited the coal.

They worked for 8 hours a day and there were meetings to attend. During the so-called May production competition, they attended meetings for 3 hours, planted vegetables for 3 hours and dug coal for 8 hours. The number of times they carried coal out of the pit was increased from 14 to 16, 18, or even 20. The laborers were required to run. Some vomited blood and some dropped dead. When they stumbled and fell, the Communist agents would accuse them of pretending.

There were originally 3 shifts of 8 hours each. Later, the leaders of the 3 shifts—Communist convicts—suddenly made a voluntary request, on behalf of the shifts, to lengthen the working time by 2 hours. In addition to the original shifts, they were given the job of opening new shafts in the pits. As the laborers had to work hard and live in bad conditions, many of them suffered from swollen feet, night blindness, fever, and stomach disease. Little attention was paid to their safety. During the competition for the Red flag, a mine collapsed killing 31 people and injuring 7. No one was allowed to mention the incident. By nightfall, their places were taken by new workers as if nothing had happened.

Mental cruelty: The laborers had to confess, admit guilt, learn and bear the humiliation inflicted on them by the Communist workers and ordinary convicts. At the so-called regeneration, mobilization, and confession meeting in Yingkow prison, they had to make confessions covering their lives back to the age of 7. This is the brainwashing system which has already been written about in many places.

They had to confess to such crimes as "joining reactionary parties" and "secret-service systems," and "smearing their hands with the blood of the people." Merit was assessed on the basis of their confessions. The Communist workers ordinarily made up a list of crimes that the prisoner was supposed to have committed and insisted that the prisoner confess to the crimes.

Secret Communist agents were planted in the prison among the prisoners to spy on them and to make up their list of crimes. At a confession meeting, one person was killed by his fellow prisoners. Fei Yu-ming was interrogated by his girl cousin to whom he had once pro-

posed but who was now a Communist agent. In Liaonan prison, the slave laborers were subjected to very strict restrictions. As punishment for the slightest infraction of the rules a prisoner was made to stand facing a wall for 3 to 8 hours, beaten or put in ankle cuffs or in paper handcuffs which he could break only at his own peril.

Reward and punishment: The regulations provide as an enticement that prisoners who observe discipline consistently, or who expose counterrevolutionary activities, or who achieve overfulfillment of production quota, shall be rewarded with commendation, material award, "merit-credit," commutation of sentence, or parole. Provision is also made that those who impede the reform of others, or who damage tools of production, or who engage in a slowdown or strike, or who violate administrative rules, shall be subject to warning, record of demerit, and solitary confinement. And there is an article of intimidation to the effect that those who are considered to have committed any serious offense shall be referred to a court for sentence, or continue the process of reform through labor after completion of the original sentence.

At its 222d meeting on August 26, 1954, the State Administration Council also adopted the so-called provisional arrangements concerning the release and rehabilitation of prisoners serving reformatory labor after completion of sentence, in which an attempt is made to enable reformatory labor institutions to detain people for long-term slavery under the pretense that the prisoners "offer voluntarily to stay for employment," or that they are "homeless and jobless," or that they "want to settle down where they work in association with settlers." It is even provided that those who have served their sentences, and are sent to work in a sparsely populated region, may take their families with them, so that the labor force will be further augmented. This well illustrates the sinister intentions of the Chinese Communists.

As regards the achievements of the Chinese Communists in respect of exploitation of slave labor, Lo Jui-ching reported that many slave-labor farms—a substantial number of which are farms with land of over 10,000 mou—a mou being a sixth of an acre—and slave-labor industrial units had been formed in the past 4 years. Under the whip of the Chinese Communists, labor battalions were used in logging, water-conservation projects, railroad construction, and building of houses. They saved the Chinese Communists a great amount of expenditure, and created for them a great quantity of wealth. In building materials alone, 2 billion pieces of bricks and 770 million pieces of tiles were produced by slave-labor in 1953. According to Lo Jui-ching, the existing units in agriculture, industry, mining, and pottery works have laid a sound foundation for slave labor in the future.

The People's Daily of September 9, 1954, carried an editorial entitled "To Carry Out the Policy Concerning Reformatory Labor of Criminals," in which it was noted that there was a difference between the participation of criminals in productive labor during imprisonment and the participation of "the general mass of the people" in reconstruction through production, because the former was compulsory and unpaid, while the latter was voluntary and paid. The People's Daily of course is a Communist paper.

However, the regulations governing reform through labor provide punishments in the form of warning, reprimand, confinement, and so on for the slave laborer who does not take good care of productive

tools or engages in a slowdown strike, while the essentials of labor rules governing labor in general also mete out warning, reprimand, demerit mark, dismissal, fine, and imprisonment as punishments to common labor.

They are both labor of a compulsory type. In no sense can the latter be called voluntary. Nominally, common labor does have remuneration in the form of wages. But, how much does the laborer actually receive after making the so-called deduction of wages, contributions, and indemnity payments? And, what is the difference between his treatment and that of a slave laborer? It is enough to draw the conclusion from this comparison that both common labor and slave labor in Communist China today share the same destiny.

Furthermore, the promulgation of the regulations governing reform through labor can be taken as a warning to labor in general in Communist China and a means to strengthen the effective exploitation and control of them. If they do not submit to exploitation in all meekness, there is the possibility that they will be sent off at any time to houses of detention, prisons, reformatory, labor corps, or houses of correction to undergo mass reform. Therefore, it is evident that the regulations governing reform through labor are also related to the exploitation and control of labor in general in Communist China.

Exploitation of workers in general: Thus we see that though the Chinese Communist Party claims to be the political party of the workers, nothing has been done to promote their interest and welfare since it came into power. Workers on the mainland have been exploited directly or indirectly to strengthen its control. By initiating labor discipline movements and production competitions, the Communist regime in China has forced them to work like beasts.

In an open letter of December 15, 1949, addressed to all workers in China, the Chinese Confederation of Trade Unions announced its support of the "Regulations concerning annual bonuses for employees of public enterprises," issued on December 11, 1949, by the Commission on Finance and Economic Affairs, which stipulated that bonuses or double wages, if paid at the end of the year for a period longer than half a month, should be paid at half the rate for the part exceeding half a month, and should in no case be paid for a period of more than 2 months, and that payments might be made in installments.

The letter also asked the workers to "show their high political intelligence and to support those regulations by their actions" (Hong Kong Ta Kung Po, December 17, 1949). This was the first positive accomplishment achieved by Communist China for its working class. In February 1950, the Chinese Confederation of Trade Unions further announced that "after the working class took over, competition in production became the regular method of work and production." When Communist China went to war in Korea, a declaration was made by the Chinese Confederation of Trade Unions on October 6, 1950, calling on the working class to join the "Resist America, aid Korea, protect our home and safeguard our country" movement. By January 1951, more than 1,200 factories and mines in the northeast, north, east, and southern part of central China had joined this movement, involving 1,200,000 workers. (People's Daily News, February 7, 1951.)

77294—56——4

Competition in production thus became an institution in China. Speaking at the second meeting of the executive committee, held sometime in February 1953, Lai Jo-yu, the secretary-general of the Chinese Confederation of Trade Unions, said, "At present, 80 percent of the staff and workers employed in the important production enterprises participate in these competitions. In the past 4 years, 223,230 model laborers were nominated" (People's Daily News, January 22, 1953).

In May 1953, the Statute of Trade Unions of the People's Republic of China was adopted by the Seventh National Workers' Convention, convened by the Communist regime. It was specified in the preamble that—

> the most important tasks of the trade unions in China in this period reconstruction are to consolidate the unity of the working class; to comply willingly with laws and orders and labor discipline, to participate actively in production, and to increase productivity steadily in order to carry out the production plans formulated by the State ahead of schedule, thus accelerating the industrialization of the country and eventually forming a Socialist community (People's Daily News, May 14, 1953).

Speaking at the convention, Liu Shao-chi said:

> Action to deal with violations of labor discipline have helped immensely to maintain it at a high level (Chungking Hsin Hua Daily News, May 2, 1953).

On July 10, 1953, a resolution on stricter labor discipline was adopted by the Chinese Confederation of Trade Unions, and an urgent announcement on further steps to increase production, to economize, and to participate in labor competition in order to ensure the fulfillment of the production plans formulated by the state was circulated on September 15. There were also established the so-called tribunals of workers in productive enterprises.

According to reports issued by the Communist regime, these were "voluntary organizations formed by workers for self-education." Their purpose was to—

> eliminate the remnants of undesirable habits which violate labor discipline and which jeapardize national production, by self-correction and self-education, in order to educate the workers, to accelerate their awakening, to maintain labor discipline and to increase production.

Actually these were tribunals set up by the Communist regime through the courts for the purpose of tightening their hold on the workers and forcing them to work harder and harder. Typical cases of violations of labor discipline or of production requirements, which had a certain educational value, were selected from among the staffs and the workers in industry and tried at mass meetings as a general warning. These tribunals were first set up at the Anshan Steel Co in March 1953. Working groups were then sent by the provincial and municipal courts to the well-organized factories and mines operated by the Communist regime to set up experimental tribunals. According to reports issued by Communist China in May 1954, 70 tribunals of workers in productive enterprises were set up in various industrial and mining establishments scattered throughout northeast, north, and central China.

On wages, the Communist authorities, in striving to establish a forced-labor system, do not fix the wages of workers or the value of the work. To them, wages are but a means to further production, to spur on the ordinary worker to give more for what he receives

and generally serve as a whip to drive the workers into slave labor.

An editorial in the People's Daily, a Communist paper, said:

> The wages and welfare of the workers should be subordinated to the interests of national reconstruction.

This was October 30, 1953. Under this pretext the Chinese Communist regime attempts to make the exploitation of workers through subnormal wages more palatable.

The wage scale of eight grades: Since 1950, the Chinese Communist authorities have been using the so-called wage scale of eight grades throughout the northeastern provinces. On June 19, 1950, the People's Government of the Northeast formally promulgated the: "Directive for wage adjustment in respect of workers and technical personnel employed in public enterprises and guiding principles for the administration of the wage scale of eight grades." In September, the Chinese Communist regime held a nationwide preparatory conference on wages, which formulated a set of regulations based on the practice in the Northeast region.

Since 1941, these regulations have been applied gradually in the various administrative regions. The Chinese Communist authorities claim this system to be the "result of long research by the Soviet Union." According to this system, wages in the highest grade can be as much as three and a half times the wages of the lowest grade. Because of the great difference in wages from one grade to another, the purpose is to force the worker to increase his production, to prevent him from changing his occupation, to delay his promotion, and generally to drain him of his last ounce of energy and make him a part of the productive machine.

Working hours: Article 32 of the program adopted by the Chinese Communist People's Political Consultative Conference stipulates that—

> At present an 8-to-10-hour day shall in general be enforced in public and private enterprises.

However, in recent years, the Chinese Communist authorities under various pretenses have recklessly prolonged working hours without giving compensation.

The following is a report taken from a Communist source:

> At the Shi-chin-shan Iron and Steel Works, the entire body of workers donated their overtime pay to the government for the purchase of aircraft and guns. For this, every worker has to work 2 extra hours in his spare time and 8 more hours on Sundays. In addition, each worker has to contribute one-half of the bonus he received for exceeding his quota in the summer (People's Daily, June 11, 1951).

The next section, Mr. Chairman, is very important. It comes under slave-laborers sent abroad. According to a United Press dispatch from Calgary, Canada, dated January 18, 1952, there were 500,000 Chinese slave laborers in the labor camps of Eastern Europe. On August 6, 1952, a columnist, Mr. Victor Riesel, reported in the Daily Mirror, a New York newspaper, that the Russians were using a large number of Chinese laborers to complete the reconstruction of the Trans-Siberian Railway as a double-track railway. On December 2 of the same year, he reported that Communist China had concluded a secret agreement with the Russians for supplying Chinese laborers to the Soviet Union, Poland, and Czechoslovakia in exchange for military supplies and textiles.

On April 7, 1953, Kung Shang Yat Po, a Hong Kong newspaper, published an open letter by Liu Yu-kuei, an overseas Chinese residing in Thailand, who said that, while in a concentration camp, he has learned from a Communist Party member that—

the Russians had asked Communist China to send 1,500,000 laborers to Eastern Europe so that the wages due to them could be used as payment for weapons and ammunitions shipped to Red China.

Lieu added that the same party member had also told him that—

according to the secret agreement concluded for that purpose, these laborers had to be in the age group of 35 to 40—

and that—

70 percent of the total number of laborers agreed upon were already working in Poland.

It is noteworthy that during the so-called nationwide general elections in Communist China, there were 10,081,069 persons over 18 years of age who had either been deprived of political rights or who had lost the franchise because of mental incapacity. If we deduct the number of mentally incapacitated persons from the aforesaid figure and add to it the number of juvenile delinquents, the final figure would be about 10 million. Undoubtedly, these 10 million persons were all committed to slave labor. The actual number of slave laborers must be still higher than this, because there are a certain number of secret labor camps completely under military control which are entirely cut off from the outside world. It is clear that their inmates were not included in the census taken before the general elections.

In addition, there is another form of forced labor in Communist China which is even greater in magnitude; that is, conscript labor. According to the People's Daily of November 5, 1951, Fu Tso-yi declared, at the third meeting of the Political Consultative Conference, that—

during the last 2 years, a total of 10,370,000 persons were mobilized to work on water conservation projects.

What a startling figure. It is also quite common to find that hundreds of thousands of inhabitants were mobilized for a provincial project. Thus, a labor force consisting of 100,000 inhabitants was mobilized to repair the northern section of the Tientsin-Pukow Railway and the eastern section of Kiaochow-Tsinan Railway, according to the Ta Kung Pao, Hong Kong, November 5, 1951.

The drive for higher production: In 1950, the Chinese Communist authorities first launched what they called the production race campaign. By describing the workers as the "ruling class" of the nation and taking advantage of their psychology they attempted to introduce a new concept of labor, dubbing the outstanding workers "labor heroes," "model workers" or "meritorious workers." By constantly appealing to the workers to meet certain challenges, the Communist authorities sought to introduce this production race on a permanent basis. The following excerpt is an illustration:

In a certain factory under the Ministryof Industry of the People's Government of the Northeast, the production race has continued relentlessly for 1 year and 5 months, thus becoming a model of efficiency in the constant struggle for higher production under the leadership of the labor unions (Shanghai Liberation Daily, April 11, 1951).

Under the so-called technical quota system and production responsibility system, the Chinese Communist authorities constantly call upon the worker to "learn the knack of his job" and to "put his potential ability to full use." Thus, the worker is constantly driven to establish new production records to replace the old quotas.

On July 15, 1950, the Ministry of Industry of the Chinese Communist Government in the Northeast fixed rigid quotas in respect of quantity and quality, and set limits on the time required for production, the number of workers, the cost of materials, and the amount of working funds for every project. Among these measures, those relating to time limits and the number of workers are the worst.

According to the bulletin, published on May 5, 1950, by the Ministry of Industry in the Northeast, on how to put the "production responsibility" system into effect, arbitrary quotas are set on the daily and weekly production of each worker so that a project may be accomplished in time or ahead of time. A report in the Northeast Daily says:

> Various new production records based on man-hours have at least doubled or tripled all previous production rates. For the completion of a 6-foot lathe a new record has been set requiring 153 instead of the former 292 man-hours. Production efficiency is thus raised 46 percent.

In the report of Lo Jui-Chin, vice chairman of the Political and Legal Commission of the State Administration Council, at the 222d meeting of that council on August 26, 1954, he stated:

> By 1955, the aggregate receipts and expenditure in the national budget are expected to approach balance. Production under the reformatory labor program has contributed significantly to the supply of commodities to meet the requirements of basic national development as well as the people's needs for consumer's goods. For example, in regard to building materials, over 2,000 million bricks and over 770 million tiles were produced last year, directly contributing to the basic construction work of the Nation.
>
> The Reformatory Labor Hosiery Works of Peking produced 714,000 dozen socks and stockings last year, thus adding to the supply of consumer's goods for the people. The Tientsin Steelworks produced over 1,700,000 units of connecting parts for heating equipment last year the products being considered above standard, a long-term contract has been signed with the Anshan Steel Works to supply the latter with this item. The farms industrial plants, mines, ceramic works, and other production enterprises now in operation have laid a firm foundation for the future work of reforming criminals through labor.

That, Mr. Chairman, is the end of the report. If the appendixes may be entered into the final summation, I am sure it would help the members of this committee to come to a determination upon the resolution proposed.

Senator DOUGLAS. That will be done.

(The above-mentioned document is as follows:)

APPENDIX I

Number of slave laborers in Communist China

	Number of persons
People who became slave laborers as a result of the Suppression of Counter-Revolutionaries campaign	1,560,000
Captured Chinese Government troops used as slave laborers	1,000,000
People who became slave laborers as a result of the Three-Anti campaign	1,000,000
People who became slave laborers as a result of the Five-Anti campaign	1,000,000
People who became slave laborers as a result of other campaigns	7,940,000
Victims of disasters used as slave laborers	3,000,000
Slave laborers sent abroad	1,500,000
Civilians committed to forced labor	8,000,000
Total	25,000,000

APPENDIX II

Number of slave laborers in labor camps: typical examples

		Number of slave laborers	Source
1. Reform Center for Prisoners, Kukong, Kwangtung.	3,500	There were at first 1,190 out of a total of 5,270 prisoners held in the northern 10 districts of Kwangtung, who were required to undergo long-term reform. The number has since been increased to 3,500.	Nan Fang Jih Pao, Canton, Feb. 26, 1951.
2. Reformatory labor brigade, Chi-kiang, Sze-chwan: railway repairs and coal mining.	1,000	Over 120 persons; increased to 1,000.	Do. Hsin Hua Jih Pao, Chungking, Nov. 8, 1951.
3. Reformatory labor brigade, Kweisui, Suiyuan.	2,536	Started from November 1950.	Sing Tao Yat Po, Hong Kong, May 1, 1951.
4. Counter-revolutionaries undergoing reform through labor in prisons in the Central Southern Region of Communist China.	812,500	As reported by Teng Tse-hui to the 4th Military and Political Conference of the Central Southern Region.	Chang Kiang Jih Pao, Hankow, Dec. 13, 1951.
5. Other prisoners sentenced to reform through labor.	328,600	----------	Do.
6. Ching Ho Farm, operated by the Public Security Bureau of the City of Peiping.	5,000	Figure deduced from information found in Communist newspapers.	New China News, Agency dispatch from Peiping, dated October 19, 1951. Kuang Ming Jih Pao, October 18, 1951.
7. "New Man" Village, Northern Kiangsu.	----------	----------	Sing Tao Yat Po, October 18, 1951.
8. Anshan Labor Corps, under the direction of the People's Court of Liaotung Province.	10,000	----------	
9. Reformatory labor battalions of eastern Szechwan.	20,000	----------	Report by Yen Hung-Yen on the suppression of counter-revolutionary elements (as published in the Hsin Hua Jih Pao, October 1951.
10. Reformatory labor battalions of Shansi.	----------	Statistics for the month of August show that over 90 percent of the prisoners in Shansi prisons were assigned to reformatory labor battalions.	New China News, agency dispatch September 1952.
11. Slave laborers in Kwangtung.	60,000	This figure represents the number of prisoners who were assigned to forced labor on 1 single occasion.	Report by Ku Ta-Tsun, vice chairman of the Kwangtung Provincial Government.
12. Over 80 groups of prisoners assigned to forced labor in Kwangtung.	[1] 30,000	----------	Communist newspaper, Nan Fang Jih Pao, 1952.

Number of slave laborers in labor camps: typical examples—Continued

		Number of slave laborers	Source
13. Slave laborers in the Northwest Region.	730,000	Sick and wounded military personnel who were captured by the Communists and subsequently sent to Sinkiang and Lanchow to cultivate land for collective farms, to build roads, and to work in mines.	Nan Fang Jih Pao, Canton, Nov. 27, 1951.
14. Captured Chinese Government troops assigned to forced labor in Sinkiang.	100,000	Tao Chih-yueh reported: "The soldiers of the People's Liberation Army, with guns on their shoulders and tools in their hands, are vigorously engaged in production. They form an excellent 'Production Army.'"	Chun Chung Jih Pao Sian, Dec. 2, 1951.
15. Shanghai concentration camp, model prison, Shih-tze-kou Soochow.	1,900	Captured Chinese Government army officers with the rank of lieutenant colonel or above as reported by Pastor Peter Jen who fled from the mainland to Formosa: "Everyone here is forced to work like an animal under the euphemistic slogan of 'reform through labor' and suffers immensely."	Sin Sang Pao, Taipei, November 7, 1951.
16. First Production corps of the Public Security Bureau, Peiping.	300	Yang Shao-lin stated: "I was detained in the so-called First Production Corps of the Public Security Bureau which was stationed in San Yuan Hall outside Yung Ting Gate."	America Today, United States Information Service, Hong Kong, November 22, 1951.
17. No. 1 Prison, Kiukiang	----------	Mentioned in an article entitled "I Accuse" by Chung Chi.	Mainland Today, Taipei, January 16, 1952.
18. National farm at Sungkiang	----------	----------	Voice of China, Vol. IV, No. 9, Hong Kong.
19. Secret concentration camp in Shunteh District, Kwangtung.	[1] 3,000	----------	The World Today, United States Information Service, Kong Kong, June 15, 1952.

[1] In excess of figure shown.

APPENDIX III

Number of inhabitants conscripted for slave labor by the Chinese Communists: Typical examples

	Distance, miles	Number of slave laborers	Source
1. Railways:			
Restoration of the northern section of the Tientsin-Pukow Railway and the eastern section of the Kiaochow-Tsinan Railway.		100,000 (civilian laborers)	Ta Kung Pao, Hong Kong, Nov. 5, 1951.
Paoki-Chengtu Railway		17,000 (young farm workers and starving people from Shensi, Shantung, and Honen, and slave laborers conscripted for the speedy construction of the railways).	Central News Agency dispatch from Hong Kong, dated Dec. 12, 1954.
Section between Suining and the border of Mongolia.	600	(Completed on Dec. 11, 1954.)	Associated Press dispatch from London dated Dec. 12, 1954.
2. Highways: Sikang-Tibet Highway.		50,000	New China News agency dispatch from Sikang dated May 25, 1952.
3. Water conservation:			
Mobilization of inhabitants in the entire Communist-controlled area to participate in water conservation projects (for a period of 2 years).		10,370,000 (as reported by Fu-Tso-yi at the 3d meeting of the Political Consultation Conference).	People's Daily, Nov. 5, 1951.
Checking of the flood which occurred in the northeast.		338,000	New China News, agency dispatch dated Oct. 20, 1952.
Dredging of the rivers Shu and Yi in Shantung.		2,000,000 (civilian laborers and skilled workers mobilized to work on the project for 3½ years).	Ta Kung Pao, Hong Kong, July 4, 1952.
Tungting Lake conservation project, Hunan.		200,000	Ta Kung Pao, Tientsin, Jan. 14, 1953.
Hung Yen reservoir project, Sinkiang.		1,000,000 (work started in 1950).	People's Daily, June 10, 1953.
Winter repairs of the water conservation system in Anhwei.		800,000	People's Daily, Feb. 7, 1954.
Other references of value			(1) The Great Highway, by Yufen, of the Hsin Hua News Agency. (2) Slave Labor in Communist China, Free Publishing Co., Hong Kong, 1952.

Senator DOUGLAS. As I understand what you have said, the estimate of United Nations is that the number of slave laborers in Communist China comes to a total of 25 million?

Father MCGUIRE. Twenty-five million—that is necessarily an estimate, but I think it is a fairly close approximation.

Senator DOUGLAS. Appendix IIa and II gives a series of illustrations of specific cases, estimated numbers and the source?

Father MCGUIRE. That is right.

Senator DOUGLAS. Thank you very much.

Father MCGUIRE. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Senator DOUGLAS. I would like placed in the record at this point, two articles from the New Leader of February 16, 1953. The first is "Slavery Supports Mao's War Economy" by Geraldine Fitch, and the second, "The State Farms and Thought Reform" by Tom Brooks.

(The above-mentioned documents are as follows:)

SLAVE LABOR IN RED CHINA

By Geraldine Fitch, Taipei, Formosa

1. SLAVERY SUPPORTS MAO'S WAR ECONOMY

How would the Chinese people react to a nationalist assault on the mainland? Is Mao's regime, "progressive"? The three articles which follow provide clues to an understanding of these vital questions. Geraldine Fitch is a veteran far eastern observer, now a special writer for the Newspaper Enterprise Association. Tom Brooks, a long-time student of world labor, is on the staff of the Transport Workers Union (CIO). William Caldwell, a Washington newsman, writes often on China.

Slave labor has become as integral a part of Mao's China as it is of Stalin's Russia. Even the western observers most sympathetic to the Peking regime admit the number of forced laborers on the mainland of China is in the millions.

Mme. Vijaya Lakshmi Pandit, Nehru's sister, who last year went on a cultural mission to the "People's Demorcatic Dictatorship," stated publicly that 2 million men had been conscripted to work without pay on just 1 of Mao's new dams.

The International Confederation of Free Trade Unions, on the other hand, estimates the number of political prisoners alone—undergoing "thought reform" simultaneous with forced labor—as "well above 1 million."

Here on Formosa, the Free China Labor League, an ICFTU affiliate, has been gathering information on Red China's forced labor for more than 3 years.

Its sources of information are the published statements of Communist officials and Communist newspapers, and the reports gathered from Formosa and Hong Kong news agencies, from FCLL underground workers on the mainland, and from escapees. Although its data cannot be considered complete (new facts pour in every day), the FCLL estimates that, as of now, there are 18 million Chinese forced laborers and more than 5,000 special slave camps maintained by the Peking regime. (See map for late 1952 breakdown.)

Most of the forced laborers were picked up on the flimsiest of political pretexts; the active anti-Communists whom Peking got hold of were, for the most part, slain, either publicly or privately. The chief motivation of slave labor in China, as in Russia, is economic. It enables Mao to build a war machine, to solve unemployment, and to crack the whip over his still-free laborers.

As an example of how the slave-labor system operates, consider the case of the capital city, Peking, itself. A former Communist official, Chen Han-po, described the situation there shortly after the Reds took power. In his book, Peking Today, he said that at one time there were over 100,000 street beggars in the city. Then:

"One day, the NKVD decided they should do productive work. The entire Peking armed police suddenly appeared in every lane and alley, meticulously rounded up all the beggars and divided them into two groups. The aged and weak were sent to tend horses and cattle in Manchurian meadows, the young and able-bodied were sent to slave camps in the Yellow River district and to the mines around Shanhaikwan."

Slave labor built three key railroads for the Communists: the Chungking-Chengru, the Tienshui-Lanchow, and the Laiping-Chengnankwan. It has also been responsible for most of the Reds' progress in flood conservation. Nearly 10 million slave laborers have built and rebuilt the dams on the Hwei River, with conditions so bad that tens of thousands have died of hunger and exposure. Chen Han-po reported that 800 workers tried to escape once, but were caught and tortured to death.

In the border areas between the old provinces of Hopei, Honan, and Shantung, the Communists have created a new province called Pingyuan, a prime center of forced labor. Even the Communist People's Daily News reported that laborers in this province, who worked from 12 to 18 hours a day, were paid in rice only. From other sources, we learn that the average wage in such a project is about 1¼ pounds of rice daily, considerably less than the slaves in the American South received before the Civil War.

I spoke here on Formosa to an escapee from a Manchurian collective farm. The eight members of his family in Nuinkiang Province had, before communism, owned less than 4 acres of land among them. When the Communists instituted their land reform, this plot was collectivized and its owners turned into state serfs. This man told me he originally worked 13 hours a day for 20 ounces of rice, but then in 1951 had first to work 16 hours a day for the same ration, then to contribute a third of his rice to "help the state." Small-scale revolts broke out among the prisoners, but those who participated were shipped off to Siberia.

A somewhat more serious revolt in the Fushun coal mines in 1950, as a protest against beating by a Soviet adviser, resulted in 198 workes being shot.

At a conference of Communist officials held in December 1951 there were 21,595 deaths "in industrial accidents" officially reported for the preceding 9 months. This was reported in Ta Tao News with the following succinct Communist explanation: "Production in war. In war there are bound to be heavy casualties."

The State Farms and Thought Reform

SLAVE LABOR IS COMBINED WITH INTENSIVE POLITICAL INDOCTRINATION

By Tom Brooks

In the Kungchuan-Tseyang section of the Chungking-Chengtu Railroad last year some 200,000 laborers solemnly pledged themselves to this code:

To give up their rest periods to work for 14 hours a day;

To overcome all difficulties, to work under any weather conditions, devotedly and perseveringly;

To labor voluntarily when there is moonlight;

To urge well-to-do colaborers to contribute money for the purchase of additional implements;

To refrain from asking for sick leave; to refrain from any form of complaint;

To obey all directives from superiors unconditionally.

At first the code seems like the pledge of fanatics—adherents of the Communist regime in China who would do anything for Mao Tse-tung. But the 200,000 men and women who took the pledge were forced laborers. And, according to evidence gathered by the International Confederation of Free Trade Unions, the performance, with some variations, was repeated throughout Communist China.

A new China News Agency dispatch from Peking reports that many criminals, "through the process of reformation," are making progress in their "political thinking."

Furthermore, the dispatch continues, "a majority of the criminals express themselves as willing to labor in order to reform themselves; to make achievements in order to pay for their past crimes; to struggle to become new men."

The Kwangsi paper, Jih Pao, on January 9, 1952, first described the program by which forced-labor camps work in China. Briefly, this is:

(1) "* * * to point out that they [the prisoners] should bow and confess their misdeeds and guilt in the face of the people and that reform through labor is their only path";

(2) "* * *to mobilize the culprits to criticize and supervise each other and to draw up work plans";

(3) "* * * All culprits should be forced to work. Those who have shown up well * * * should be praised and passed for lightening of sentence. Those who have shown up badly should be criticized and heavily punished."

State farms are one of the forms concentration camps take in China. There are 40 state farms, comprising some 1,810,000 acres of land. One such farm, Ch'ingho, is located along the Peiping-Shanhaikwan Railroad, with some 15,000 acres of land. When it started, in March 1950, the land was barren; today, the expected rice crop is 20,000 tons.

"When they first started to dig canals," the regime reports, "the offenders standing on ice and snow with bare feet averaged less than 1.5 square decameters. Now they can do 5.7 * * *." But all this "progress" is not realized through faith alone. The report continues with the story of "Kuomingtang Army Agent Tu Hsin-chin," who "resisted control measures during the period of reform through labor and organized the escape of six criminals."

Tu, the only escapee to be captured, "was sentenced to death, taken to the farm, confronted with a mass meeting, and executed on the spot."

The lesson is not lost on anyone familiar with the ways of the concentration-camp universe. Note that the Communists called the mass meeting not only to witness the execution but also to pass judgment. This is an essential part of "the struggle to become new men."

Ting Yao-tsung, a former slave-camp inmate, illustrates this struggle quite clearly. Ting reports that, on one occasion, he and a fellow prisoner managed to pick up two crows, shot by guards, and with their permission cooked them for dinner. Po Kow-king, a fellow prisoner, saw them and jokingly remarked, "You are lucky to get a better meal for a change."

This remark reached the ears of the authorities, who considered something seriously wrong with his thinking and started an investigation.

At a special meeting of the prisoners, suppression was ordered at the instigation of the Communists. Ting reports that, "in the process of suppression, Po was finally shot to death in front of all the other prisoners especially gathered together to witness the execution."

Even this did not satisfy the Communists, who wanted to be sure that their ideological education got across: They cut open his stomach with a bayonet and tore out his intestines. And this had to be accompanied by the wild acclamation of the entire group.

Chou En-lai, Premier of Red China, spelled out the Communist program some time ago. In an official report to the National Political Consultative Commission on October 23, 1951, Chou said:

"In accordance with the directive of Chairman Mao Tse-tung, we decided that, in the meting out of punishment, the following principles should be followed.

"To those leading counterrevolutionary elements who owe us a debt in blood, who are so bitterly hated by the people that they must be executed, who have seriously hurt the interests of the state, the death sentence must be imposed and must forthwith be executed.

"To those other elements who deserve the death penalty but who do not owe us a debt in blood, who are not so bitterly hated by the people, who have hurt the national interest but not most seriously, the policy is to impose upon them the death sentence, but to postpone its execution for 2 years, to send them to forced labor, and to see how they come out."

The Peking People's Daily had this to say about the deferred death sentence:

"Deferment of 2 years does not mean immediate release after 2 years. Based upon the accomplishment during these 2 years, decision will be made as to whether the execution of the death sentence will be carried out. If it is found that the work they achieved is not satisfactory or that they refuse to reform, they can be executed at any time. Even if they show willingness to be reformed, their conviction can also be commuted to life imprisonment for certain terms."

The key to the Communist concentration-camp program is that the prisoners "should bow and confess their misdeeds and guilt in the face of the people," and that they should "criticize and supervise each other." The labor of the prisoners is forced, but they must be made to "express themselves as willing to labor in order to reform."

Former slave laborers have testified that "what we dreaded most in our prison life was the daily attendance at various meetings." There were the "Hsieh-hsih meetings, where you had to praise the Communist Party and condemn the Kuomintang; the Tan-Pei * * * for confession and self-criticism and finding fault with each other; and the Tou-tse * * * for group trial."

The techniques of the social scientist for group work are used to control the slave laborers. Discussion, in order to bring out confessions which are then submitted to group criticism, exacts conformity. Group discussion carried on to the point of exhaustion (aided by 10 to 14 hours of work every day) washes out heresy. This process of brain-washing is going on all over China today—in the slave-labor camps, in the universities, wherever men and women gather together.

How are forced laborers recruited? A penetrating sidelight is the comment in the official Moscow publication Soviet State and Law, by Candidate of Juristic Science V. F. Kivichenko:

"In this connection, article 16 of the Statute on the Punishment of Counter-revolutionaries in the Chinese People's Republic * * * rules that persons who, for counterrevolutionary purposes, commit other crimes not covered by the statute are subject to punishment applicable to the most similar of the crimes envisaged by the statute.

"The situation is complicated and the class struggle is sharpened by the special norm (art. 19) in this statute which admits anonymous reports by any person in the People's Government on counterrevolutionary crimes, provided, there are no false accusations based on personal grounds."

In other words, there is no law. Men are sentenced to forced labor on anonymous charges and penalized for crimes not on the statute books. The counterrevolutionary class—so-called bandits, rascals, secret agents, reactionary parties or groups, and reactionary associations and clans—must go.

As Public Security Minister Lo Yui-ch'ing (the head of the Chinese MVDO stated in the Peking paper Jen Min Jin Pao, "the subjection of counterrevolutionaries to forced labor is an indispensable means for the liquidation of the counterrevolutionary class. * * *"

The extent of forced labor is hard to gage precisely. Actually, treatment varies little between those who are conscripts and work for no pay and yet are nominally free laborers; those who are forced to work for the state for food and board, pitiful though it be; and those who work in the reformation-through-labor program. Thus, it is difficult to say where slavery begins and where it ends.

But forced labor is used today to dredge China's rivers, build her dams and irrigation projects, expand coal mining, build and repair military lines of communication and railroads.

It is as much the key to Moa's new democracy as it has been to Stalin's 5-year plans. It is also the indispensable basis for Mao's aggressions in Korea and elsewhere.

Senator DOUGLAS. I would also like to have placed in the record, at this point, certain articles from the Newsletter, Committee of 1 Million.

(The above-mentioned documents are as follows:)

THE TRIUMPH OF TERROR—HOW THE PEIPING REGIME KEEPS CHINA ENSLAVED

Among the 80,000 ideographs in the Chinese language, none are charged with more meaning for the people of China today than Hsiao Mieh. In the abstract but exact language of China, "Hsiao Mieh" means "deprived of existence * * * done away with * * * otherwise disposed of." In the broader language of humanity Hsiao Mieh today symbolizes the greatest planned massacre in the history of mankind.

In the village of Liuchiatsun a peasant named Liu resented the seizure of his tiny (3-acre) farm and carelessly talked of resisting. The Communists' answer was quick, final. The local peasantry was called together at the new brick Public Security Station to see Liu standing before a circuit tribunal. A people's procurator charged him with being a reactionary. The procurator asked the assembled crowd: "Comrades, what do we do with these inhuman counterrevolutionaries, these criminals, bandits, secret agents of capitalism, and organizers of Taoist sects?" Voices cried: "Kill them! Kill them!" The peasants understood from the accents of the words that the response had been made by people from another part of the country, but they took their cue. "Kill him! Kill him!" they echoed.

Next day Liu's name was brushed on the wall newspaper at the Public Security Station. Beside it was brushed the dreaded Hsiao Mieh.

THE MONSTROUS PYRE

Since October 1949, when the Chinese Communists officially set up the Chinese People's Republic, Hsiao Mieh, by the account of Red China's press, has been written officially against the names of millions of Chinese. Foreign specialists, carefully sifting reports from refugees and other sources, estimate that at least 20 million Chinese have been deprived of existence, done away with, or otherwise disposed of.

Because it is hard for the mind to visualize so vast a slaughter in human terms, the Communists have been able to reap an advantage from the very size of their funeral pyre. Many Westerners, finding the monstrous incredible, cannot see the blood on the hand of pretended friendship proferred by Chinese Communist Leader Mao Tse-tung.

The trial of the peasant Liu is only a village echo of hundreds of mass trials, often involving thousands of blood-yelling participants, carried out in the big

cities, usually at a popular sports ground, in which the victims are publicly denigrated, then publicly shot. (In one Shanghai mass trial, described by a Shanghai businessman, relatives were allowed to take the body away in a wooden coffin after paying the cost of the bullets used to kill the victim—approximately $38.)

Back in 1951 Communists had already liquidated tens of thousands of landowners, rich and poor, Red forces carried on the program with scientific thoroughness. Nominally, their campaign was directed against "exploiting landlords," but in practice people were liquidated because their parents or grandparents were landlords, because they were intellectuals, village elders, held religious beliefs objected to communism in principle or simply would not cooperate. The Red cadres were given target quotas for grain and confiscated land, so that even if a village had few landlords, a necessary percentage of Hsiao Mieh was written up.

With "land reform" launched, the Peiping regime turned its attention to the cities. "Two ways are open to all counterrevolutionaries: the way of death for those who resist, and the way of life for those who confess."

In cities like Shanghai (population 7 million), the Communists made sure that people would know about "the way of death" by staging machinegun executions of the paddy fields, and sending through the streets open wagons bearing people bound hand and foot. Then one spring night in 1951 the sirens wailed in Shanghai, and all night long the police wagons sped about the city. Next morning there was nothing in the newspapers to indicate what had happened, but as people began checking with friends, horror spread through Shanghai: it was reckoned that 100,000 people had been arrested that night.

PUBLICIZING MURDER

Red newspapers were not silent about arrests and executions in other parts of the country. Month after month, the Hsiao Mieh totals were issued, almost always in round figures: "1,150,000 in the central-south provinces"; "1,176,000 in 4 administrative regions"; "300,000 in the 5 northwest provinces"; and so on. Says Peiping calmly: "A large number of people with blood debts have been executed."

Other hundreds of thousands committed suicide. At one time in Shanghai, the bund on the Whangpoo River was roped off, the roofs of tall buildings were guarded to prevent suicides, and residents developed the habit of avoiding walking on the pavement near skyscrapers for fear that suicides might land on them from the rooftops.

An anti-United States campaign (during the Korean war) gave the Reds an excuse to arrest Chinese doctors, technicians, and professionals educated in the West (and therefore suspected counterrevolutionaries). An anti-Christian campaign was conducted, designed to cut the local churches off from the rest of Christendom, but failed when Roman Catholic authorities refused to bend to a rump Catholic Church that the Reds tried to organize. So the Communists went ahead arresting missionaries, priests, and clergymen as spies, or harried them into leaving the country. Of China's 6,475 foreign missionaries, only 11 priests (8 in prison and 3 under house arrest) and 14 Fransciscan Sisters now remain.

Ordinary people stay off the streets after 8 p. m., and people who do venture out are shadowed by police, often disguised as beggars or pedicab drivers. Although today the mass trials are mostly held in country areas, arrests are still frequent in the big cities. In Shanghai bodies are still hauled to the crematories in low-sided trucks, with splashes of blood visible on the victim's clothing.

A feature of Chinese Communist justice is collective responsibility and collective punishment. A neighborhood may be punished for a misdemeanor committed by one family. Fishermen are forced to guarantee each other mutually, in units of from 5 to 15 fishing boats. Peasants must join peasant associations which are collectively responsible for the behavior of individual members. In state factories and mines, comrade tribunals composed of Communist workers, conduct cases that are of educational significance and are related to labor discipline and work regulations, i. e., workers suppress workers.

In the background of the terrorist picture there are the forced labor camps. Why kill opponents when work can be got out of them? Like the Soviet Communists, the Chinese believe in the theory of reform through labor. Millions, including many with suspended death sentences, have been trucked to railroad and water conservation projects all over China and to lumber camps in Man-

churia. Risings in these remote camps have been frequent. Mobile units of slave laborers have been reported as far distant as Poland and Czechoslovakia.

Something of deep significance to China, to Asia, and all the world occurred in the last 6 months of 1955. The crescendo of terror in 1951, and the skillfully timed and carefully calculated applications of terror since, had their cumulative effect. One of the most enduring and resilient of peoples apparently gave up hope. On this important fact most of the foreign agencies whose work it is to observe, analyze, and report on Communist China agree. Millions of Chinese, something in the order of 100 million families, had surrendered not to the idea of communism, but to its iron system.

THE LOSS OF HOPE

This collapse of the will to resist surprised even the Communists themselves, who suddenly revised their calculations upward. In July Mao predicted that the new China was about to witness the high tide of the great Socialist revolution. In January of this year he said the tide was running. Last July Mao announced that only 16.9 million of the 110 million peasant households had been forced into producer cooperatives; by December he was able to announce that more than 60 percent of peasant families were in cooperatives—an astonishing increase of 53.1 million peasant families in 6 months. Mao and his subordinate leaders presented other evidence of a widespread consolidation of Communist power and, elated by their success, announced a speedup in their socialization programs. Plans which were to have been accomplished in 10 or 15 years were cut to 5 years. "The Socialist revolution, in the main," said Mao, "could be completed on a national scale within about 3 more years."

The non-Communist world, which had not been able to prevent this vast upheaval, at least had a duty to understand it. The triumph was not the victory of the "Uncle Mao" of Peking propaganda, the benign statesman who has charmed such outstanding humanists as Attlee, Nehru, and U Nu. It was the triumph of terror.

A Record of Communist China's Inhumanity to Its Own People—25 Million Slaves

The following facts on forced labor practices in Communist China are featured in the official report (U. N. Document E/2815) by the Secretary General of the United Nations and the Director General of the International Labor Office, prepared for the 21st session of the U. N. Economic and Social Council.

"The following detailed analysis shows the number of persons who have been persecuted as a result of the various suppression campaigns conducted by the Chinese Communists, and the number of those who were finally sent to slave labor camps and forced into slavery:" (Editor's Note.—We are listing but a few examples cited in the complete report.)

SLAVE LABORERS SENT ABROAD

"According to a United Press dispatch from Calgary, Canada, dated January 18, 1952, there were 500,000 Chinese slave laborers in the labor camps of Eastern Europe. On August 6, 1952, a columnist, Mr. Riesel, reported in the Daily Mirror, a New York newspaper, that the Russians were using a large number of Chinese laborers to complete the reconstruction of the Trans-Siberian Railway as a double-track railway. On December 2 of the same year, he reported that Communist China had concluded a secret agreement with the Russians for supplying Chinese laborers to the Soviet Union, Poland, and Czechoslovakia in exchange for military supplies and textiles. On April 7, 1953, Kung Shang Yat Po, a Hong Kong newspaper, published an open letter by Liu Yukuei, an overseas Chinese residing in Thailand, who said that, while in a concentration camp, he had learned from a Communist Party member that the Russians had asked Communist China to send 1,500,000 laborers to Eastern Europe so that the wages due to them could be used as payment for weapons and ammunitions shipped to Red China. Liu added that the same party member had also told him that according to the secret agreement concluded for that purpose, these laborers had to be in the age group of 35 to 40, and that 70 percent of the total number of laborers agreed upon were already working in Poland."

THE SUPPRESSION OF COUNTERREVOLUTIONARIES CAMPAIGN

"Ku-Ta-Tsun, a Communist official, reported, on September 18, 1952, that 89,701 persons were arrested in Kwangtung Province within a period of 10 months and that 28,332 of them had been executed, while the remaining sixty-thousand-odd persons had been sentenced to forced labor. Since the population of Kwangtung is about one-thirteenth of the total population of Communist China, it may be estimated that, in the entire area under Communist control about 780,000 persons have been forced to do slave labor within this 10-month period. On a 5-year basis, this figure would be at least twice as large: 1,560,000 persons."

CAPTURED CHINESE GOVERNMENT TROOPS

"Even according to published information from Communist sources, approximately 100,000 captives were sent to Sinkiang to develop uncultivated areas. * * * Taking the entire Communist-controlled area into account, the total number of captives used as slave laborers should be no less than 1 million."

THE "FIVE ANTI" CAMPAIGN

"This countrywide campaign aimed at the extensive persecution of industrialists and merchants. Peng Chen, the mayor of Peiping, reported that there were 1,700 business concerns in that city which had violated the "five anti" regualtions, while Chen Yi, the mayor of Shanghai, indicated that there were 57,000 such concerns in his city. On the assumption that there were at least 2 persons in each concern, the minimum number of victims in these 2 cities would be approximately 120,000 persons. Thus, the total number of victims in the entire region under Communist control would be in the vicinity of 1 million."

VICTIMS OF DISASTERS

"Following the devastating flood of the Yangtze River in 1954, 2,500,000 flood victims from the Provinces of Hunan, Hupeh, Kiangsu, Anhwei, Kiangsi, Kwangtung and Kwangsi were sent by the state administrative council to the Communist regime of north China and the northwest to construct 2 railways. * * * Judging from this single case, it may be further estimated that in addition to conscript labor of a temporary nature, no less than 3 million victims of disasters on the mainland of China were used as slave laborers."

CONSCRIPT LABOR

"According to the People's Daily of November 5, 1951, Fu Tso-yi declared, at the third meeting of the political consultative conference, that 'during the last 2 years, a total of 10,370,000 persons were mobilized to work on water conservations projects.' What a startling figure! It is also quite common to find that hundreds of thousands of inhabitants were mobilized for a provincial project. Thus, a labor force consisting of 100,000 inhabitants was mobilized to repair the northern section of the Tientsin-Pukow Railway and the eastern section of Kiaochow-Tsinan Railway (Ta Kunk Poa, Hong Kong, November 5, 1951)."

"There are other examples. In 1952, 338,000 inhabitants were mobilized to check the flood in the northeast (New China News Agency dispatch dated October 20, 1952). The project of dredging the rivers Shu and Yi took 3½ years and required a total of 2 million laborers and technicians to accomplish (Ta Kung Pao, Tientsin, January 14, 1953). A conscripted labor force of 1 million civilians and People's Liberation Army personnel have been working on the Hung Yen Reservoir project in Sinkiang since 1950 (People's Daily, June 10, 1953). Over 800,000 farmers were mobilized in Anhwei to repair waterways, irrigation canals, dams, and dikes in the winter (People's Daily, February 7, 1954). Assuming, conservatively, that the number of civilians forced to work on public projects in each province averages between 200,000 and 300,000, the figure of 7 million to 8 million would be arrived at as the total number of civilians conscripted for such service each year.

* * * From what has been said in the previous chapters, it may be concluded that those who do not accede to the demands of the Chinse Communists, those who do not want to live under the Communist regime as slaves and those considered by the Chinese Communists as potential insurrectionists in the event of a war launched according to the Soviet timetable of aggression, have all been earmarked for elimination.

CONCLUSION

"The system of forced labor, as practiced by the Chinese Communists, is even more vicious than the system prevailing in Soviet Russia. It deprives individuals of their human rights and freedoms, destroys the human dignity, and extracts the last drop of their blood and sweat. Such a system of forced labor not only violates the United Nations Charter, but also constitutes the type of forced labor described by the United Nations Economic and Social Council as 'a means of political coercion or punishment * * * on such a scale as to constitute an important element in the economy of a given country.' In addition, such a system aims at encroaching upon the territory of neighboring states and destroying human beings, which is totally incompatible with humanitarian principles."

THESE ARE THE FACTS

The various figures given in the official U. N. report may be arranged in tabular form as follows:

People who become slave laborers as a result of the suppression of counterrevolutionaries campaign	1,560,000
Captured Chinese Government troops used as slave laborers	1,000,000
People who become slave laborers as a result of various other government suppression campaigns	9,940,000
Victims of disasters used as slave laborers	3,000,000
Slave laborers sent abroad	1,500,000
Civilians committed to forced labor	8,000,000
Total	25,000,000

Senator DOUGLAS. The next witness is Prof. Lev. E. Dobriansky, Associate professor of economics, Georgetown University, and chairman, Ukrainian Congress Committee of America.

Dr. Dobriansky, we are very glad to have you here.

Mr. DOBRIANSKY. I am very happy to be here, Mr. Chairman.

STATEMENT OF PROF. LEV. E. DOBRIANSKY, PROFESSOR OF SOVIET ECONOMICS, GEORGETOWN UNIVERSITY

Mr. DOBRIANSKY. The Ukrainian Congress Committee of America, as you no doubt know, is a national organization of Americans of Ukrainian background. There are approximately 1½ million such Americans here in this country and the objectives of the organization are informational, educational, and largely in the area of foreign policy.

We attempt to disseminate as much information as we can on the basis of the experiences of not only Ukrainians, but all other non-Russian nationals within the Soviet Union.

I am very grateful for the invitation extended me by this committee to submit testimony on Senate Joint Resolution 117 which provides for United States cooperation with other nations through the International Labor Organization to abolish forced labor.

It was my equal privilege to testify in 1950 before the McMahon Committee on the Genocide Convention which presented the opportunity to offer evidence on the close relationship existing between forced-labor camps in the Soviet Union and the heinous crime of genocide. At the time, many in this country viewed the evidence with doubt and disbelief, but just recently, at the 20th Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, even the Russian Communist leaders admitted to its veracity and truth. Had we wisely ratified the Genocide Convention, we would today be in the strongest moral and legal

position to do something in the court of world opinion about the genocidal acts of mass murder, purges, and famine which the present oligarchical dictatorship vainly ascribes to Stalin.

Forced labor in itself is not genocide, but it bears its criminal features as an institutional instrument and means for the consummate act of genocide as practiced in the Soviet Union. Again, and more seriously at this time, we would be missing the boat should we fail to pass Senate Joint Resolution 117 and allow the opportunity of exercising our leadership in the International Labor Organization toward the abolition of forced labor for political and economic purposes slip by us.

In the limited time allotted me here I should like to develop the essentials that presently constitute the picture of Moscow's application of the instrument of forced labor to Ukraine, the largest non-Russian nation both in the Soviet Union and the European orbit of the Russian Communist Empire. These essentials may be appropriately attuned to Mr. Khrushchev's latest revealing and bluff-like outburst, "Never shake your fist at a Russian" (AP, April 23, England).

Indeed, founded on extensive source material, they will serve to explain, especially in the field of forced labor, why Ukrainian patriots always shake their fists at imperialist Russian Moscow without fear or trepidation in the face of Russian threats or bluff. Whether at Vorkuta in the north or Krupkoy in the south, Kamenets-Podolsk in the west or Magadan in the east, forced Ukrainian labor, in rhythm with the captive Ukrainian people generally, keeps shaking its fist at the colonial Russian imperialists through widespread strikes, resistance, and a network of planned political operation.

Since World War II mounting evidence on the extent, nature, conditions, and composition of the Russian Communist concentration-camp system has been overwhelming.

There is little excuse today for displayed ignorance on the existence and horrible realities of this forced-labor system. Undirected tours by westerners into the forced-labor camps are prohibited, but intellect-appealing facts about them are abundantly accessible.

The work of the Select House Committee to Investigate Communist Aggression, which carefully studied the documented testimonies of scores of former Ukrainian and other inmates of these camps, is monumental in scope and content, despite limitations of time and resources in assembling all the data that are still available. Investigation of Communist takeover and occupation of the non-Russian nations of the U. S. S. R. 83d Congress, Washington, 1954; also Communist takeover and occupation of Urkaine, Special Report No. 4, 1955.

Countless Ukrainian refugees who experienced the most dreadful life in these camps and were fortunate to escape the scissors of forced repatriation, have yet to relate their individual forced-labor experiences. The realistic and compatible testimonies given by German, Hungarian, Spanish, Austrian, and Japanese prisoners who mingled and slaved with Ukrainian and other nationals in these camps, have provided us with a wealth of the most recent information.

This authoritative work that I have in my hand here, Mr. Chairman, on the Black Deeds of the Kremlin, published by the Vasilian Press in Canada, consists of vivid personal accounts given by former Ukrainian inmates of camps in the Solovetsky Island, Kolyma, and other

distant places of the empire known as the Soviet Union. I wish to submit it for extracted use at the discretion of the committee in the preparation of its publication of these proceedings.

Senator DOUGLAS. I wonder, Mr. Dobriansky, if you would work with the staff of the committee in indicating the excerpts from that book that you think most valuable. We will be limited somewhat on space. We want it to be conclusive.

Mr. DOBRIANSKY. I shall be most happy to do so.

(See appendix contents for the excerpts from the books referred to.)

I wish also to have the permission of the committee to submit subsequently and within reason additional factual data which base my general observations on forced labor in Ukraine and of its people. The reason I asked for that, Mr. Chairman, is because of the inadequacy of time.

Senator DOUGLAS. I understand.

(The additional material is as follows:)

CONCENTRATION CAMPS IN THE U. S. S. R.

Information furnished by Ukrainian Supreme Liberation Council in Ukraine (U. H. W. R.)

All the concentration camps in U. S. S. R. are under Gulag (Glavnoye Upravlenye Lagerey) headquarters for management of concentration camps. The concentration camps administration, whose headquarters are in Moscow, is directly under the management of the Ministers of the Interior (Kruhlov, 1948[1]). The camps are divided into three main groups:

I. Compulsory
II. Regimen
III. Opened

I. The compulsory camps

The center of the compulsory concentration camp is in Kolyma. People are sentenced there because they have violated two articles:

(*a*) Article 58. Political leaders are sentenced because of their antigovernment activities, and such as traitors to the motherland. They are given sentences from 15 to 20 years. A 25-year sentence substitutes a life sentence in the U. S. S. R.

(*b*) Article 59. Criminals who possessed weapons and committed armed robberies and murders. They are given sentences from 15 to 20 years and are sent to the compulsory concentration camps in Kolyma.

Practically no one comes back alive from these camps and no one except the Ministry of Interior knows their fate. The compulsory camps are shut off altogether from the rest of the world. This means that the people are completely cut off from any communications with their families and deprived of all freedom. They do not receive any printed literature, newspapers, books, etc. They do not have the right to correspond with the outside world. They are forbidden to receive any kind of aid, such as food packages, money, etc.

II. The regimen camps

The second group of concentration camps in the U. S. S. R. are the regimen camps, whose centers are in Siberia and Ural. These camps are densely scattered throughout the U. S. S. R. beginning from Volga in the west, to the Far East. The people here have violated various articles of the Soviet codes. For example:

(*a*) Articles 58 and 59, law dated August 7, 1932
(*b*) Articles 162, 193, 72, 74, order dated December 26, 1941
(*c*) Order dated June 1941 and others.

For violation of these articles, they receive from 1 to 10 years' imprisonment. The prisoners in the regimen camps must subordinate themselves exactly to the regulations of the camp.

---

[1] Contents of this booklet deals with events up to 1948.

1. Every prisoner must work and complete his assignment although this assignment is so great that a hungry man is unable to complete it.
2. In refusing to do the work the prisoner is sentenced a second time and is sent to a compulsory concentration camp.
3. When not fulfilling the assignment of work, the prisoner is isolated, and his rations are cut. He who does not fulfill the assignment is isolated for the night. During the day he does not receive the 650 grams of bread as is assigned, but instead, for 3 days he is punished by receiving only 300 grams of bread.
4. They must strictly subordinate themselves to the rules of the day and also to the rules of personal appearance. This means they must wear the concentration camp's uniform and shave off their heads and beards completely. The only difference between the regimen and compulsory concentration camps is that the regimen prisoners may receive package from home, money, and mail. In this way they keep in contact with the rest of the world and receive material aid, although the work is the same in both camps.

III. Opened camps

The third group of camps are scattered throughout the whole U. S. S. R. from the Volga to the west. These camps are in the open. Prisoners are imprisoned here because they violated the "state articles" of the U. S. S. R. code and are given small sentences from 6 months to 5 years. These prisoners are called labor columns.

A great number of these camps are in the following industrial centers: Murmansk, Leningrad, Moscow, Minsk, Branjsk, and in the Ukrainian cities of Kharkiw and Donbas. In Kharkiw there is a tremendous transporting center where all the prisoners from Ukraine are sent. Here they are gathered into large groups and are sent to the compulsory and regimen camps in Kolyma or to the Siberian or Ural concentration camps.

These open concentration camps are not always like the compulsory and regimen camps which are directed by the Minister of Interior. They are located near army districts and are called the army concentration camps, which execute various war and army constructions.

The interior safety of the camps is carried out by the Ministry of State Security and the camps are protected by the Ministry of Interior. All prisoners are excluded from the citizen's rights. They are under the jurisdiction of the operating officers of the state security, whose head is the special adviser (Troyka) with a center in Moscow. In every camp there is the so-called operating police division organization. These organizations, especially the special adviser, investigate all important matters concerning the prisoners and sentence them without trial. No officer has the right to give mercy to the people condemned by the special adviser, not even the highest court.

Special organized zones

In addition to the above mentioned concentration camps in U. S. S. R., there are special organized zones where there are several hundred thousand and even millions of people who are deprived, not only of citizen's rights, but they are also deprived of the most basic human rights. They are forbidden to leave their assigned places of living, such as moving from one district or province, to another. They live like working cattle—always hungry, barefooted, and improperly dressed. They are people who perform compulsory work without any remuneration.

They have a love toward their own beloved country and a hatred toward the Moscow-Bolshevik exploiters. This accounts for their being sent away from their homeland, as displaced and repressed persons, to Siberian and Ural barrenness. Through difficult compulsory work their last strength is drawn out, causing mass deaths. The greatest number of such displaced persons are Ukrainians, White Russians, Lithuanians, Latvians, Estonians, the non-Caucasian and Caucasian people who refuse to be Moscow-Bolshevik slaves, and who are carrying on a fight for their liberation.

The above mentioned concentration camps and special zones can be found throughout the entire Soviet Union. The following is a description of one of the concentration camps under the supervision of the Ministry of Interior in U. S. S. R.

"UNZHLAG," MINISTRY OF INTERIOR, U. S. S. R.

"Unzhlag" concentration camp which is located near the river Unzh. This territory belongs to Tajha, and is covered with ancient forests. The southern section is located in the northeastern part of the Gorkij Province. The north-

ern section is located in the southeastern province of Kostroma. The total area of the camp is 100 kilometers long and from 50 to 70 kilometers wide. This camp was founded in the winter of 1930–31. Its first prisoners were "counterrevolutionists" and "the faithless element," who fell into the Bolshevik hands in Ukraine during the forced collectivization.

These people were gathered into groups of about 800 to 1,000 each. Then they were unloaded, and, under heavy guard, were driven into the woods. Between severe frosts and deep snow, they built tents for the guards and for themselves, covering the insides with branches and pines. Living half naked and starved they began their first compulsory work, which was to build a fence (zabor), followed by constructing barracks for the guards and for themselves.

None of the above-mentioned people returned to freedom. If, by chance, any of them are alive today, they are still in the concentration camp.

One of the first prisoners of Unzhlag, was John Shalabaj. He came from the province of Rostov, near Don. He was a Ukrainian, married, and possessed a higher education. He was a colonel of the Don Cossacks who took part in the liberation movement of the Ukrainian nation by being a commander of a regiment against the aggressors. In 1930 he was arrested. Without a trial he was sent as a counterrevolutionist, and taken, with a group of 800 men, whose cases were similar to his, from the Rostov prison, into the woods of the Unzhlag. From the group of 800 men he was with in 1930, only 3 were left by 1947. All the others died from starvation, frosts, and from difficult compulsory work. The three who were left were:

1. Majboroda, from the Province of Kamjanez Podilskyj, a Ukrainian with a higher education, single, a captain of the Ukrainian National Republic Army.

2. Mizhuckyj, Pavlo, from the Province of Rostov, Don, a Ukrainian, single, only 4 years of public schooling, a Cossack in the U. N. R. Army.

2. Sarichnyj, Vasyl Pavlovich, also from the Province of Kamjanez, Podilskyj district of Staroushezkyj. Ukrainian by birth, single, possessing a higher education and an officer in the U. N. R. Army.

All the above-mentioned individuals were captured in 1930 and put in groups of 500 to 1,000 persons each. From these groups there are left only 2 or 3 persons each. Those who are still alive have not received their freedom.

Unzhlag before 1937

Before 1937 Unzhlag was one of the compulsory concentration camps in U. S. S. R. This meant that if the prisoner refused to work, he was shot to death immediately. The prisoners were not allowed to correspond with their relatives. They were forbidden to have any contact with the rest of the world.

This concentration camp contained prisoners who violated the political codes, called counterrevolutionists. Until 1937 there were absolutely no nonpolitical prisoners. It was only after 1937 that this concentration camp became open, but with regimen. At that time they began to bring in prisoners who violated various codes and gave them various sentences. After 1937 the prisoners were granted permission to write and to receive mail from their relatives and 1 food package once every 3 months. However difficult the compulsory work was, hunger and executions for refusing to work were not altered. The condemned continued to die en masse. This situation lasted until the end of the war, 1945.

After the end of the war the Government began to save the working strength somewhat. The food rations were increased so that there weren't as many mass deaths. The executions for refusing to work were halted. Instead of being shot, the prisoners received additional sentences, such as 10 additional years' imprisonment for 10 refusals to work. The medical aid for the sick improved to some extent. The work assignments did not change. Instead the assignments increased each year a little more, hastening the prisoners' deaths.

Organization of the Camps

All the concentration camps in U. S. S. R. are under the direction of the Minister of Interior (Kruhlov, 1948).[2] Through the agency of Gulag, he directs them. Every camp is self-sufficient and is in no way tied up with other camps. These concentration camps are directed by the directory. The director is under the administration of Gulag, whose headquarters are in Moscow. The head of the directory is in charge of all the heads of the branches. There are 31 branches in Unzhlag. With the aid of the directory (informers), the head of the directory directs all the concentration camps. Each branch head has, as his assistants, leaders of the separate divisions who come under the jurisdiction of the branch leaders and the camp director. The head of the

[2] Armed Forces of Ministry of Interior are equivalent to former SS troops in Nazi Germany.

branch is the supreme head, similar to the head of the directory who controls the whole camp.

The camp occupies 100 kilometers in length and approximately 70 kilometers in width holding 31 branches and about 50,000 prisoners. The director needs these separate divisions in order to direct and control the camp. Therefore these divisions are created by Unzhlag.

Unzhlag's directory and divisions

The leader of the camp is Engineer Captain Ivanov, a Russian, who is a party member, possessing a higher education. The substitute leader of the camp is a lieutenant colonel in the army of the Ministry of Interior. His name is Abkin, a party member, possessing a higher education.

I. Division of Ocho ("Operativnoy Chekistkoy Otdel") (Operative Political Secret Division).

(*a*) Head of Ocho, mayor of the State Security, is Tjulenev, also head of the research division. He is Russian, a party member, and has a higher education.

(*b*) Substitute head of Ocho is Kulikovskyj. He is also in the research division, possessing a higher education, mayor of the State Security, and a party member.

(*c*) Mamojko, is higher in political matters. He is a higher lieutenant of the State Security, and a party member possessing medium, or high school education.

The political police numbers from 15 to 18 men. Each of these men have a military rank. The lowest ranking member is a lieutenant of the State Security.

Ocho, has, in every camp division, one official member of the Operative Political Police, an investigator, who does not have a lower rank than a lieutenant in the State Security. This investigator constantly lives in his assigned camp division and arrests all suspicious individuals. He conducts the primary investigations, reviews the circumstances and sends the arrested person to Ocho.

Ocho has a so-called central isolator (jail). The head of the isolator is the operator of the Political Police, a Lieutenant Smirnov (1948),[2] also a party member who has not completed his high-school education.

The headquarters has a court and prosecutors.

(*a*) Prosecutor jurist (first rank), Colonel Voronov (1948).[2]

(*b*) Substitute prosecutor, Captain Malishev.

(*c*) Assistant prosecutor, higher Lieutenant Maximov.

II. Second Division "YRC" (directors of the working prisoners)

The head of the YRC is a captain in the army of the Ministry of Interior, Tarancov (1948[2]). In this division there is a division of employees. The head of these employees is a lieutenant in the army of the Ministry of Interior, Poljakow (1948[2]). This division which is also known as the URC is obliged to accept the prisoners who are sent to the concentration camp. Their job is to supervise them and to be responsible for them. All prisoners who are brought to the camp are registered. The camp must have documents to identify the prisoners, telling why they are sentenced, what article they violated, and how many years they must serve. This division accepts only those people who have documents and then introduces them to the new forms, and divides them according to the needs of the camp. A thorough check of the prisoners is made. If necessary, the prisoner is transferred to another camp. No one accepts the prisoners into the camp or ever frees them without notice from this division. This division of employees sends the prisoners to the assigned camps and hands them over to its subdivisions (representatives), which are found in every camp branch with its reinforcements.

The subdivisions (employees divisions) of URC, which are found in every camp branch, are called URCH (directors of the working parts). URCH comes from the subrepresentatives and therefore it does not direct anything. Instead it carries out the orders and instructions issued by URC. The directors of the working parts can only send the prisoners from one camp to another.

III. Production division

Captain Talabajcev (1948[2]), captain in the army of the Ministry of Interior[2], is the head of the production division, located in the headquarters. This division takes care in carrying out plans sent by Gulag. For example: Gulag plans

[2] Armed Forces of Ministry of Interior are equivalent to former SS troops in Nazi Germany.

that within a specified time, Unzhlag should prepare and give a certain number of millions of cubic meters of wood, or a special assortment such as butt ends for guns, automatic machine guns, or material for aviation or railroads. This plan must be carried out. Therefore, when a plan from the headquarters arrives, the planning division replans the amount of working strength in the camp accordingly. The head of the production division and the head of the camp are directly responsible for carrying out plans which are assigned to the camp. Regardless of what may happen this plan must be accomplished. If the plan is not fulfilled, the heads of the production division and the camp itself must severely answer for it. Daily the camp's planning division reports by telephone to the central planning division, its accomplishment or its unfinished plan in the camp. The directory then reports to Gulag in Moscow. Therefore, Gulag knows every day whether or not its plans and instructions are being carried out in the camps. If the plan is not being carried out, they issue a special order. The head of the camp and the head of the production division are threatened not only with the loss of their job, but also with a sentence for sabotage. Therefore, they give their entire strength as well as using the influence of the administration and its protection for inhuman treatment of the prisoners.

Whenever the plans are accomplished or surpassed, the heads of the camp and the production divisions not only receive praises and an increase in pay, but they also receive large rewards. It's not only because of fear, but also because of personal interest that they attempt to complete orders. Although they force thousands of prisoners to attain the required quota, not one of them is responsible for the prisoners.

IV. Distribution of forest production

The camp headquarters also has a supervisor for distributing forest production. He in turn has a representative in every separate camp unit. The duty of the representative is to have all the material in the camp loaded and shipped, according to the plan. As a result of this, they have them loading groups of prisoners. These representatives are mainly responsible for the exact timing of the loading and shipping in accordance with the plan. If the work is not completed during the assigned time, or if the railroad cars are left idly waiting, they either pay an enormous fine, or are sentenced. This accounts for the fact that they squeeze out the prisoner's entire strength in order to fulfill their assigned work.

V. Division of general supplies

The head of the division of general supplies is found in the headquarters of Unzhlag. His name is Shechter, a party member, possessing a higher education. He does not belong to the Army and is a trader by profession.

It is the duty of this division to supply the whole camp with food, clothes, footwear, and the necessary tools and technical equipment which is needed by the workers, such as small wagons in which prepared wood is shipped to storage, electrical saws, handsaws, axes, tractors, and essential parts for woodcutting and electric stations. This division takes care of the general needs of the camp by having at its disposal three large bases of supplies. They are the following:

Base 1. Suchobesvodna
Base 2. Lopshanha
Base 3. Kajsk

In the fall these bases prepare and receive a large amount of food in order to keep the camp supplied throughout the entire year. Some of the products received are crops from Ukraine, fish from Astrachan, necessary manufactured goods from Moscow provinces, including Vladimir, Ivanov, and others. The supervising division in Suchobesvodna has a camp mill where the grain is ground into flour and given to the camp. Under the direction of the division of supplies, and with the aid of the division of general supplies, there is in every camp unit a dining room, bakery products store, and odds and ends store. There is also a household aid, which is a few acres of cleared forest that the prisoners use to grow potatoes, cabbage, and turnips. The gathered harvest is stored, and normally distributed to feed the prisoners.

Under the direction of the division of supplies there are the so-called agricultural camp units: 2d, 5th, and 14th. These agricultural camp units have some uprooted soil where they raise potatoes, cabbage, turnips, and carrots for the prisoners. Other products are not raised because of soil and climatic conditions.

VI. Division of capital building and repairing

The duty of this division is to build new camp units if they are needed. They also build camp zones and repair the central camp and various buildings in the camp units. In 1947 this division erected a large building in Suchobesvodna to be used as a club for the officials and nonprison workers. They also completed a new 16th camp unit which at the present time is under the command of the 3d camp unit.

VII. Homestead and domestic section

The head of this section is also in the directory headquarters. It has a reporter or an assistant for the homestead matters in every camp built. The duty of this section is to create for the prisoners a decent cultural abode of living. A sufficient number of semi-invalid prisoners, whose duties are to act as guards in the barracks, are at their disposal. While the prisoners are asleep during the night, the guards' duty is to see that the prisoners do not rob each other. During the day, as the prisoners leave for work, the guards are supposed to bring water, sweep, and see that no one from a neighboring barrack enters and steals.

Under the direction of the head of the homestead section, the headquarters has a motion-picture equipment which, according to plan, is to present a moving picture in each camp unit once a month. The central propaganda group is also supposed to put on 1 or 2 plays in each camp unit once every 3 months.

VIII. Cultural education division

In the camp's administration there is a cultural education division which has its own reporters in every camp unit. Every reporter must be a party member and have a higher medium education. His job is to conduct an agitative propganda work among the prisoners. He works closely with the operating police leader, studies the moods of the prisoners, and checks whether or not the plan assigned to the camp is carried out each day. In other words, he appears as the eye of the Soviet State. The prisoners' mail goes through the hands of the cultural education division reporter; he accepts letters from prisoners and forwards them to the free addresses. He conducts a censorship. Letters that come from the free world also go through his hands. His assistant in this work is a trusted prisoner and an artist-painter. This artist-painter decorates and paints the dining room with various placards and slogans, for example: "He who doesn't work, doesn't eat." "Work in the U. S. S. R. is a matter of heroism, honor, and fame." "More wood for the country."

Before taking the prisoners out to work every morning, the assistant to the cultural education division head reads praises to those prisoners who complete and surpass their assignment of work.

IX. Sanitation division

The administration's head of the sanitation division, captain of the medical works, an army man in the Ministry of Interior, is Edkin (1948[2]). He is a party member possessing a higher education. This division is supposed to give medical aid to prisoners. It forms a category of work for them. The work is assigned according to category. This division also conducts a fight against infectious disease. The sanitation head comes under the head of the sanitation section which is found in every camp unit and in each hospital in the camp. There are 3 large hospitals in the camp and more than 6,000 prisoners are constantly hospitalized.

No. 1. Hospital: Internal and infectious diseases, and X-ray. Dr. Rohal heads the hospital and directs a medical personnel of doctors, hospital assistants and nurses, chosen from the prisoners. This hospital has about two and a half thousand patients continuously, both prisoners and free individuals.

No. 2 Hospital: Skin division and eye and ear corps—Lapshanka. Dr. Nikonova heads this hospital. He also directs a medical personnel, hospital assistants, and nurses selected from the prisoners. There are about 2,000 prisoners as patients in this hospital.

No. 3 Hospital: Treats tuberculosis and pellagra—Sanitation City. The head of this hospital is Dr. Bohomoliv. He directs it similarly to the above-mentioned hospitals. He has a fairly large medical staff of hospital assistants and nurses. Here, more than 3,000 prisoners are hospitalized constantly. This hospital also uses X-rays.

Although all three hospitals have a good medical staff, the death rate is high. This is because they lack a proper and sufficient amount of medicine.

[2] Armed Forces of Ministry of Interior are equivalent to former SS troops in Nazi Germany.

Besides the above-mentioned hospitals, every camp unit has, along with the sanitation division, a medical-aid unit which continuously holds from 100 to 300 prisoners, depending upon the number of people in the camp unit. This number greatly increases during the winter and spring months due to exhaustion, hunger, and frost. Patients of various illnesses, such as loss of a hand or foot while working, other injuries to hand or foot, pellagra, typhus, dysentery, malaria, are found here. The greatest number of people ail from pellagra caused by insufficient food and difficult compulsory work. Although medical-aid units send the seriously ill prisoners to the above-mentioned hospitals, the death rate is still higher in these units than in the hospitals. This can be explained by the fact that the sanitation division does not receive as much of the proper mdeicine as the hospitals do. They have only iodine and aspirin here. This can also be explained by the fact that the higher leaders come here less often.

X. Transportation—Regime division

Unzhlag has its own railroad known as the Unzhlag branch, and its own transportation installation, which is eight locomotives for a certain number of cars. The Unzhlag branch starts from station Suchobesvodna. It is built from Gorky railroad on the Gork-Kirov line which runs directly north and extends for 89 kilometers. Along both sides of this railroad are built camp units. Each one of these camp units has a branch built from this Unzhlag branch railroad. These branches are known as the railroad mustaches. Food and other materials are carried to the camp units. The prepared material is brought from the camp along this Unzhlag branch and the railroad mustaches. These materials are brought to the station Suchobesvodna by the camp transports. There they are accepted by the Gorky railroad locomotives which transport these materials for distribution to the assigned places.

The duty of the transportation-regime division is to keep the above-mentioned railroad, locomotives, and cars in the exploiting state. If necessary, they are to build new mustaches, extend the roads, and renovate them. In order to keep the locomotives and cars in the exploiting state, the transportation-regime division has three stations, Suchobesvodna, a camp depot and repair shop.

Besides this, the transportation-regime division handles one personal camp train which runs systematically every day through the Unzhlag camp railroad, from station Suchobesvodna to the station called Green Field, and back. This train is called Warmly Heated or Teplushka, and is composed of the following cars: two cars strongly reinforced by metal bars on all sides, which are used to transport the prisoners from the camp units to a central isolation place and back. They are also used whenever necessary to transport the prisoners from one camp to another. There is one sanitation car which transfers the sick from the camp units to the hospitals. There are two cars for free individuals who work as guards and administration workers in the different camp units. These cars are also used by the free residents who live in the villages that are within the camp territory.

One baggage wagon distributes all sorts of baggage throughout the camp units. One mail wagon distributes mail and packages for the prisoners. Two inspector's wagons are for the traveling inspectors who prepare and transport from the bases to the camp units, food, forage, and various articles necessary for work.

This train leaves daily at 9 p. m., and returns the following day at 12 p. m. For fast connections the transportation-regime division has three small electric cars. The first is for the directors, second for the operative political police, and the third is for the protection and fire staffs.

Separate camp divisions

In the construction of Unzhlag's Ministry of Interior, the camp is broken up and separated, as previously mentioned, into 31 separate camp divisions. A site for the construction of the separate camp division is picked in the following manner: The site is in a very dense forest, near a river or stream. It must be no less than 10 to 15 kilometers around. It must be a wild forest in which there is a sufficient amount of necessary wood material, for example, plenty of birch trees for the makers of gun butt ends, automatic machineguns, plywood for the building of planes, aspen for making matches, pine for manufacturing of paper and boats, and fir trees for reinforcement of mine shafts.

All the camp units are not of standard construction. The largest districts in Unzhlag are No. 3 and No. 6. In the third separate camp division where there are at least 3,000 prisoners, there is built a mechanized service factory which prepares clothes for the army and also for the entire Unzhlag. The zone (fence)

length of the third separate camp division is 2,000 meters and the width is 1,000 meters. The sixth zone is 3,000 meters long and 2,000 meters wide. A mechanized shoe factory (leather and felt shoes) is built here. There is also a factory of watches and clocks. Remaining camp units are much smaller; the smallest is 800 by 800 meters. The majority are 1,000 by 1,000 meters.

THE CONSTRUCTION AND THE GUARDING OF THE SEPARATE CAMP UNITS

The area, one kilometer by one kilometer, is surrounded by a strong enclosure. A guard is constructed as follows: Within the area of every 30 to 40 meters there are thick, strong pillars which are dug into the ground and to which powerful cross beams are attached by stakes. These stakes are bound by wires 3 meters long and from 15 to 20 centimeters in diameter. They are planted about one-half meter in the ground and 2½ meters above the ground. With strong nails they are fastened to the stakes. To every pillar there are nailed stakes 70 meters long which are bent toward the inside of the zone thickly wound around by barbed wire. All around the zone, both outside and inside there is a so-called Brovka (ridge). This is dug or plowed earth which is raked. From the outside of the zone it is 3 meters wide. The inside is 5 meters wide. Surrounding the ridge are pillars every 50 to 70 meters, through which electrified wires run. To each pillar there are fastened electric lamps which light up the zone and ridge at night. At each of the four corners of the zone, there are towers built, on top of which are lookout posts where the guards sit. From tower to tower there is an extended wire to which dogs are tied. Every guard has his assigned area for which he is responsible. If a prisoner from the assigned area escapes, the guard is sentenced to 10 years.

Following the ridge, inside the zone, there is a pathway where the guards constantly walk both day and night. This is called surveillance service. In order to enter or leave the camp unit there is only one main gate which is always locked. This main gate has a guard. He allows passage through the gate by brigades. He always receives an advance notice as to who are included. They are those who leave for work in the morning and in the same manner, according to the list, they are permitted in again. While on duty, the guards also admit individuals who have a pass from the camp administration. Their work is very rigid. Without a pass, no one, not even the head of the separate camp unit, may enter.

On the outside, approximately 50 meters from the guards, there is a fairly large building called Vochr. This building houses the platoon guards, members of the Ministry of Interior which numbers from 30 to 80 men. This number depends upon the size of the separate camp unit and the number of prisoners. There are also several larger and smaller buildings, such as the home of the head of the separate camp unit, a club, fire station, powerhouse, tool house, and several small buildings where the free individuals live. The locations are noted on the sketch.

The inner side of the zone contains the following buildings: a main office which houses the cabinet of the chief of the operating division. The cabinet consists of the heads of the camp units. A cabinet of the substitute heads of the camp units, cabinet heads of the production division, cabinet heads of the supplies, head of the regimen, directors of the working parts, planning and norm division, and general bookkeeping.

Some of the other buildings are—the stationary, in which the sanitary division is located, bathhouse, dining room, club bakery, product storage, tool storage, barracks for the prisoners, and the isolator. All the above buildings can be found on the sketch.

Protection and their tasks

Every camp unit, as a protection against the prisoners' escape, has a platoon protection which is formed by a commander who is no lower than a lieutenant, an assistant commander of the platoon, a political leader who is a lieutenant, a substitute commander of the platoon and the "leaders" or dogkeepers who feed and train the dogs to catch escaping prisoners. Actually the dogs are feared more by the prisoners than the protection squad, for as soon as they find the prisoner's footprints they don't give up until the prisoner is found. The camp unit also has 25 soldiers.

The commander of the platoon and the political leader live in separate quarters. The others live according to the army regulations. They live in the Vochr barracks. In regard to the army training, the soldiers have very little training.

Most of the attention is centered on skill in shooting and in political education, so that the soldiers are better able to aim at the escaping prisoner, and also to prevent the soldiers from becoming familiar with the prisoners.

Platoon's weapons

The protectors are armed with light ammunition equipment. All soldiers carry German Mausers. The dog keepers carry automatic guns and revolvers while the commander and the political leader carry pistols, Tokarevs. Also the platoon has two machineguns, Dechtjarjov, which always stand prepared for action in the barracks.

The main duty of the protectors is to protect the camp unit so that no prisoners will escape. If the prisoner escapes, not only is the protector punished from whom the prisoner escaped, but the commander of the protectors and the head of the sentry are also punished. When one of the protectors shoots an escaping prisoner, he receives an award while the commander of the platoon receives praise and an increase.

Sentry service

Besides the outer protection in the camp unit, there is also an inner protection called the sentry service. This group is composed of the head sentry, head of the regimen, and four overseers, two overseers serve during the day and two during the night, in the camp unit. This service has the following duties: First to conduct investigations to see whether there is a plan among the prisoners to have a mass, group, or an individual escape. They must also follow to see whether the interior camp orders issued for the prisoners are being carried out. Secondly, their duty is to keep order. This means to watch out for murders, fights, robberies, and thefts.

Protection staff in Unzhlag, Ministry of Interior in U. S. S. R.

The protection of the camp and forcing prisoners to work is created by the army of the Ministry of Interior, Protection. Gulag, the concentration camp's administration in U. S. S. R., is directly under the management of the Ministers of Interior whose headquarters are in Moscow, where there is also a concentration camp protector's headquarters. This protection headquarters is directed by Kruhlov (1948), whose job is to direct the protection of all the concentration camps in U. S. S. R.

A protection staff for Unzhlag's protection has been created in Suchobesvodna, at whose head is the mayor of the army of the Ministry of Interior (name unknown). Unzhlag's protection staff directs the outer protection of the entire camp. It is also obliged to help the operative political police division with the inner camp security. The protection staff is divided into divisions. Every division has from 4 to 6 camp units. A whole territory is assigned to it for protection. Under the staff division the platoon guards are in every camp unit. (More detailed information about the platoon guards can be found under the heading: "Guarding of the Separate Camp Units".)

The protection staff has formed an operating division which directs operating units. These units cover the entire territory which is under the camp's supervision. In the so-called populated units, such as the villages, settlements, forests, etc., there are operating units which are formed from 2 or 3 members who are called operators. Their job is to see that no prisoner escapes their assigned territory.

Wherever the operating unit is located the heaviest, this territory is called the death zone. For 30 kilometers in width around the camp's territory, the operating unit creates an appearance of a living zone which makes it very difficult for the escaping prisoner to pass through it.

Is an escape possible?

Every prisoner from the day of his imprisonment until the completion of the longest sentence, thinks only of freedom and escape. Although there isn't a day when someone doesn't attempt escape, the total percentage of successful attempts is small. For example, for every 200 hundred prisoners who try, only 1 escapes, and that is with great difficulty.

In order to escape from the camp, either individually or in a group, one must prepare the plan of escape very thoroughly. First of all it depends upon the prisoner's state of health. A physically ill person absolutely cannot escape. Secondly, anyone who is not familiar with the neighboring territory, although he escapes from the zone, will get lost in the unknown forests. He will come upon

another camp unit or else he will come to a settlement where he will be caught. Third, to prepare for the road, one must have enough food saved to last him a few days.

Food presents one of the greatest problems in preparing an escape. Every working prisoner receiver 650 grams of bread a day which is distributed twice a day. He receives 350 grams in the morning and 300 grams in the evening. For a starving man, 300 grams of bread amounts to the same thing as a fly amounts to a starved dog. He is not only unable to hide the food but he can barely hold himself back even for 10 to 15 minutes from eating the ration with balanda soup. If anyone is patient enough not to eat the bread, which keeps the prisoner on his feet for a few days, he would lose his strength because of hunger. He would not only be unable to go through such a risky and difficult road, but after a few days he would be unable to walk.

The above-mentioned bread situation is very well known by the camp administration and protection unit. This accounts for the reason that whole packages from home are not given to the prisoner at once. If any of the prisoners ever receive a food package from the outside, the addressee is called into the shipping department. Here in the presence of the head of the regimen and a representative from the bookkeeping department, they open, inspect, and write down everything that is in the package. After this the prisoner signs, stating that he received the whole package. He is then permitted to eat as much of it as he possibly can, and the remaining food is left in the shipping department. The prisoner receives a receipt which he shows each day and receives as much as is necessary for him to eat in 1 day until the food package is finished.

In order to fully prepare the escape plan, just as with food, one also needs to prepare civilian clothing. If any of the prisoners are successful and escape beyond the zone in the camp's uniform he would be caught by the first policeman or by one of the civilian district or village administration members. Another very important item in preparing the plan for escape is paprika, chloride, lime, or other similar things used in covering or spraying footprints, as every camp unit has trained dogs which follow up footprints which are not adequately covered. Those dogs will find the escaping prisoner even though he may have made a number of kilometers. Prisoners fear those dogs more than they fear the protectors.

An escape is of tremendous importance. If one of the prisoners is able to pass through the zone during the night, he leaves behind him fresh marks on the ridge. The guard walks around the ridge the entire night with a lantern and as soon as he notices any marks on the ridge he gives an alarm signal—two shots from a gun. Upon hearing the alarm signal, the protection arises and takes with them 10 to 15 armed soldiers, dog trainers, and dogs. All of them run toward the place of alarm. As soon as it is decided that someone actually did escape, the dog trainer sets the dogs upon the footprints. As an additional help, the guard gives the dog trainers a helper with armed soldiers. The guard then returns to his post where the warned protectors await him. The posts are also all reinforced. With the remaining soldiers and the camp administration, he enters the zone camp unit and awakens all the prisoners. Together they check to find how many and who are missing. As soon as this information is ascertained, they immediately telephone the protection staff in central headquarters. Informed of the escape, the protection staff instantly alerts the whole camp, all the proctors of the camp unit, the whole operating division, all the inhabitable places. This search continues for 4 days. If the fleeing prisoner is not found, the search is halted. This means the prisoner has passed through the death zone. The staff of protectors then informs the leading searchers. They, in turn with the help of the documents, and with the pictures, search for the prisoner throughout the entire U. S. S. R.

When the above facts are taken into consideration, an escape for the prisoner is practically impossible.

Escape during time of transportation

As previously mentioned, the guard is responsible for admitting prisoners through the gate. The guards are also responsible for all the prisoners during the time that they are on the road and on the job. Prisoners who are permitted beyond the zone in a convoy, are formed in lines of two. The following words are uttered by the guard, "If anyone disobeys the convoy orders, and any attempt to escape from the convoy, we will use arms without warning." He then asks if all the prisoners understand him. When all the prisoners answer that they understand, he again instructs them to hold each other's hand and walk in the

instructed direction without turning around. The guards follow the prisoners, holding the prepared weapons. If one of the prisoners, during the time of the convoy takes one side step, the guard without any warning shoots and kills the prisoner instantly.

The smallest group of prisoners consists of 25 persons which are convoyed by 2 soldiers. More than 25 prisoners are convoyed by 4 soldiers. An individual escape during the time of convoy is impossible, but a group may escape with very few losses. For example, if a group numbering 25 persons, decided upon an escape, at a given moment everyone would run in a different direction. Then the convoy soldiers would kill only a few prisoners and the others would escape. However, an escape of this sort is not practical because the prisoners do not have an opportunity to escape very far as the alarmed protectors would immediately catch them or kill them.

IS IT POSSIBLE FOR A PRISONER TO BRIBE HIS WAY OUT OF PRISON?

Prison bribing in the camp is absolutely impossible as every prisoner is subject to a very detailed recording and severe control. Control is conducted daily by telephone, by having every separate camp unit in the evening give a detailed report to the central administration camp. The central administration camp reports the same day to Moscow. A report is given of the following information: The total number of prisoners in the camp unit, the number of well prisoners and their category of work, number of sick prisoners, invalids. This is given by groups. The number of prisoners who worked during the daytime; if someone did not leave for work, a reason is given why he refused to work. Such a severe daily control accounts for the fact that no one dare free a prisoner, for he would be given 10 years in a concentration camp or jail. If a prisoner is missing from a camp unit, the central administration must be notified the same day as to where he disappeared and what happened. For instance, when a prisoner dies in a camp unit, a commission of the following representatives is formed before his funeral: heads of the camp unit, operating division, sanitation division, working parts, and the commander of the platoon protection. The above-mentioned representatives, as a commission, verifying the prisoner's death by writing the document and certifying it by signing their names. A copy of the documents which remain after the prisoner's death are sent the following day to the central administration. After the administration receives the documents which state the death of a prisoner, he is then removed from the camp unit records.

If anyone wanted to bribe his way out of prison by saying he died, one must also bribe all the above-mentioned commission members. Of course, none of the five members would agree as they are afraid of each other. In order to bribe by saying that the prisoner escaped, the guard or the convoy head would receive 10 years in prison because the prisoner would have escaped from them and the sentry. The platoon commander would also receive a sentence. Naturally none of the above three mentioned individuals would agree to sit in prison or in a concentration camp for one or two thousand rubles. Therefore, when the above facts are taken into consideration, it is clear that the prisoner cannot bribe his way out from camp. There is, however, one possibility in bribing. There is a camp law known as Aktirovka (complete unfitness of a person to work and live, generally speaking). Prisoners must, however, be sentenced for nonpolitical matters in order to take advantage of this law as the political code sentences do not contain the Aktirovka law. A prisoner who is ill from an incurable disease can come under the Aktirovka law. The doctors' commission which is formed by the head of the hospital, head doctor in the hospital and a doctor who is a specialist in the disease that is in question, get together and write the Aktirovka act in which they state their diagnosis of the disease in detail and certify that it is incurable within the camp means. The sick prisoner, together with the Aktirovka act is immediately sent to the polyclinic in the central administration where again he passes a similar central Aktirovka commission. Here again, this commission checks on the disease and writes out a similar Aktirovka act which is sent to Moscow. If Moscow recognizes the act, the sick prisoner is then set free.

Therefore, if anyone is fortunate enough to be able to bribe both commissions so that they would diagnose the healthy prisoner as incurably ill, and write down the Aktirovka act, then this is the only way the prisoner can bribe his way out of the camp.

Changes which took place in 1948 in Unzhlag, Ministry of Interior, U. S. S. R.

Unzhlag's Ministry of Interior, from 1937, has become regimen and open concentration camps, as previously mentioned. Since that time, in every Unzhlag's camp unit, the men and women who violated various political and nonpolitical statutes live together. Nonpolitical prisoners are those who are sentenced for the following violations: Citizen's thefts, honor insult, light assault, leaving a place of employment without permission, falsifying documents, speculation, etc. All prisoners were practically on the same level. Those who violated a political statute, just as the nonpolitical prisoners, not only performed difficult compulsory work in the forests, but were permitted to hold various jobs such as specialists in the interior administrative camp matters, such as: bookkeepers, statisticians, bakery managers, dining room managers, stock product storage managers, expediters, etc.

Just at the beginning of 1948, there came about a radical change. All women prisoners were gathered and separate women camp units were formed. In March 1948, an order was issued whereby all political prisoners were removed from the interior administrative posts. No matter what sort of specialist he was, he was to be substituted by a nonpolitical prisoner. Political prisoners are to be kept doing only difficult, compulsory work in the forests. Without any questioning, this order has been carried out.

In the month of May in the same year, another order was issued. Political prisoners are to be kept separate from nonpolitical prisoners. Special camp units known as the Traitors to the Motherland units, or for short, Fascist units have been formed for them. The camp units which house the political prisoners have had their guards strengthened and the convoy guards doubled. Working norms have been increased and the regime strengthened.

[The Ukrainian Quarterly, vol. IX, No. 4]

In the Kolyma Gold Mine of Nizhny Khatynakh

(By Petro Kolymsky)

After several days of traveling by steamboat over the waters of the Pacific Ocean, there came a loud whistle as we approached the bay of Nagayevo. The crowds of criminals who had been the entire time on deck shouted together that they could see the city of Magadan. The ship began to reduce its speed and soon we felt a blow as it approached the wharf.

About 5 hours after the ship docked, they began to unload us. When we got on shore, it was late at night. We were surrounded by men of the NKVD with dogs and taken to a bathhouse on the outskirts of the city. No one slept that night, for we went through a general sanitary inspection.

Before undressing we were told that for the disinfection we should give only articles of value and throw away everything old, for we would receive what we needed in new things. Taught by our bitter experience in the Bamlag, we did not believe this and handed over everything for disinfection. After washing we went from the bath into the dressing section. As we passed a table, we were given underwear, summer clothing, and footwear, all new, so that all the prisoners left the bath with new prison clothes.

From the bath we were taken under the same heavy guard to a distribution center a long distance from the city of Magadan. We arrived at about 7 o'clock in the morning. Each of us was called by name and checked against our photographs. This center was very large and covered a large area with a great number of barracks and huts. Assigned to it was the entire group from our ship, the *Dalstroy*, and also some prisoners remaining from the preceding convoy. In the barracks there were bare bunks on which the prisoners slept without any bedding. As in Vladivostok there was a throng of ruffians who terrorized the political prisoners. They were interested in our own clothing which had been left to some, and our money. Just as on the ship these criminals were the complete masters of the camp.

On the day when we arrived, we were told that we would not remain long in this camp. Three days later almost the whole camp was transferred to the place were we were to work. It was the end of August and the NKVD was in a hurry to get the prisoners away, so as to increase the number of slaves in the washing of the gold, for the season for getting it out was coming to an end.

Among the prisoners in the Soviet jails and concentration camps there had passed from mouth to mouth the joking remark, "Kolyma, Kolyma is a new planet, 12 months winter and the rest summer." Since I imagined Kolyma as a land of eternal freezing, I was delighted with the weather which prevailed at Magadan in the third week of August 1938. In the daytime, the weather was sunny and comparatively warm. Only on the southern slope of one of the highest mountains was there a white covering of snow.

THE AUTOROAD FROM MAGADAN TO THE MINES AT KHATYNAKH

We traveled for 3 days from Magadan to the gold mines.

We traveled only by day and spent the nights in transportation points built specifically for this purpose. The majority of these looked like cattle fences surrounded with barbed wire. At each one were 2 or 3 tents without beds or bunks. The prisoners were driven into these and covered the earth with their bodies like a thick blanket.

During the 3 days we went west in autos from the Sea of Okhotsk along a paved autoroad which ran more than 600 miles to the Aldan gold mines through high mountains. The 370 miles which I covered ran exclusively through mountains and often crossed mountain crests almost perpendicularly.

The valleys of the rivers and the mountains were covered with forests and moss. The dominating tree was the Arctic pine. On the lower third of the slopes were a few scanty birches. About 280 miles from Magadan the great River Kolyma which gave its name to the country cut our road. Where it did, the river had a well-defined broad valley, surrounded by low mountain frames. Further to the west the mountain peaks were noticeably lower than on the right bank of the River Kolyma.

In Yagidna, not far from the gold mines of Khatynakh, in a broad, unforested valley were to be seen the poor vegetables of Kolyma, cabbages, beets, and squash. The local green vegetables were used for treatment against scurvy, which in the winter attacked everybody and especially the hungry prisoners who were exhausted by hard work. There was so small an amount of the whole vegetables that they were given only to the hired workmen and the prisoners were fed substitutes from the needles of a dwarf cedar called the Slanik.

THE ARRIVAL AT THE MINES OF KHATYNAKH AND THE DISTRIBUTION TO THE CAMPS

On the third day at about 4 o'clock in the afternoon, we reached Khatynakh. As we left the autos we were called by name and checked against our photographs. Many like me received new formulas of accusation. In Vladivostok my K. R. (counterrevolutionist) had been changed to K. R. D. (counterrevolutionary activity). In Khatynakh it was again altered to N. K. R. D. (nationalistic counterrevolutionary activity). We prisoners were almost completely indifferent to what accusation they fastened upon us, for the prison was the same for all. We were expecting hard physical labor with a pickax, wheelbarrow, and a spade in our hands.

They placed in a special group those whose sentences were for 15 to 25 years; I was also included although I was condemned only to 10 years. This group of 22 men were loaded into 3 autos and sent to the post of Nizhny Khatynakh. It was only when we arrived there, that we were told and saw that it was a punitive station. Unlike the central point in Khatynakh the camp at Nizhny Khatynakh was surrounded with barbed wire with watchtowers on all four corners, manned by guards with machineguns.

In the middle of the camp the commander received us and divided us into the special brigades with which we were to go to work every day. On our arrival a lot of young criminals gathered around us and began to shout at us "Counterrevolutionists, Trotskists, Fascists, Hitlerites, spies," etc. We had previously heard such epithets from the lips of the criminals, for the NKVD definitely fostered it in the camps, but we had never heard such a flow of vileness.

This went on for about 15 minutes. The man who received us paid no attention to the howling of the criminals, for, as we learned later, he was one himself. At the end of our reception a man came up to us and began to call the shouters to reason. After his remarks the shouts diminished and soon completely stopped. That evening we learned that our defender was a product of this camp and that he was a condemned prisoner but not for political reasons.

In the camp of Nizhny Khatynakh were 12 large barracks which could house about 1,500 men. Each prisoner had a sack filled with moss and a cotton blanket—this was the entire bedding of the prisoners.

DAILY GOLD-MINING LIFE

The next day at 5:15 a. m. there came a sharp whistle and the guards roused all the prisoners from their beds. Those who had their own towels washed in the yard by the barracks, and those who did not, either did not wash or dried themselves with their dirty clothes. In Magadan we had been given clothing, footwear, and underclothes but no towels. As a rule the barrack guards were criminals and murderers who had the power to beat the prisoners with rubber truncheons or wooden sticks, if they did not get up voluntarily. Then the prisoners went to the mess hall, where they received a glass of oat or barley soup without potatotes, vegetables, and fat, and a glass of unsweetened tea. At 5:45, all the prisoners went to the gate and by brigades were formed into a compact column.

The guard at the gate counted the number of prisoners sent out and on their return counted the number that came in. On passing through the gates, the prisoners went directly to the toolhouses where they received the necessary tools. Then the brigades under their brigadiers went into the mine to their assigned places.

At 6 a. m. the day shift began and at 6 p. m. the night shift. It was the end of August and the washing of the gold continued two-thirds of the day, while the water was freezing and it was possible to carry off the empty slag without gold.

Before they began work in the mine, the newly arrived prisoners were told by their brigadier that all the prisoners in the camp received an amount of food in accordance with the norm of production. For the performance of 101 percent of the work, they would receive 800 grams of bread and 2 dishes of food in the mess hall. For the performance of 121 percent of the norm, they would receive 1,000 grams of bread and an extra dish at dinner (25 grams of white bread and of a glass of sweetened tea). For 151 percent, they would get 1,200 grams of bread and an extra course twice a day. If they did from 76 to 100 percent, they would get 600 grams of bread and the ordinary food. From 51 to 75 percent, 400 grams of bread and unsweetened tea. The fulfillment of less than 50 percent would cause the transfer of the prisoner to the jail on 400 grams of bread and water. Those who were in the jail worked under armed guards and slept in the jail. The first failure to produce more than 51 percent was punished by 3 days in the jail. A second failure meant 5 days, and a third, 10 days. The fourth time the prisoner would be brought before a court and accused of sabotage.

The norms of production varied with the conditions. When the ground was frozen from 50 to 100 cubic meters, and the moving of the rock by wheelbarrows was 100 to 130 meters, the norm was 10 cubic meters of earth mixed with stones, which was about 18 to 19 tons. When the rock was moved 170 to 200 meters, under the same conditions the norm was about 8.5 cubic meters. The prisoner had to dig out the rock with a pickaxe, load it on the wheelbarrow and cart it to the place for unloading the empty slag. The frozen ground, broken up by ammonia, had its own norms. As in every field, all the steps in the production were strictly provided with norms and also with an increase of those norms for the prisoners as compared with those of the hired laborers.

Hunger is the greatest spur. It drove the prisoners to seek a larger norm, even 101 to 105 percent. No one thought of more, for the norm of 100 percent was so high that the prisoners had to work at full speed, to fulfill it.

But for purposes of deception both in freedom and in the concentration camp there was applied a system for the artificial increase of the percent of production for certain persons who in fact did no more than the others, so that they could be taken as models.

The brigadiers were mostly criminals and almost always agents of the NKVD. They did not work themselves and only saw to it that the prisoners under them worked all the time. So during the entire day, day after day, they sat in a prominent place and constantly repeated the hateful word "Faster, faster, faster." There is not a single prisoner who was not sick of hearing it. The German war prisoners so hated it that when they returned home to Western Germany, they made a film on the life of the prisoners under the title "Faster, faster, faster!" When the shouts had no effect, the brigadiers had heavy sticks or rubber truncheons with which they beat the prisoners so that they would work harder. As appeared later, these beatings by the brigadiers were so hard, that the prisoners were taken to the hospital and often died there.

The daily deepening of the bottom of the mine into the frozen earth called for the deepening of the water course and the side trenches through which the water carried off the frozen earth. This deepening was done under water with heavy iron and the work was far heavier than that in the mine. The worker was constantly drenched in the cold water, which had a temperature of 37° F. to 41° F. The work continued until 9 : 30 p. m. for the day shift and until 9 : 30 a. m. for the night shift, some 15 hours of constant work.

WORK IN THE MINES IN THE AUTUMN

Everything that could be done for washing gold in the summer of 1938 was done. The fine weather of the whole of September compelled the administration to apply new methods, for the terror and violence to the helpless prisoners led to exhaustion and fatigue which was reflected in the productivity of their work and as a result the production of gold decreased. The entire part of the valley near the river where the gold-bearing stratum was not deep was already worked out and there remained only the sections at the foot of the mountains, where the gold-bearing stratum was 8 meters deep. To remove the hundreds of thousands of cubic meters of frozen ground by the manpower of hungry prisoners and by the methods of the NKVD was a hideous nightmare. Six hundred prisoners were forced to dig 100 wells in the frozen ground to a depth of 7 to 9 meters.

After passing 0.75 to 1 meter in the rocky ground and 0.25 to 0.45 meter in gravel, it was a question of working the entire time in an icy cellar. All expressions of protest were cruelly punished. If anyone dared to protest, he was placed in a central isolator, at the disposal of the third section. After 4 to 5 days he was tried and accused of sabotage and counterrevolutionary activity. The minor cases were sentenced to an additional 10 years in prison and the most flagrant were shot. In our camp 2 men were shot during the noonday rest in the mine before some 600 prisoners. The people "imprisoned without fault" cherished the hope that they might in time be released, and so each was afraid to open his mouth, for he knew that these executioners would not hesitate about sending the prisoners to the next world.

In the second half of September the heavy freezes came at night and the temperature dropped to 5° F. to 0° F. The water regularly froze at night and did not thaw enough to wash the gold and the surface thawing of the ground almost stopped. To thaw out the newly opened gold-bearing stratum it was ordered to bring fallen dry trees to thaw out the ground. In doing this a stricter method of guarding was introduced—a definite zone was laid out in the forest, and woe to the man who lost his way in the semidarkness of the night and crossed the limits of the zone; the guard shot him without warning. This thawing of the ground continued about 3 weeks. During this time 4 men were shot in the woods for crossing the boundary of the zone in their search for wood.

All the prisoners who came to Kolyma, like our convoy, received a full outfit in Magadan. As a rule, the seasonal change of clothing was 2 to 4 weeks late. This was painfully felt in the autumn. Beginning with the second decade of August, in the region of Khatynakh, the nights were frosty and every day it became colder and colder. In the beginning of September the temperature at night went down to 16° F. and in the second half to 9° F. to 0° F.

The reduction in the gold output caused a reduction in the food of the prisoners. Along with the loss of energy in the performance of the hard physical labor, the prisoners wasted a great deal of their body energy in keeping warm. They had to work in a cold of 5° F. to 0° F. in summer clothing in the mine and the forests; the barracks and rooms too were terribly cold, for until the official beginning of winter the barracks were unheated. If the prisoners had been allowed to bring in wood through the gates, they would have heated the barracks but were forbidden to do so. The cold and the excessive 15 hour a day work in the autumn defined the situation in the winter of 1938–39. It was noticeable how all the prisoners began to waste what is called the physiological minimum, how they lost weight and turned into living skeletons.

THE KOLYMA WINTER

I can remember everything that I experienced as a prisoner but nothing has given me such a fear as thoughts of the Kolyma winter. In 1937 when I was arrested, I instinctively shuddered at that thought of this region, although in the cell there were people who knew the area. It is true that here in America I met an old emigrant who as a young man, on a mission from the Geophysical Commission, before the revolution of 1917, had passed 5 years in the Kolyma region.

When I saw him in February 1953 at an agricultural experiment station near Washington, it came out in our conversation that he was thoroughly familiar with the region.

In the neighborhood of Khatynakh, winter commenced in 1938 on September 29. On that day a light snow fell and it lay on the ground until the second half of the following May. With the snow the temperature fell to —2° F. to —22° F. In November it was —31° F. to —49° F. In December —58° F. to —81° F. In January —76° F. to —88° F. Even in the second half of April it went down to —5° F. to —13° F. and in May 18° F. to 5° F.

In the camp there were prisoners who had been in Khatynakh 6 to 7 years. They told us that winter set in every year at the end of September. The real Kolyma winter found the prisoners in their summer (and usually ragged) clothing. The torn remnants of the winter clothing of the preceding year were made use of, but there was not enough of this. So the men had to work for 2 weeks in 4° F. to 22° F. in summer clothing without gloves. Many prisoners had their hands and feet frozen. They were left in the barracks on the starvation diet of 400 grams of bread and soup once a day. The winter clothing arrived on October 13. They gave to all the prisoners who were going to work a cap, padded trousers, a bushy hat or skin jacket, felt boots, and gloves. In such a costume it was possible to work outdoors in the cold.

The heads of the camp, without any regard for the prisoners, tried to continue the washing even in the first weeks of winter. In the first half of October, they continued to warm the ground to wash the gold and used the same methods as in thawing the slag. In the second half of October, when all the water was frozen solid, they stopped the washing of the gold and transferred all the prisoners to the day shift.

With the publication of the order to stop the washing of gold on October 20, 1938, the food of the prisoners became worse for all categories lost 200 grams of bread.

All prisoners were transferred to the work of removing the upper nongold bearing stratum. Instead of wheelbarrows, large sleds were used and these held 0.1 to 0.8 cubic meters of rock. Three men were assigned to each. When it was loaded, the three men pulled it to the pulley which transferred the rock further.

THE JAIL IN NIZHNY KHATYNAKH

The post at Nizhny Khatynakh was the only place of punishment in the gold mines of Khatynakh. In the other posts no zones were set up in the mines or the forest; it was only at Nizhny Khatynakh that zones were mapped out and there was a stern order not to leave them. The other posts had neither fences nor armed guards while here a guard with machine guns was on duty all the time.

There was at Nizhny Khatynakh a unique jail where the sadism passed all bounds. This was 3 to 4 meters from a small stream in which even in summer the temperature of the water never was over 40° F. to 41° F. In summer each day at 5 p. m. a fire pump was used to force water into the jail until it covered the floor to the depth of 5 to 8 cm. Those prisoners who had not performed 50 percent of their norm were driven in here to sleep. They passed the whole night on their feet for they could not lie down in the cold water and in the morning they were sent into the mine to work. They went from the jail to work under an armed guard. Sometimes there were guards who made no comment when one of the prisoners after 3 or 4 days in the jail sank down on his wheelbarrow and slept for 20 to 30 minutes. This, however, could only be done in the summer.

In winter water was not put on the floor, for there was none, but the jail was entirely unheated. To land in it in winter was certain death. It was possible to keep awake for 1 or 2 days but on the third the man fell down and went to sleep. So as to keep warm at night the prisoners did not sleep but walked around the cell and did physical labor in the mine. When the exhausted prisoner fell asleep in the jail, he was either badly frostbitten or completely frozen and so it was in the mine. In December 1938, more than half of the prisoners in the jail were badly frostbitten and few lived until the summer of 1939.

IN THE DEATH CAMP OF THE "POST MARCH 8"

The regime with its limitless exploitation of the prisoners, the cold and the hunger in Nizhny Khatynakh brought about the middle of November a large percentage of prisoners bloated from starvation who were also suffering from scurvy.

Many of these lay in the barracks with their bodies bloated, and those whose legs festered were taken to the local hospital. Almost the entire camp was on the penal diet, for they did not have the strength to fulfill the norm and this fact increased the bloating from starvation.

In the second half of December 1938, a group of 60 men were sent to the post by the name of "March 8." All changes of location in the mine area took place after work. At 10 p. m. certain prisoners were ordered to assemble at the gate. At 10:30 four armed guards with dogs took us to another post. That night a strong wind blew freezing our faces which were covered with a thick beard as they were until the end of April of the next year. We arrived at our destination at 3 a. m. We were temporarily put in a room where there were no stoves and the temperature indoors and outdoors was the same. Exhausted by 15 hours of work and a 5-hour march on a snow-covered road, we fell asleep on the way. To keep our feet from freezing we lay down as "valets" and each prisoner put his arms around the feet of another to keep his feet from freezing in his sleep.

At 5 a. m. the whole camp was awakened, including us. We were shown to the messhall and given the same kind of soup as at the preceding post. This post was small, and including us, contained 283 men. It was very different from Nizhny Khatynakh. It was not surrounded by wire or a fence and there was no armed guard. Compulsion was exercised by the chief of the camp and his staff which was composed like the chief of criminals, i. e. those prisoners called by the NKVD as socially related.

The work was the same as at the preceding post—the removal of the nongold-bearing stratum by the use of pickaxes, shovels, and sledges. We at first thought that it was much better without the guard over us. But in the near future we became convinced that the unrestrained rule of armed thugs was more frightful than the real armed guard. That often had restrained the sadistic actions of the thugs who had the leading positions in the camp.

At the post of March 8, we saw unparalled examples of mercilessness and cruelty toward the sick prisoners. If a prisoner was sick and unable to get up, but had no medical permission (for the healthy thugs had them), the guard of the barracks and the so-called captain first beat the man with pliable sticks or rubber truncheons on his bed. If they saw that he did not get up, they took him by the hands and legs, undressed him to his underwear and threw him out into the snow and cold. In the Kolyma climate, it needed only 3 to 5 minutes to make such an undressed man a cripple or dead. Those who were thus frozen were left in the barracks until they rotted alive as a result of wet gangrene in their frozen body.

Seeing this inhuman attitude to the political prisoners, those who did get out of the barracks under their own power did so and preferred to freeze in the mine or the forest rather than suffer the inhuman treatment of finally perishing in the barracks or a room as a result of the villanous actions of the criminal elements.

The work of the prisoners in the Post of March 8 continued from 6 a. m. to 9:30 p. m. We had two meals, in the morning before we went to work and in the evening after work. For fifteen and a half hours the hungry and exhausted prisoners worked outdoors at —85° to —88° F. At that temperature, one could only keep warm by working. But to perform this work and warm one's own body, a man had to have energy. The lack of sufficient food made the prisoners take advantage of their own bodies.

In the second half of December and the beginning of January, very many prisoners turned into shadows and began to bloat suddenly but no one released them from working. They were driven into the mine and forest where they lost their strength and sank down into a hidden corner usually forever. In our mine during the two and a half winter months 14 men froze to death. Among these were Ukrainians, Uzbeks, Tadzhiks, Georgians, and Russians. When a prisoner was found still alive, he was taken back to the camp. But almost all who were not frozen to death, when they came to, were panting from fever, although it was —85° to —88° F. Of those who were found half alive, almost all died in a day in the camp.

The felt shoes distributed in October were by January half worn out and had holes. The camp had a repair shop but the same criminals were in charge there. The shoes taken to the barracks of the guards were returned in the same condition. Despite this, the prisoners were driven from the barracks to work. So in the majority of cases the actually unshod prisoners returned to the camp with frozen feet. Due to torn boots I froze the big toe on my right foot. It was still more terrible to go out to the mine without gloves, for it was absolutely impossible

to work in that climate with bare hands. You could barely work without gloves 10 to 15 minutes without freezing the fingers.

Beside the freezing prisoners there was blazing a huge fire. Around it were the brigadiers, the professional staff, and the other criminals. The political prisoners were forbidden to go near the fire. At the beginning of the winter the prisoners had rushed to the fire but the brigadier criminals broke their arms and heads. So in January no one went near the fire. The man who became exhausted in the semidarkness of the Arctic day, sat down somewhere, knowing that he would freeze but he did not approach the fire and said nothing to anybody. If he told a brigadier that he was exhausted and could not work, he would be beaten to death. Two men were especially cruel: Chelintsev and Prasolov. They beat to death far more than 1 dozen of innocent, sick prisoners.

[The Ukrainian Quarterly, vol. X, No. 2]

Daily Life in the Kolyma Camps of Death

By Petro Kolymsky

(This article is a continuation of the memoirs of Petro Kolymsky published in the previous issues—Editor)

THE PRISONERS HAVE TO SERVE THEMSELVES

In the application of the extraordinarily severe regime in the camps there were variations in the different sections in one direction or another. Though in Nyzhny Khatynakh we were forbidden to bring wood to the barracks, in the section "March 8" the prisoners fully provided the camp with fuel. There were four horses in camp, nevertheless the prisoners were forced to carry the wood from the mountains on their shoulders for the barracks, the mess hall, and the kitchen. After 15½ hours of heavy work, at 11 o'clock in the night, the prisoners were sent into the woods in the steep cold mountains. We had to cut down the trees, let them down from the mountains, and then carry them on our shoulders to the camp some 1½ to 2 miles. We got back to the camp at 2 a. m. These nightly walks took place twice a week. In spite of the night's work in preparing the fuel, all the prisoners were roused at 5 a. m. and sent to work in the mine. Besides these 2 days when the wood was prepared in the night, each camp had a certain stretch of the automobile road which during the winter had to be cleared of snow. This was in addition to the 15½ hours of work in the mine. This regime of limitless exploitation of the strength of the prisoners helped to increase the number of sick prisoners in the camp.

Being in a land far removed from equilibrium, and feeling themselves helpless slaves, who sooner or later could not endure such treatment, many prisoners committed suicide. In the winter of 1938–39, in the section "March 8" two prisoners hung themselves in the woods. Two others cut off their fingers in the mines. My acquaintance, Dmytro Altshuler, during this winter twice tried hang himself but his friends took him down and brought him back to life. In March 1939 he put his hand on the rim of a narrow wheel. It cut off the palm of his hand along with his fingers.

SANITARY PRECAUTIONS AGAINST TYPHUS

In camp "March 8" there were no baths. For more than a month the prisoners did not wash and no one spoke of baths for the feared blows. All wore dirty and torn underwear for 2 to 3 months and under such conditions the prisoners were ridden with lice. In some camps of Kolyma cases of typhus appeared. For this reason a physician came to the camp from the chief administration and made an investigation to see if the prisoners had lice.

At 10:30 p. m. all prisoners were placed in their underwear in a room and were told to take off their shirts, which were filled with lice. At 11 p. m., we were taken to a neighboring camp about 2 miles. All clothing was taken for disinfection and we were sent to wash. In the building, where we washed, it was very cold. The entire walls were covered with a thick layer of ice. There were two stoves in the place but their warmth served only to melt snow to secure water for bathing. Each of us received one quart of water with which we were required to wash our entire body.

After finishing the "dry" wash, we received our things from the disinfecting station and were taken back to our camp. We went to sleep at 3 a. m. and at 5 a. m. were roused for work. When we came back to camp in the evening at 10:30, there was another check for lice. They were found on almost all the prisoners and we were again sent to spend the night in the bath. This time the bath was occupied and we had to wait and so we got back at 4 a. m. In spite of the fact that the prisoners slept 1 to 2 hours, they were roused for work at 5 a. m. On the third evening there was another inspection and lice were found again. We were inspected 5 nights in a row and 5 nights we spent in the bath, and slept only 1 to 2 hours a night.

THE CLOSING OF THE SECTION "MARCH 8"

Hunger, severe cold, and hard work without a single day of rest destroyed the entire working capacity of the small camp. More than half of the prisoners were swollen and their skin peeled. They could not work and rotted away in the barracks. Yet the regime, in general, remained as severe as before and each day saw an increase in the number of the swollen and the dead.

On February 26, 1939, at 10:30 p. m. all who were considered able to work were ordered to collect their things and go out into the courtyard; 94 prisoners out of the total number were picked out and more than a hundred severely swollen were left in their bunks. We noticed six armed men of the NKVD approaching us with dogs. We were formed in a column of fours and marched back to the camp. None of us knew where we were going and all thought that it was to a punitive camp. At 2 a. m. we passed the chief administration and were driven on further down the valley of the little river Khatynakh.

Four miles below Nyzhny Khatynakh we saw a small hut in which there was a crew of carpenters, who had arrived the previous day. We were told that we would build here a new camp section to be named Ledyana. Conditions here were very bad. We had no housing whatsoever. So, in order to have some sort of sleeping facilities, we had to build first such a building. Under the guidance of one of the carpenters, we were sent to a wooded hill to bring out on our shoulders the necessary building materials. The trees were let down from the hill into the valley, and then 2 or 3 men carried them on their shoulders, about 1 mile to the site of the new camp.

At 3 p. m. the frame of the building to house 120 men was raised and strengthened. After 2 hours the cloth was put on and at 5 p. m. iron stoves were connected to supply some heat in the structure. The floor and the bunks were yet to be built so that night and the next we slept on thin branches with fresh needles.

THE LAYING OUT OF A NEW MINE AT CAMP LEDYANA

On the eve of the third day of our stay in this camp, 150 new prisoners arrived. Few were left to build the camp and more than three-quarters were sent to begin work on a new mine. The first step was to dig a pit down to the gold-bearing stratum after which it was possible to proceed to a primitive mechanization of the work.

In March 1939, with the forming of the new Ledyana Camp, prisoners were driven to it from the various camps of the Khatynakh area. All prisoners confirmed that in the month of March they had received more and better food, regardless of their fulfillment of norms. This was true of the Ledyana, where the prisoners were also given more and better food.

Although at the beginning of the winter the swollen prisoners were forced to work until the skin peeled on their legs, now they were left in the camp. The length of the working day at the mine was reduced to 12 hours. The "brigadiers" and foremen of the mines only saw to it that the prisoners worked the entire time, and took no account of the intensity of their work. The letup in the exploitation of the prisoners and the improvement of the food improved the physical condition of the prisoners. No further cases of swollen prisoners occurred. The swelling soon began to leave those who were swollen but whose legs showed no peeling.

It is hard to give any explanation of this change during the stay of the prisoners in Kolyma then and 14 years later. Joseph Stalin saw the results of his crimes. He destroyed N. Yezhov and laid the blame for the terror upon him. On the other hand, Kolyma produced over 60 percent of all gold and this was due to the strength of the prisoners. If the food had not been increased and the hours of labor reduced to 12, 65 to 70 percent of the prisoners

would have been lost. Their muscular energy was the basis for the securing of gold in Kolyma. Probably this was the main reason for the change in the regime and the betterment of the food allotted the prisoners in the spring of 1939.

EDUCATION AND THE CAMP REGIME IN KOLYMA

Even under the conditions of the Arctic cold, the rising of the sun above the horizon and the increase in its light quickly increased the warmth. In the second half of April there were days so sunny that the glare of the sun upon the surface of the snow aften blinded people forever. At this time all the prisoners were given dark glasses and sternly ordered to wear them.

At 2 p. m. in the open, the sun was quite warm, although in the shade the thermometer showed 12° — 6°. At night the cold went down to 22° — 13°. In the first half of May the streams flowed from the mountains and flooded the mines.

The surface of the river valleys in the Kolyma Mountains was formed of sheets of rock and mold mixed with earth. The melting of the upper layer of the mineral soil made it porous for the filtration of water.

In the whole of the Khatynakh area along with the free and hired workmen there were only one chief engineer, who had completed the course of the geological faculty of Moscow University. The rest of the personnel in charge were either semiliterate party members who had been assigned here or criminals who had completed their term and were working as free labor. When the floods came, they were hopeless.

I was working on the night shift in pumping water from the mine. A large tractor worked a huge centrifugal pump and after 8 days the level of the water in the mine had been reduced less than 5 centimeters. The water that was pumped out flowed by the flooded mine quickly sank into the unfrozen soil, and flowed back into the mine through the frozen subsoil.

In the camp "March 8," someone had told the chief engineer that I was by profession a student of soils. He looked me up in the mine and for 10 to 15 minutes asked me whether I knew the soil experts in Moscow University, Professors Vilensky, Kachinsky, Gemerling, and Yarilov. Later he met me at the pump which was pumping the water from the mine. He could not fathom why the level of water in the mine remained constant. He asked me about it as a professional and a workman constantly employed at the pump. I explained to him that the water pumped out nearby flowed beside the mine into the stony soil and upon contact with the shallow frozen base it ran back into the mine. To avoid this it was necessary to take pumped-out water from the mine to a place with a noticeable slope so that the water would quickly flow off. By lengthening the slant the level of the water in the mine began to fall rapidly and in 4 days the mine was dry.

When the mine was dry, the chief engineer came again and told me that he would ask the third section to make me the hydrogeologist of the area. Two days later he came again and told me that the third section would not permit him to use me as a professional. In my case there was a special note that I was to be used only for hard physical work. It was not without meaning that the prosecutor Kosachenko had said to me: "Don't be stubborn and give the information the prosecution needs; it will lighten your lot in exile." As I recalled those words, I did not regret losing the favors through self-incrimination to lighten my lot. What had happened to me had happened to hundreds of thousands of prisoners in Kolyma, with a higher professional education, prisoners who before death or liberation had had to deal with a wheelbarrow, pick and shovel, while the technical and economic parts of the camp were managed by the uneducated and the criminals.

THE KOLYMA SUMMER

Kolyma covers quite a large area and extends from the river Indigirka to Bering Strait, some 2,200 miles, and from the sea of Okhotsk in the south to the Arctic Ocean, a distance of 800 miles. Kolyma includes the tundra, forest-tundra, and the forest belt but gold mining is only in the forest-tundra and the southern part of the tundra.

On the shores of the Arctic Ocean during the day the sun is quite warm in summer. Where I was interned, there was no intervening period between winter and summer or summer and winter.

The transition period was marked by heavy freezes at night with quite warm days. This period was short and did not exceed 25 to 30 days. In the second half of May it was warm enough to begin the washing of gold. The opened gold-bearing stratum was frozen at 15–29 centimeters in depth. It was taken out and brought to a state where it could be washed.

The beginning of the washing season opened a new period of exploitation of the prisoners. The system of feeding the prisoners according to the productive norm was again introduced. The long hours of work were renewed and the working day was increased to 16 hours. However, the heavy 16-hour day in summer in the mines could not be compared with the sufferings of the prisoners in the winter cold. Prisoners who were in the punishment cell looked better than those who, in winter, were fed in the first category.

During the summer the weather could quickly change. There were very often years when snow fell in July and lay on the ground for 2–3 days. In 1939 there was no snow but there were heavy rains which were accompanied by a quite low temperature. Despite the heaviness of the rain, the prisoners in their usual summer clothes worked 16 hours a day though soaked to the skin. In 1939 there were 18 days of rain in a row which flooded a majority of the mines. To stop and pump out the water, the prisoners for days worked in the cold water up to their waist.

In the brigade in which I worked, there was one prisoner named Bukhyalter. His father was a German and his mother was a Jew. During World War I he had belonged to the German Social-Democratic Party and in 1916 had been sentenced to 15 years in prison. The revolution of 1918 in Germany had liberated him from prison but in 1923 as a Communist he again was imprisoned and in 1925 was exchanged by Moscow. Until 1936 he worked in various institutions in Moscow and in 1936 he was arrested and proclaimed a spy of Hitler. Since this occurred during the time of Yagoda, he was given 10 years in a concentration camp in Kolyma.

Learning that I had been connected with agronomy, Bukhvalter asked me if I knew the professor botany in Kharkiv University, Yanata. I told him that I did not know him personally but I was familiar with his scientific works. Then he told me that Professor Yanata had died May 17, 1938, in his (Bukhvalter's) arms from inflammation of the lungs.

Thirty miles from Magadan, Bukhvalter and Professor Yanata were working in a lumber camp. During the spring thaw, which warmed the valley in which the camp was located, the prisoners were forced to go from the camp to the place of work by a ford, often in water up to their chest. The water was almost freezing and in 1 day in the camp 17 men came down with inflammation of the lungs. Among them was Professor Yanata, who, as millions of others, was guilty without a crime. He had committed no crime against the people and the state, but was only a prominent scholar and a Ukrainian patriot.

With the coming of warm, dry weather, in spite of the heavy 16-hour working day in the mine, without a single day of rest, the physical condition of the prisoners markedly improved and illness and mortality decreased. The short and changeable Kolyma summer is the most delightful part of the year, which saves and prolongs the lives of hundreds of thousands of innocent prisoners who are sentenced to death. The life-giving force of the rays of the sun gives them strength and endurance to oppose death in the next winter.

ILLNESS AND MORTALITY IN THE KHATYNAKH AREA IN THE WINTER OF 1938–39

The best indication of the living conditions of the prisoners in the camps is the number of sick and dead. The heavy work, cold, hunger, and the absence of any rest were the basic causes of the high percentage of mortality in the camps of the NKVD in the Khatynakh area. In all the section of this area during 1938–39 there was not a single day of rest. For 2 years the prisoners worked 15–16 hours a day plus the supplementary labor of furnishing the camps with fuel, warming the shelters, cleaning and drying the area around the camps, and cleaning away the snow on the roads. Even on the state holidays, the October and May days, the prisoners worked 12 hours. On November 7 all the camps prepared fuel for the winter, and on May 1, they dried and cleaned up the camps. When the prisoners, brought to despair, asked for rest, the organizers of this demand were taken to the famous prison of Kolyma in the Katynakh area called Serpentinka and from there no one returned. The less active were put in jail and most of them were shot in broad daylight by the guard on the

charge of trying to escape. The rest of the prisoners, like an obedient flock of sheep, went where the armed guard drove them.

The endurance for 16–18 hours in winter in the severe cold which went to —88° and the performance of heavy work exacted from the prisoners an extraordinary loss of energy for the performance of the work and the warming of their own bodies. The indigenous population of the polar regions during the winter eats 2 to 3 pounds of seal, bear, and deer fat. This amount keeps them in strength and supports their ability to live on a certain level.

The ration of the prisoners who performed 100 percent of the norm included at most 1,500–1,700 calories. This included one-eighth ounce of fat. Butter, as the most tasty thing on the road and in the camps, was stolen by the criminals in charge of the camps. Thus, the prisoners received not more than one-twentieth ounce of fat. With this quantity of food, the prisoners during the first days of winter swelled up and died.

In the winter of 1938–39 in all the camps of the Khatynakh area there were too few physicians and almost half of the buildings of the camps were regarded as hospitals. The swelling of the prisoners from hunger and the scurvy sores which covered their bodies took out of work more than half of the prisoners of the area.

In December 1938, while in the camp "March 8," my legs swelled up and became covered with scurvy sores. Despite this, like the others, I was not relieved of work, for the skin had not fallen off my legs and my temperature had not reached 100°. I received from my family packages with sugar, salt, and onions. It was almost impossible to get rid of the swelling and the sores of my legs while in constant hunger and doing 16 hours of heavy daily work. This shows that the chief cause of the swelling of the prisoners was the lack of sufficient food in the winter. All the letters and telegrams which I sent to my family had one message—send food packages, no money. Under the conditions in the camps of the NKVD, the prisoners would not receive the money and if they did, there was nothing to buy with it. If it had not been for the food packages which I received in the winter of 1938–39, I would never have lived to the summer of 1939. I would have taken my place among the hundreds of thousands of the dead in Kolyma during that terrible winter.

The prisoners' bodies were wasting away not only outdoors but in the dwellings, especially in the huts. The walls of the huts had an icy coating 3–5 inches thick. This chilled the air and as a result it circulated throughout the entire hut. Despite the fact that two stoves burned constantly, the temperature in the huts never went above 45–48°. The bedding of the prisoners, moss mattresses and summer clothing did not furnish enough insulation and the heat of the body of the prisoners was used up uselessly. This completed the harmful influence of the arctic winter cold upon the prisoners.

THE SHADOW OF DEATH HUNG OVER THE PRISONERS

In January and the beginning of February 1939 the camps of the Khatynakh area offered a terrible sight. The hundreds of the swollen and the dead, even in the small camps of less than 1,000 men, had a depressing effect upon those who were still well. As in the other camps of Siberia, very many prisoners wrote protest letters against their unfounded conviction and asked for a review of their cases. They did the same at Kolyma when they lost hope of enduring the sentence. The specter of inevitable death wound itself around the souls of all the prisoners in Kolyma. Men who were working in the mines for 16 hours a day were dying. To get out of the mine meant a possibility of salvation from death and many prisoners resorted to self-mutilation. Cases where the prisoners cut off their fingers were reported in almost every camp in the area.

To explain these acts of voluntary mutilation and the psychosis of death which dominated the prisoners, I will give the mortality in certain camps of the Khatynakh area for the winter of 1938–39.

At the post "March 8" from the beginning of December 1938 to February 26, 1939, out of a total number of 283 prisoners, 81 died; i. e., 28.3 percent of the total number of prisoners. The prisoners died in the camp; therefore, every prisoner knew the number of dead. According to the statements of Dr. Koali (who before his transfer to the mine had been the head physician of the area) at the camp Central Khatynakh, of a total number of 1,390 prisoners, 216 died; i. e., 16 percent. At the camp Nyzhny Khatynakh, of 1,240 prisoners, 402 died; i. e., 32.4 percent. The same phenomenon was observed in all the sections and camps of Kolyma.

These figures show what suffering went on during the regime of Yezhov until May 1939, to kill 65–70 percent of the prisoners. And if we take into account that 97–98 percent of the prisoners had committed no crimes against the state and were innocent victims of the bloody Communist terror, the diabolical savagery of Joseph Stalin, who drove millions of innocent people to certain death, becomes frightening.

The question involuntarily rises: Why and in the name of what ideals were these millions of innocent people sacrificed? Did the man who ascribed to himself basely and shamelessly all virtues and the finest human feelings for the sorrow of others and the most talented mind not know about this? When we were taken from Kolyma for a review of our cases, a Ukrainian named Bublik, who lived in Central Asia and had been arrested, was with me in the same compartment of a Stolypin prison car. He said: "If Stalin knows of this and approves it, he is the greatest monster in the history of humanity; if he does not know about it, he is a fool, who has no right to be a dictator. We cannot lay all blame on N. Yezhov."

THE GRAVES OF THE DEAD WERE LEVELED AND COVERED WITH MOSS

The catastrophic mortality of the prisoners in the winter of 1938–39 made it impossible to bury them in the winter and the bodies were left until spring. Because of the constant freeze, it was hard to dig a pit even in summer, because the ground was frozen at a depth of 20 to 30 inches. In winter the ground froze to the very surface and this made the digging of pits more difficult, although both winter and summer explosives were used. The general weakness of the prisoners and the great mortality forced the bodies of the dead to be kept in sheds. In camps of my detention the dead lay in tiers until April or May. During these months broad pits were dug 3 to 5 feet deep and 25 corpses were put in each. They put a metal tag on the foot of each corpse and thus registered death.

The dead bodies were buried about 3 feet deep, and were frozen even in the summer and therefore did not decay. Because of the eternal frost it might be possible 100 or 1,000 years hence to find the remains of these great martyrs. If conditions change, the families might find their dead and take them back to their own lands.

Every precaution was taken, so that no one could find the place of burial. The brigades which buried the dead in Nyzhny Khatynakh, were given special instructions: To cover the graves so that in filling them the surface of the ground would be level; then to cover the place of burial with moss and plant trees on it. This shows that the NKVD very deliberately dug the graves for the dead prisoners in Kolyma, for these victims of Bolshevik brutality.

[The Ukrainian Quarterly, vol. X, No. 4]

Past and Present of Kolyma's Mines

(By Petro Kolymsky)

(This article is a continuation of the memoirs by the inmate of the Kolyma concentration camps, published in previous issues.—Editor)

Berzin, a Lett by nationality, and one of the former chiefs of the Kremlin security guard, was appointed in 1929 representative of the NKVD in the Kolyma district. Under his direction, the first geological surveys, after the discovery of the gold-bearing strata and the first washing, plants were built by the hands of the first prisoners in Kolyma. The city of Magadan and the automobile road from Magadan to the Adanski gold fields were built. Each year more and more prisoners were sent to Kolyma and set to mining gold. At the end of the Berzin administration, Kolyma held the first place in the production of gold.

Taking advantage of the relatively liberal policies of the NKVD up to the period of Yezhov, Berzin introduced the method of pay for work in the Kolyma camps, and though it was forced labor this gave the prisoners real incentive. At a time when the workers and members of the kolhosps in freedom were ragged and hungry, the prisoners in Kolyma were fully assured of clothing and food. Each prisoner could buy in the camp stores an unlimited amount of articles of primary importance when in freedom people had cards by which they

could secure only 200 to 500 grams of bread. The prisoner, who was an average worker, made 1,500 to 1,800 rubles a month in summer and 1,000 to 1,200 rubles a month in winter.

Both summer and winter all the prisoners had a healthy appearance and were able to do the extremely heavy work of gold mining. The amount of the work of each prisoner during the Berzin period was 3 or 4 times that of the prisoner in 1938–39. The mortality was quite insignificant. All who finished their term in Kolyma up to 1937 had earned good money and, upon their release, took it home with them.

THE REPLACEMENT OF BERZIN BY GARANIN

In the period of uncertainty, when in the entire U. S. S. R. the leaders were falling from the Communist Olympus into the abyss, Berzin, the boss of Kolyma, fell headlong from the heights of the NKVD ladder. In Novembrr 1937, he was arrested and proclaimed an "enemy of the people." He was accused of being the organizer of an anti-Communist Party among the prisoners in Kolyma, so as to tear Kolyma from the Soviet Union and give it to Japan. He was accused of spying for Japan. He was also condemned for bettering the working conditions of the prisoners in the concentration camps in Kolyma as compared to the workmen in freedom.

The arrival of Garanin, the new boss of Kolyma, was marked by an incredibly savage terror against all the prisoners. Without exception, all prisoners who had been condemned for political reasons, were given new terms of imprisonment. They were charged with the crime of forming counterrevolutionary organizations so as to tear Kolyma from the Soviet Union, though they were under the constant supervision of the NKVD. The prisoners were accused of sabotage, diversion, and economic counterrevolution as a result of which, Kolyma had not completed its planned quota for the production of gold. The more fortunate received additional terms of imprisonment, up to 10 years each, and many fell into the prison of the Serpantinna. In the second half of 1937, prisoners who had been condemned for political activity were not released from the camps, even though they had completed their terms. In Khatynakh, I met a man of 69, a former prominent SR and a responsible deputy of the old, prerevolutionary Petersburg, who had been in prison since 1922. In September 1939, he received an additional 5-year prison term and he did not expect to live to see the end of this term.

THE KOLYMA PRISON SERPANTINNA

Berzin was accused of Trotskism and like the prominent Trotskists in Kolyma, he was thrown at Khatynakh into the Serpantinna prison. Almost no one left this alive. Tortures were inflicted upon the prisoners along with the breaking of their arms and legs. The victims were seated in wooden boxes with sharp nails sticking out of all sides and kept there for days at a time. Bound prisoners were roasted in a fire. Without exception, all were savagely beaten. As a rule, prisoners incriminated themselves so as to avoid the serious physical tortures before being shot.

To deaden the groans and curses of the men under torture, the investigators of the NKVD sang various songs over loudspeakers. From those who had survived and worked with us, we could learn nothing of the institution which imposed death sentences upon its victims. According to the testimony of prisoners who had served their sentences, the shootings in the Serpantinna went on often all day and night in a deep mountain ravine. Three heavy tractors of the NKVD stood by and the sound of their motors deadened the sound of the shots. In 1938, there passed through the Serpantinna tens of thousands of prisoners, who had come to Kolyma with fixed prison terms and had not completed them. Perhaps of the thousands, 1 or 2 remained alive and were sent back to the camps but the others were annihilated.

THE FALL OF GARANIN

In spite of the severe isolation of the convicts from the outside world, all the changes which took place among the heads of the U. S. S. R., came to us prisoners, even if belated. On January 27, 1938, when we were at the station "March 8," we knew of the fall of N. Yezhov and his replacement by L. Beria. With this change was connected the relaxation of the conditions of life for the prisoners, which I mentioned in the previous article.

Garanin was appointed at the end of 1937, when the importance of N. Yezhov was at its height and so it was very natural that the new Narkom L. Beria

deposed Garanin as an appointee of Yezhov. After a year and a half of his rule in Kolyma, Garanin had killed by cold and hunger about 250,000 men, who actually had been arrested without being guilty and sent to Kolyma. During the winter of 1937–38 and half of the winter of 1938–39 great masses froze at Kolyma. Very many of these died. Even a slight freezing produced an army of over 60,000 invalids among the prisoners.

In the spring of 1939, Garanin was arrested and proclaimed "an enemy of the people" and a Japanese spy. Everything that he had done in Kolyma with the knowledge of N. Yezhov and J. Stalin was ascribed to him as his own crime. The catastrophic fall in the productivity of the work of the prisoners in the camps of Kolyma was caused by hunger, which prevailed under the regime of Garanin. The incredible losses from sickness and the high mortality of the prisoners, up to 500,000 to 600,000 were replaced by new prisoners, but they could not maintain the level of gold production of the earlier years under Berzin. In 1938 there was much less gold secured than in 1937, although the total number of prisoners was three times greater than in the preceding years.

When Garanin was arrested, it was clear to us that the cause of his arrest and shooting was not the death of the hundreds of thousands of innocent men during these 1½ years, but the drop in the gold production. The liquidation of Garanin unquestionably was a factor in the alleviation of the fate of hundreds of thousands of prisoners, although the regime as a whole underwent almost no changes in the camps in Kolyma.

About 200,000 prisoners under Garanin received supplemental terms of prison in Kolyma, each of 10 years. No one gave any indication whether these new terms imposed by Garanin would remain in force or be annulled. Just as the first accusations and condemnations, so the second sets were the product of the diseased imagination of the NKVD. In both cases, the absolute majority of the prisoners had never belonged to any antigovernmental parties or organizations, had committed no crime against the people and the state. They were people who had accepted loyally the decrees of the Government and considered it their duty to fulfill them. As for the usual group of prisoners, who were transferred to the category of political prisoners and received new terms of imprisonment, most were pretty criminals and murderers, who had no interest in political affairs.

FREE TODAY, ARRESTED AGAIN TOMORROW

The second time I fell into the punishment section of Nizhny Khatynakh, there was in the same brigade with me, a prisoner by the name of Evert. As a freeman, he had worked as a miner in the Donbas. In 1935, he was arrested and sent for 3 years to Kolyma. He was accused of counterrevolutionary propaganda and like the other prisoners with short terms of imprisonment, he received under Garanin another 10 years in the Kolyma prison.

In July 1939, Evert completed his first term. He was called to the central office and informed that he had completed the legal term of imprisonment and was free. Evert then replied that he had been given a supplemental term of 10 years. He received the answer that the second term given him in the camp had not been confirmed.

During my imprisonment in Kolyma, I knew only this one case (Evert) when the supplemental term of imprisonment was canceled. So, we must admit that the Garanin sentences had been annulled, although the heads of the camps did not inform the prisoners of this fact.

The people, freed from imprisonment in the Kolyma conditions, were only formally counted as free. They actually continued to live the life of prisoners. When anyone was released, he was told that there was a long waiting list for the steamship and so he would have to work "as a free laborer" for 1 or 1½ years. These "free laborers" lived in the camps but were not guarded. They went to work with the prisoners. Many quickly found themselves again behind the barbed wire as prisoners. Evert, as a trained miner, on his release obtained the post of a foreman. He no longer worked with a wheelbarrow but he was with us in the mine. Three weeks after his release, he was again arrested and placed in the isolation ward. He was accused of poor work while a prisoner and of stating among the prisoners that he had not dug gold in Kolyma and would not look for it. He was condemned by a show court in our camp. The regional procurator of the Far Eastern country asked for 10 more years of imprisonment. At the end, the accused was given the opportunity to speak. He began by saying that his grandfather, father, all his brothers and he himself had been working miners; that he, Evert, with arms in his hands had fought for communism;

for this he had been given the order of the Red Banner. That as a workman, when he was free, he had committed no crime against the state and the people and had been the victim of slander and lies of hostile elements, to which the NKVD had listened and as a result of this, he considered and considers himself innocent and has no reason to confess his crimes in the Kolyma concentration camp. He demanded from the court either the death penalty, to stop further sufferings, or freedom.

The court acquitted Evert and he again became a foreman. This shows that the chief object of the NKVD was to hold people as long as possible in the cold Kolyma wilderness, where free people refused to go for any money. However, there are two ways to do this: (1) After release make them wait for years for transportation from Kolyma and (2) give the prisoners new additional terms. When Evert was released for the first time in July 1939, I thought that he would leave for home. I wrote my wife Evert's home address in Stalino-Donbas and told her to go to Stalino and he would tell her about the prison life in Kolyma. When I was free and home with my family, in May 1941, I wrote a letter to Evert's wife in Stalino and she answered that he had not returned home and she did not know when he would come. From the time of his second release in August 1939 to May 1941, it was 1 year and 9 months and his turn had not yet come to depart. In a month the war began and there is no doubt he did not return before the end of the war.

THE COMPOSITION OF THE PRISONERS IN THE CAMP OF NOVY KHATYNAKH

The second All-Union census of the population of the U. S. S. R. was made twice. The first in January 1937, I was in freedom with my family. The second time in 1939, I was in Kolyma in the concentration camp of Novy Khatynakh. The census was taken by the prisoners in our camp and so we all knew the figures. The census of the prisoners in the camp of Novy Khatynakh showed that 87 percent had received higher technical education. They were people of intellect, but fate had assigned them to pushing a wheelbarrow and using a pick and shovel, while the uneducated ran the camps. Most of the prisoners with higher education were the products of the Soviet period. They had received state scholarships during their studies and had prepared themselves for independent technical work. The money and time spent on their education had been wasted. These people were ill-adapted to perform the extraordinarily heavy work and most of them lived on punishment fare. Evenings after their work, they wandered around the refuse pit and picked up the leavings from the prisoners' kitchen. They were first candidates for the fatal swellings.

Unlike the former years, there were in all the camps and especially in those in Kolyma, a goodly percentage of Communists among the prisoners. According to the data of the census of 1939, there were 34 percent of former members of the party in the camp of Nizhny Khatynakh. More than two-thirds of these had taken active part in 1917–20 on the side of communism. The majority had high decorations of one of several orders but this had not saved them from the prison which they had introduced. Up to the day of their arrest, they had been condemning and sending to prison camps totally innocent people, peasants, intelligentsia, and workmen. When they supported the general trend of Stalin, the terror in the country and the opening of prison camps, not one of them supposed that the time would come when he himself would fall prisoner into such a camp.

Their appearance and conversation revealed the national composition of the prisoners. The most common form of speech in the camps of Kolyma was Ukrainian. Of other nationalities, there was a large number of Caucasians and peoples of central Asia. The data of the prisoners' census in 1939, in the camp of Nizhny Khatynakh, shows the quantitative composition of the different peoples in the camp. According to the census there were 39 percent of Ukrainians, 17 percent of Caucasians, 23 percent of the peoples of central Asia, and the rest were Russians and of other nationalities.

LINKS WITH THE OUTSIDE WORLD

In the camps in Khatynakh, the prisoners had the right to carry on unlimited correspondence with their relatives and to write requests for a review of their cases. However, it was impossible to secure even a scrap of paper and an envelope, so the prisoners could write only 1 letter every 6 months. Paper was not sold or given away in the camp office or in the prisoners' store. To communicate with one's family, the prisoners had to use paper bags or tear off scraps from paper packages. As a result, many prisoners lost contact with their families.

Quite a few prisoners, when they found a scrap of paper for the first letter, asked their families to send them in each letter an addressed envelope and a sheet of paper for an answer. I did this and my family sent me always in each letter an addressed envelope and paper and so I maintained a regular contact with them.

To get the scrap of paper sent, it was necessary to give to the criminal or murderer, who brought the letter, a day's supply of bread for each sheet of paper and envelope. Otherwise, he took the paper from the letter addressed to me and sold it to other prisoners.

When I reached Kolyma, I had a few rubles. To inform immediately my family of my arrival, I sent them a telegram saying: "I am in Kolyma, alive, well. Send packages, money."

The usual mail connections with the U. S. S. R. were only from May to December, when airplanes flew between Vladivostok and Magadan. From the beginning of December to May, the Sea of Okhotsk was covered with thick ice and ships could move only with the aid of powerful icebreakers. These were used for other cargoes but not for prisoners' mail.

Letters from home could be sent by airmail but prisoners were forbidden to use it.

From time to time my family sent me in winter telegrams with a prepaid answer and I replied briefly how I was.

In Kolyma we were forbidden to read newspapers and the free laborers who worked in the camp, did not have the right to throw away used newspapers, they had to be burnt. We were completely cut off from the outside world and could learn the news only from new prisoners. In August 1939, in the camp of Nizhny Khatynakh, a loudsp aker was placed near the gate. But even after that we were forbidden to read newspapers.

THE POSSIBILITY OF ESCAPE FROM KOLYMA

In the Camp Ledyana, I met Zelinsky, a captain of the Pacific Ocean commercial fleet. He was a comparatively young man, who had been several times in the western ports of America and had friends there. His wife lived in Vladivostok and wrote that his friends from San Francisco often visited her. Zelinsky knew well the coast of the Chukotsk Peninsula and proposed to me and two other prisoners in April 1939 that we flee to Alaska.

We asked him how we could cross Bering Strait and he assured us that he knew well the Chukohi who would take us across. Our chief problem was to collect hard bread. This was a serious problem in the camp. A prisoner received only the food that he ate. Everything that he hid in his clothing or his bed disappeared without a trace the next day. It was at once stolen. In spite of these difficulties, with the aid of a physician, we obtained one day biscuits instead of bread. We bought more from several prisoners and thus had 5 pounds of dry bread, which under prison conditions was a great treasure.

Only we four prisoners knew of our plans. One of us, as a result of carelessness or because of fear turned a provocateur. In a few days Captain Zelinsky was transferred and 3 days after his transfer, I was taken to the punishment post in Nizhny Khatynakh. As I later learned, it was almost impossible to escape from Kolyma. The native population, which did not value gold, would give up their own children for 50 to 100 cubic centimeters of alcohol.

Making use of this weakness for alcohol among the native population, the NKVD announced that they would give 5 liters of alcohol for any prisoner caught. This was such a high reward that there was not a single native who would refuse this amount of alcohol and have mercy on a prisoner.

In September 1939, I met a group of 5 men, former army officers between the ages of 25 and 35, who had been sent to Nizhny Khatynakh after an unsuccessful attempt. All were of the central command unit of the Kiev military district and in 1937 had been proclaimed "enemies of the people." Each had received 15 to 25 years of imprisonment. Actually this meant life imprisonment.

They chose the most favorable time for escape under the conditions of Kolyma—the second half of August. There was then no problem of food, for nature furnished plenty. The moss, woods, and even the rocky peaks of the mountains had enough berries, mushrooms, and cedar berries.

These 5 bold army officers wandered into the forest tundra for 21 days. The entire wooded area of Kolyma is covered with a layer of moss 2 to 3 meters deep, which thaws in August to quite a depth. This gives the moss an extraordinary springiness, and it is very hard to walk on it. The first days they

made only 6 to 7 miles. Their feet began to ache them. The next days they could go only 2.5 to 4 miles a day. The rocky summits of the mountains lacked the moss. So they were compelled to continue their way through the woody and mossy ground. They wandered 3 weeks in the woods. Their clothes were torn to ribbons in the thick growth; their bodies were scratched until they festered and finally they had to go out upon the automobile road and wait for a passing auto to take them back to the concentration camp. This ended the attempt of the five officers to escape. Almost no one, even the most desperate murderers and criminals ever fled from Kolyma. They had no hope for success. It was very easy to leave the boundaries of the Kolyma camps, but very difficult to find the desired haven.

[The Ukrainian Quarterly, vol. XI, No. 2]

The Return From Kolyma

(By Petro Kolymsky)

STALIN THROWS SAND IN THE EYES OF THE PEOPLE

At the end of 1938 the terroristic machine of communism was working so swiftly that in the next 1½ or 2 years, it would have put more than half of the citizens of the U. S. S. R. behind prison bars. The man, who for 3 years in a row had stimulated and speeded up its movement, now stopped before a menace to himself and the existence of his dictatorial regime. He had first to slow down and greatly check the course of that terroristic regime. His first act was to remove N. Yezhov from his post as Narkom (People's Commissar) of Internal Affairs of the U. S. S. R.

The press, which had played a special role in the development and growth of the terror, sharply changed its policy and began to look for criminal intentions in the machinery of the NKVD itself. Immediately after the removal of N. Yezhov, articles in the press began to speak of "enemies of the people" in the machinery of the NKVD. In November and December 1938 the case of the Moldavian NKVD was discussed in the press of Ukraine. My family sent me to Kolyma clippings from the newspapers which included accusations against the machinery of the NKVD. They said that "enemies of the people had wormed their way into the organs of the NKVD and were there carrying on their damaging work." All that the NKVD had done by the orders of Stalin, now recoiled on their own heads as a self-initiated, harmful act.

The papers wrote the real truth that the NKVD had arrested innocent people and by incredible tortures and abuse had compelled them to make unjust confessions of belonging to nonexistent organizations and then had condemned them to punishment and exile in concentration camps.

To deceive the people, in addition to these inspired trials of the machinery of the NKVD, the Government set up an institute of members of the NKVD in the districts with full powers to busy themselves with reviewing the appeals of the persons arrested or of their families. But as it was soon seen, this was only a great sham and in fact the NKVD continued to carry on its terror, although on a smaller scale. It tried at all costs to justify the actions of the investigating machinery of the NKVD of the previous period. When articles on the "branding" of the NKVD appeared in the press, the families who were at liberty, began in the name of persons arrested, to appeal for a review of their cases. In their petitions to the effect that the NKVD had applied tortures in the examinations and had compelled the prisoners to confess uncommittted crimes, these new guardians of justice considered this a slander on the NKVD and threatened them with arrest. Just as it had been prior to 1939, so in 1939 came the assertion that "the NKVD was not mistaken."

When relatives presented appeals in the name of the prisoners, they were summoned and shown the signatures of the prisoners written in their own hand under their confessions. The investigators of the new officers of the NKVD brutally attacked the relatives and accused them of hiding the true "enemies of the people." In this they relied upon isolated cases of releasing prisoners from confinement. With the passage of time and the approach of war, the number of those released began to grow noticeably and finally included those who, for various reasons, had an unfinished case and yet were in the prisons.

MY CONSTANT PROTEST AGAINST UNFOUNDED ACCUSATIONS

From the first day of my stay in a concentration camp, I began to protest against my illegal and unfounded condemnation and I demanded a review of my case. During 1938–39 I wrote 19 appeals to various institutions in Kiev and Moscow. My family typed 100 copies of my statements and constantly kept sending them to various bureaus and to highly placed persons. All these statements and appeals piled up in the NKVD Ukrainian S. S. R. and formed a mountain of papers which even the NKVD could hardly get through. The investigator Babichev handled my case. In answer to my wife's request for a reexamination of my case, he answered that "a man who is really innocent, has long ago been released." As a proof, he cited the case of Nikitin who had been liberated from the Birobidzhan concentration camp in July 1938.

Persons at liberty crossed the threshold of the NKVD in fear and trembling and most of the appeals were taken to safer places, where there were fewer chances of the arrest of the petitioner. Such places were the offices of the army and republic procurators and the presidium of the Central Executive Committee of Ukraine. While in the concentration camp, I had no clear picture of the Ukraine in 1938 and I asked my wife to go to Moscow to the office of the procurator of the U. S. S. R., A. Vyshinsky.

In 1938 my wife received from Stuchek, the procurator of the Kiev military district, three refusals saying: "There is no reason to review the case of your husband." My wife wrote to me of this but even then I still continued to make appeals. One of them, directed to the head of the Central Executive Committee of Ukraine, was given to the pardon section, which informed my wife that I had not asked for liberation but merely for amnesty. In a second declaration to that section, I wrote that "I had committed no crime and would not ask for pardon from them."

In the concentration camp where life hung upon a hair, I did not try to win trust and justify myself by acting like a slave. I worked like all the other prisoners and never thought of "atoning" for my faults (which I had not committed) by hard prison work. Perhaps my conduct was influenced by the support and real help of my family, especially my sister-in-law, who at the risk of her own liberty and perhaps her life, wrote me encouraging letters.

THE DEPARTURE FROM KOLYMA

On August 28, 1939, I was ordered to take my belongings and report to the command post of Nyzhni Khatynakh. I had nothing to pick up, for I had only what was on my back. The overseer of the camp, himself a prisoner but condemned for theft, told me that he had personally seen a telegram with instructions to take me to Kiev at the disposal of the NKVD. He was from Kiev and gave me the address of his parents whom I was to contact upon my release from prison. An armed guard accompanied me to the central command post. After 2 hours my name was called and I was asked whether I knew how to lay water pipes. I answered that I had never done it and that I had been brought here to be returned to Ukraine. The rascal smiled and told me that I would see Ukraine just as I would see my own ears. Instead of Ukraine, I was sent to a forest squad to cut wood.

I worked in this forest squad until September 6 and then was sent back to Stan-Khatynakh. For no reason whatsoever I was placed for 5 days in the brig (kartser), although I worked in the woods like the other prisoners. After leaving the brig, I was again sent back to Nyzhni Khatynakh. Everyone in the camp thought that I was well on the way back to Ukraine and were much surprised to see me returned, among them the overseer of the camp. He promised to find out the cause of my detention and 2 days later told me: "The third section of the gold mine of Stan-Khatynakh asked Moscow by telegram if I had been really summoned to Kiev for a review of my case."

The camp NKVD had my personal record which made me appear a dangerous political prisoner. They also had my record in Kolyma which showed that I could not be bent on the NKVD anvil. Violence toward myself and more so toward the other prisoners I answered with a sharp protest which had not escaped the ears of the NKVD. For this reason the third section could not conceive of my return for a review of my case. The journey itself from Kolyma, even if a prisoner was not released, was a great joy to a man. Just like the hundreds of thousands of the prisoners in Kolyma, I wanted to leave as soon as possible this cold waste. In the depths of my soul, however, I did not believe such a miracle possible. So I quietly accepted my fate and without fear con-

tinued to do the hard work of a prisoner. On September 15, 1939, I received three packages from my wife and I had to find some way of keeping them for the winter. The overseer of the camp agreed to help me.

On September 17, 1939, at 11 a. m. I was again taken from my work in the mine and ordered to the camp. The overseer met me at the gate and told me that this time I would certainly be taken to Kiev. My joy knew no bounds. Most of the articles that I had received in the packages I distributed to the sick prisoners in the hospital. An NKVD man took me to the main administration building. This time I was called quickly and sent to the transfer point of the mine administration, where I found five prisoners in the same position as I. The following day we were officially told that we were leaving the Kolyma camp and could take from our account the money which our families had sent us. The money had been lying there for years but they had never given it to us or told us that it was there. Remembering the journey on the steamboat to Kolyma, I did not want to take the money with me, and I asked the authorities to return it to my wife in Kiev. At the moment when I gave these instructions I completely forgot that it would greatly disturb her, for money sent was returned only in the event of the death of a prisoner.

On the third day we six prisoners were placed in an open truck and sent to the city of Magadan. The summits of the mountains along our way were already covered with snow. The temperature was 10–0° F. at night and 15–20° F. during the day. We were attired in our summer prison clothes and practically froze. A shelter had been made of a blanket for the two NKVD men who accompanied us but we prisoners were not allowed to get under it. During the 2 days of travel we huddled together and so kept from becoming frostbitten and frozen. When we reached the seashore, we found warm autumn weather in Magadan, and until we boarded the steamship we sunned ourselves well.

October 1, 1939, we were loaded at Nagayevo on a steamer. There were on board 52 prisoners, and more than 2,000 persons who had finished their term of imprisonment and had been working for some years "at hired labor," waiting for their turn to leave Kolyma. The trip was very good in comparison with our passage to Kolyma. In the hold, where previously some 1,000 men were packed, there were only 52 of us. Every day we were permitted to go twice to the upper deck. In the Sea of Okhotsk a bad storm raged for 2 days and both the prisoners and the guards became seasick. On leaving the Sea of Okhotsk, the weather became quiet, and it was very pleasant to be even for a short time on the upper deck, from which we could see the limitless expanse of the ocean dotted with white sailed boats of the Japanese fishing fleet.

On the 8th day of our journey, we reached the Golden Horn Harbor at Vladivostok and there disembarked. Everyone felt happy that it was a reality and not a dream that we had left Kolyma.

THE CAMP OF VLADIVOSTOK AND THE TRANSFER PRISONS OF THE SIBERIAN RAILROAD

In 40 to 50 minutes after we had landed, 2 trucks picked up the prisoners and took us to the transfer point on another river. In August 1938 there had been about 30,000 men in this camp, but in October 1939 there were only about 2,000. These were the protracted remaining cases awaiting investigations.

In part of the camp there were many persons who were free and had either returned from Kolyma or were going to Kolyma for "voluntary" work for wages. In 1938, however, there were almost none of this type in the camp. The falling off of prisoners had caused the increase of "voluntary" employment of workers in Kolyma. While being taken from Khatynakh to Magadan, we passed dozens of cars going from Magadan deep into Kolyma, carrying the families of these "voluntary" workers. At one of the halts, these people told us that by a mutual understanding they were going to work with the NKVD economic organization, Dalstroy. Unfortunate men. Their lives would differ little from that of the prisoners.

Life in the transfer camp was better and easier than in 1938. All the prisoners had a place in the barracks. When it rained they did not get drenched outdoors, as in the preceding year, and the food was better. Among the prisoners destined to the camps in Kolyma, there were many who had been condemned by the military commission of the supreme court to long-term sentences in isolation camps. Many were former high-ranking army officers as revealed by their cloaks. Some were bold and daring persons who bitterly attacked Stalin and his stooges. They publicly averred that there was still no order in the country and would not be while "the dregs of human society" ruled, for they regarded nothing prohibited or sacred.

At the end of October, all the prisoners whose cases were under review were photographed and fingerprinted. The following day part of us were sent to the railroad station. We were placed, seven men in a compartment of a Stolypin prison car. Beside the prisoners from Kolyma some prisoners from the Vladivostok prison were put in the car. Our car was attached to a train going to Irkutsk. The journey of several thousand kilometers lasted 6 days. Unlike life in the transfer camp, we were fed very poorly on the train. Each of us received 400 grams of bread and 100 grams of fish per day. At Irkutsk we were taken to a transfer prison. In spite of the fact that we were being brought from camps under heavy guard, we were thoroughly searched before being admitted into the prison. All our things were looked over, all seams were felt and all the openings of our bodies were inspected. It was only after this that we were allowed to dress and go to a cell. Similar search was made, when they took us from the prison.

In the cities where the course of the train ended, we were taken to transfer prisons. When we reached Krasnoyarsk, we were taken to a prison but under a system unlike that in Irkutsk. We were not searched at all. In the next prison at Novosibirsk, our group was broken up and taken in different directions, and so we waited here more than a week. During this time new groups of prisoners kept coming and going. Among them was a group of officers of the special Far Eastern Army, commanded by Blyukher. All belonged to the higher ranks and had once worn lozenges on their epaulets. Now as prisoners they were being taken to Moscow at the orders of the NKVD U. S. S. R.

From Novosibirsk the Ukranian group was taken via Zlatoust—Samara—Syzran and unloaded at the Syzran transfer prison. There we met a group of prisoners from the Vorkuta and Ukht-Pechora camps, who were also being taken for a review of their cases. We learned from them about the regime in these camps. It was the same as in Kolyma—unendurable heavy work without a single day of rest, cold, hunger (and unlike Kolyma, a lack of clothing) and a high mortality among the prisoners. From Syzran we were sent to Kharkiv and from Kharkiv I landed in the investigating prison in Kiev on November 29, 1939.

THE HOPES OF THE PRISONERS EN ROUTE

All the Kolyma prisoners were certain that if they had been brought from there some 7,000 to 13,000 kilometers, it was because they were to be released. This hope was partially dispelled in Vladivostok by Khomenko, a Ukrainian brought from the island of Sakhalin and put in our car. Khomenko had come from the Nizhin region of Chernihiv district where he was born and lived until the terrible period of collectivization. In 1931 he, like millions of others, was declared a kurkul and the authorities by force tried to send him and his family north. With the help of a relative, who worked at the railroad station in Nizhin, Khomenko left all of his property and fled with his family to the Far East to Vladivostok. In 1935 Khomenko under a contract went to work in an oil plant under a Japanese concession on the island of Sakhalin, and moved there with his family. When he was arrested in 1938, he was charged with having burned in 1934 his property in the Chernihiv district. In answer to this, Khomenko proved that he had fled from Ukraine in 1931 and had not returned and could have done nothing from a distance of 10,000 kilometers. He offered to prove from the records of his employment that during the 7 years of his stay in the Far East he had never been absent a single day. At the end of 1938 he was sent from the island of Sakhalin to Chernihiv. There he was imprisoned for 3 months and then without explanation returned to the island of Sakhalin. In 1939 he was once again taken to Chernihiv from the island of Sakhalin and the 30,000 kilometers of his transportation back and forth was without results. But the hope still lingered in our hearts and "perhaps"?

In the Syzran prison this "perhaps" began to totter. We met a prisoner from Kiev who November 1938 had been brought back from Kolyma to Kiev. His case was reviewed and he was given 5 years instead of 10 and his place of imprisonment was changed from Kolyma to Karaganda. Every one hoped for new and better conditions in the country. Upon crossing the Volga River we saw railroad stations crowded with military equipment. The western part of the U. S. S. R. was on a military basis. The prisoners drew hope from this. However, in the Kharkiv prison, we lost hope for release. We met prisoners on their way from Kiev to Kazakhstan. Among them was an important scholar of the Ukrainian Academy of Sciences, the director of the Institute of Physics, Professor Goldman. He was a baptized Jew. He had been accused of membership

in a Ukrainian nationalist organization and been given 5 years in Alma-Ata. Upon such meetings we lost all hope of release thinking that only a miracle could free us from imprisonment. In this mood I crossed for the second time the threshold of the Kiev prison. Here reviewing of my case began.

[The Ukrainian Quarterly, vol. II, No. 2]

METROPOLITAN SLIPY—THE UKRAINIAN STEPINAC—IN A LABOR BATTALION

The crime of the Tito government over Archbishop Stepinac of Zagreb moved the dormant conscience of the world, but almost unadvertised is the persecution of the Ukrainian Stepinac, Metropolitan of Lviv Joseph Slipy, Primate of the Greek-Catholic Church in Western Ukraine, along with his four suffragan bishops.

After they in early 1945 refused the appeal of Moscovite Patriarch Alexius to join the Russian orthodoxy, they were imprisoned by the NKVD and deported to the east. Their trial was prepared with demagogic advertisement by the Soviet General Attorney in Kiev; collaboration with the Germans, in accordance with the Soviet pattern, was advanced. Materials were industriously collected in the order to make a public show-trial for Western Ukrainians.

But while 1 years of silence enshrouded this case. The resistance of the Western Ukrainians against Russian communistic persecution of their church, of the bishops as well as their Ukrainian national culture, influenced the Soviet Government to resign from the planned show trial. As a result a clandestine trial had been arranged in one of the eastern Ukrainian cities, probably in Kiev, as the Ukrainian Press Service announced.

Metropolitan Joseph Slipy was condemned to 8 years of hard labor, the aged bishops to 6 years each. Who of them remained alive is unknown because of the Soviet Iron Curtain. The Primate of the Western Ukrainian Catholic Church, a prominent scholar and former president of the Theological Academy in Lviv, is working now in Krasnoyarsk in Siberia, in a famous Soviet labor battalion. What has been the fate of his suffragan bishops is unknown.

No doubt the Stalin Constitution, published in several languages of the world, provides a full guaranty of religious freedom for all Soviet citizens as well as just democratic trial. Only the capitalistic world does not understand what is the nature of this religious freedom, what is the just democratic trial in the therms of Russian conceptions.

[Ukrainian Quarterly, vol. XI, No. 3, summer 1955, p. 271]

IN THE VORKUTA CONCENTRATION CAMPS 50 PERCENT ARE UKRAINIANS

The German physician, Joseph Scholmer, author of the well-known book Vorkuta, in a conversation with a Ukranian journalist, Yuri Tarkovych, in Germany asserted that in these camps which were the only ones to stage an open physical revolt against the Soviet regime of violence to the individual, 50 percent of the prisoners were Ukrainians; next in number were Lithuanians and Latvians and Russians were in the fourth place.

The prisoners of Vorkuta offer a cross section of the internal opposition in the Soviets and in this the opposition of the non-Russian peoples to their rule by Moscow is the strongest factor. Our American specialists from the "Harvard Russian center" assert the very opposite.

Mr. DOBRIANSKY. As in the case of agricultural collectivization, to construe forced labor in the Soviet Union in purely economic terms is a grave mistake that only leads to a distorted picture of the situation. Similar to the phenomenon of forced saving, there is forced labor among the ostensibly free labor which is inherently associated with very mechanism of a planned economy in a totalitarian social framework. Aimed at curbing labor turnover, this type of forced labor ranks far below the type dwelled on here from the viewpoints of human costs and the brutal violation of political and moral principles and rights. It patently belies the Soviet Code of Laws on Labor

which, like the Soviet Constitution, is a paper of theory with scarcely the remotest relationship to practice. However, unquestionably of prime concern to freemen everywhere is the forced labor in what Moscow paints as "the corrective labor camps."

Several years ago the British delegate to the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations, Mr. Corley Smith, sized up these camps well when he stated:

> If, as we believe, a high proportion of the population of the Soviet Union is in fact working in forced labor camps and colonies, this can mean either that the Soviet system has produced an infinitely higher proportion of criminals than any other social system, or else that the regime is unpopular and is only maintained by force or the mass imprisonment of its opponents (Forced Labor in Russia, International Survey, London, No. 60, August 1950, p. 31).

All parts of this statement are true, but it is the latter casual explanation that is powerfully buttressed by fact. The vast majority in these forced labor camps is made up of political prisoners, and only a small percentage of criminals has been witnessed among the approximately 15 million imprisoned in them.

Senator DOUGLAS. Mr. Dobriansky, isn't it true, the punishment meted out to political prisoners tends to be more severe than for criminal prisoners?

Mr. DOBRIANSKY. That is true, very true indeed, and in fact, criminals, who we would regard as criminals, are often used as instruments to inflict punishment upon these political prisoners.

Furthermore, not only does the determining fact of forced labor for political reasons stand out in connection with the worst type of such labor in the Soviet Union, but also, and perhaps more significant, is the prominent fact that the composition of this labor clearly demonstrates the nature of these political reasons. It is not simply opposition to a dictatorial regime but one far deeper than this.

The conspicuous Ukrainian and generally non-Russian composition of the inmates shows that the nature of these political reasons is one of the continuous and unrelenting struggle of the captive non-Russian nations in the Soviet Union against the traditional colonialism and imperialism of totalitarian Russia, be it white or red. Whoever fails to grasp this basic political reason for forced labor in the Soviet Union today, not only fails to perceive the significance of presented facts but also fails to understand the foremost anti-Communist and centrifugal force at work in this colonial empire.

As so many other fundamental institutional facets of the Soviet Union, the institution of forced labor has its firm historical roots in totalitarian Russian history and scarcely any in the foundations of ideologic communism. Political prisoners sent into Siberian exile and forced labor was, lest it be forgotten, a prominent feature of the Czarist Russian Empire and its furtherance of the colonial movement. See M. Mirsky, Russia, page 231.

Like the Iron Curtain, the police state, colonialism and imperialism, this institution of Czarist Russian totalitarianism was carried over wholesale into the present period of Russian Communist totalitarianim and with considerable technologic innovation developed into a major instrument of authoritarian control and genocidal liquidation. Thus, with regard to the largest single national group in the forced labor camps of the Soviet Union—the Ukrainians—the concrete content of the political reasons for their imprisonment in hard circum-

stances of forced labor consists of their fearless and patriotic resistance and opposition to denationalization and Russification since the late 1920's, to the mass collectivization measures of the early 1930's, to the successive purges of the 1930's and the late 1940's, to the current deportation program under the guise of land development in central Asia, and to many singular aspects of slow genocide of the Ukrainian nation itself.

The Russian leader, Khrushchev, knows these events well inasmuch as he formed his criminal record in Ukraine for his quick ascent to power.

Senator DOUGLAS. When Khrushchev denounced Stalin, is it not true that he was the Communist agent in charge of Moscow, and was also in the Ukraine at the time of the bloodiest of these purges?

Mr. DOBRIANSKY. That is very much true, sir; and, in fact, as anyone knows in any political system, we have a huge bureaucracy. The fact that Mr. Khrushchev was the leader in the Ukraine gave him, from his position, a wide latitude, autonomy, as to how to implement the policies that certainly were arrived at in Moscow. And the man has as much blood on his hands as Stalin did in his time.

The constantly raised Ukrainian fist has caused him and his collective dictatorship to moderate, so far, the colonial exploitation of Ukraine.

The ultimate meaning of the forced labor of Ukrainians and other non-Russian captive nations in the Soviet Union cannot, therefore, be properly understood unless this fact is fully observed within the ruling context of political realities in the Soviet Union. A succinct description of this context is given by David Lawrence in a remarkable article, 200 Million Slaves:

> Inside the Soviet Union are more than a score of major nationalities. There are only about 80 million Russians. The other nationalities—around 120 million persons—have little feeling of patriotism about anything Russian. The so-called Union of Soviet Socialist Republics is a paper description of a loose federation held together only by the iron hand of the dictatorship group (U. S. News & World Report, Washington, February 18, 1955).

Ukrainians, Byelorussians, Lithuanians, Georgians, Armenians, Turkestanians, Azerbaijani, and others have a patriotism only to their respective native countries. For the sin of bourgeois nationalism, which every patriotic American understands as one's love of God and native land, these non-Russian patriots are committed to forced labor and, in countless instances, through it to death.

Two paramount general facts appear in respect to the composition and conditions of the forced labor camps in the Soviet Union. One is the predominant numbers of Ukrainian political prisoners which observers conservatively estimate at 45 percent of total composition.

Two, the leadership of opposition and resistance to armed authorities has been undertaken in the main by patriotic Ukrainian nationalists who belong to the thriving network of the far-flung Ukrainian underground.

The striking importance of these basic general facts for our leadership today in taking constructive and effective steps to abolish forced labor will become manifest once we review some of the evidence supporting these facts.

In the informative work on *Forced Labor in Soviet Russia*, by D. J. Dallin and B. I. Nicolaevsky, Yale University Press, 1947, the testimony of Prof. Ernst Tallgren, himself a former prisoner in the early 1940's, emphasizes that the bulk of labor prisoners in the Russian Communist concentration system consists of political offenders and of these—

the most numerous * * * are Ukrainian farmers—

as well as—

those condemned for their religious beliefs, particularly Catholics and members of the Ukrainian Autocephalous Orthodox Church.

In the 1930's, as well as in the 1940's, in occupied western Ukraine, the sturdy Ukrainian peasantry fought the collectivization program not only for economic reasons but also the political one of centralized Moscow control for colonial exploitation and abetted Russification. Countless numbers were deported to the slave-labor camps, which doubtless contributed, in a comparison of the 1926 and 1939 official census figures for Ukraine, to a decrease of 16.8 percent of Ukrainians in their native country.

For the record, at this point, I should like to submit an article on I Was in Siberia written by the author of the book One of the Fifteen Million, Little, Brown & Co., Boston, 1952.

I must have it in my briefcase.

Senator DOUGLAS. That will be printed in the record.

(The article referred to follows:)

[The Ukrainian Quarterly, vol. VII, No. 4]

I WAS IN SIBERIA

(By Nicholas Prychodko)

In the open forum of the United Nations, and other world conferences, Russian delegates deny the existence of concentration camps on Soviet territory. Upon being pressed with heavily documented proof they admit only that they maintain corrective labor camps in which criminals are retrained for useful citizenship. This picture of an advanced and reformed penal system in the U. S. S. R. is one of the carefully contrived hoaxes ever put over on credulous visitors to the workers' paradise.

I myself witnessed one such travesty. In the prison on the Shevchenko Boulevard in Kiev, the bars were replaced with white curtains, the beds were made with clean linen, white cloths were put on the dining tables—even artificial flowers. Workshops were set in the back yard. Then a delegation of foreign tourists and sympathizers was led in to see the show.

They were told that the prisoners worked only a regulation 8-hour day, relaxing the rest of their time in these pleasant circumstances. Many of these visitors returned home to extol such a humane system. No doubt you have read their stories.

From this show prison it was only 10 minutes' ride to a real prison where one could have seen how people really live in the prisons of the NKVD in the Soviet Union. In this prison I was held for 21 months. Not only did the windows have bars but even iron shutters to exclude every ray of sunlight and breath of fresh air, and to prevent the prisoners from even seeing the yard of the sky.

It was during one of the several waves of terror in the period of the great purge, 1936–39, that I was thrown in here. Our cell, 30 or 40 square meters in area, was jammed with 100 to 140 prisoners. For their bed they had, not clean linen, but the filthy cement floor.

From 11 o'clock at night until dawn we were called in groups for questioning (very rarely is any questioning carried on in the daytime) and brutally tortured

to extract from us confessions to unheard of crimes. Myriads of bedbugs were a further torture which drove the prisoners to the verge of despair.

These prisons the gullible visitors to Russia have never seen nor ever will see. Nor will they see the real conditions of life of the Soviet people, for that would destroy the myth of the "great leader of the people's democratic bloc." Even less will delegates of the U. N. ever be permitted to inspect the north Russian or Siberian concentration camps, no matter how many declarations of human rights the bosses in the Kremlin may sign.

After my 21 months in prison I was shipped to one of these camps—the Ivdellag. Our train was made up of about 50 small freight cars with steel bars on the windows. Each one carried 42 men. In the middle of the train and at either end were special guard cars provided with machineguns and bloodhounds. Our food was salt fish, moldy black bread, and two pails of water to a car per day.

At the longer stops the guards would test the sides with long-handled mallets, while others ran over the roofs to detect any loose boards where prisoners might break through. In this way the train rolled on for 14 days, rarely stopping at the larger stations lest the citizens see its ghastly, scarcely human cargo. This train "bound for a special destination" rolled from Kiev to Siberia in November 1939. From every corner of the mighty "Fatherland of the Proletariat" similar trainloads of serfs were rolling to the impenetrable taiga and the mines of Siberia and the Far East.

They were destined to replace the thousands who were dying of cold, of hunger, and unbearably hard-labor quotas. The Kremlin's 5-year plans came before all human considerations.

We passed over the Ural Mountains at night and with the dawn saw on either side of the railroad throughout the taiga, the watchtowers, which reminded us of the time of Ivan the Terrible.

The guards in long sheepskin coats, armed with mounted bayonets, kept constant vigil. A picture of such a watchtower, with an armed guard, would make an appropriate Soviet emblem.

These watchtowers were set around a double barbed wire enclosure and beyond were the low, wooden, gloomy barracks. At some railroad stations we saw hundreds of filthy, emaciated beings, in tattered rags, loading freight trains with lumber. It was frightful and horrifying to watch these caricatures of humanity, although our plight was in no way better.

In their eyes we read hopelessness and despair. Whenever they could evade the eagle eye of the guard, who constantly yelled "Davay, davay!" they would ask us where we came from and what news we brought and beg for a piece of bread or a smoke. We could give them nothing, for we had nothing, not even any good news to cheer them up.

After we had passed several such camps, a heavy silence settled over my companions on the train. Only the wheels clicked their monotonous song over the rails. Ragged and dirty we sat in somber dejection, thinking of the loved ones we left behind, whom we would never see again. We had seen with our own eyes the fate that awaited us: forced labor, cold, and hunger.

Now we began to meet endless trains on their return journey, emptied of their freight of misery and now loaded with lumber and ore, produced by the sweat and blood of such as ourselves. Finally, we reached Camp Sama.

Camp Sama is the port of admission to the Ivdellag concentration camps, one of the smallest of the camp administrations in Siberia. It holds only some 350,000 prisoners. At Sama the new arrivals are assigned to the different work camps of the Ivdellag.

Over a railroad branch from Sama (the railroad station), which runs for several miles into the depths of the taiga, we were brought almost to the gate of our camp and ordered to get off. We jumped off into deep dry snow which reached to our waists, but at least we could breathe clean air again.

We were herded inside the wire enclosure and into low wooden barracks, 200 men to each one. Inside there were only bare, double-decked beds of boards and an iron stove in the middle. There were no sheets, no blankets. The beds were infested with bedbugs which gave us no rest at night, or even during the day.

Our only comfort was the privilege of being able to walk about inside the double wire enclosure and breathe the fresh air. For food we received 1½ pounds of heavy black bread a day and two bowls of balanda, a stinking liquid that resembled slops more than anything else.

At Camp Sama there were over a hundred prisoners from southern Georgia. In this demoralizing environment they still held themselves proud and aloof; the look of hatred never left the eyes of these unbowed sons of Caucasia. They

were given no work for almost to a man they suffered from tuberculosis. Coming from the hot southern climate, they had no resistance against the terrific frosts, and each day 3 or 4 of them were carried into the forest to eternal peace.

There were also at Sama barracks reserved for criminals. The guards were very friendly with them, calling them socially close and entrusting them with many administrative duties of the camps. These duties they executed with the most inhuman brutality, but were never reprimanded for looting or beating the prisoners.

Our contingent stayed at Camp Sama for only a short time, then was driven off under guards and bloodhounds to another camp in the taiga—Palkino.

Here the conditions were no better. Only when a prisoner completed his full quota of work could he receive his daily allotment of food. Each man was expected to cut from 2.5 to 12 cubic meters (roughly a cord) of wood a day, depending upon the size of the trees. These had to be cut not higher than 7 inches from the ground—though the snow was waist deep. The branches were trimmed off and burned and the trunk sawed into pieces 4, 5, or 6 meters (12 to 20 feet) in length.

Many of my fellow prisoners sickened and died quickly from the heavy work, carried out under relentless pressure, on poor food in the bitter cold. In Palkino, which housed some 3,000 unfortunates, during the worst periods 10 to 15 men died each day. But these were as quickly replaced with new arrivals.

The dead were deposited in communal graves holding 200 to 300 corpses. Only when the graves were filled to the top with victims were they covered with frozen clods and snow with an attempt to level them carefully with the surrounding ground. The graves were still prominently noticeable, however, and I saw many of these around Ivdellag. Often, bodies would be dragged out into the forest by wolves.

And this was only a small camp. There are, in the U. S. S. R., around 50 larger concentration camp sites, in Siberia, on the shores of the Sea of Okhotsk, on the White Sea, and the Arctic Ocean. The largest of these are Siblag, Kraslag, Carlag, Uzhiblag, Vorkutlag, Tobalsklag, Sievurlag, Viatlag, Sievostoklag, and the dread Kolyma gold camp. Besides these there are great building projects in the north and throughout Siberia, Kazakhstan, and the Far East, developed by slave labor, which was also used to build the White Sea and Moscow-Volga canals, and the famous Moscow subway.

According to the lowest figures and such facts as I possess, there are never less than 15 million slaves held at a labor pool in the concentration camps. This slave-labor system represents the ultimate weapon of the regime in suppressing all discontent, criticism, and opposition.

Mr. DOBRIANSKY. Mr. Nicholas Prychodko, who now resides in Canada, gives a pertinent and vivid account of his experiences in this general period of mass deportations to the slave-labor camps.

Others who have recently furnished striking evidence from their personal experiences include, to mention only a few, John H. Noble, William E. R. Piddington, numerous released German prisoners, Dr. Joseph Scholmer, Maria Varkony, Dr. Fedor Varkony, and Japanese and other former prisoners heard by the International Commission Against Concentration Camp Practices.

To a question posed on the basis of his slave-labor experiences in Vorkuta (What nationality were the prisoners at Vorkuta?), Mr. Noble answered, "Most of them were Soviets, but not Russians. Most of them, I'd say, were Ukrainians." Vorkuta has been a tremendous center in the Russian slave-labor camp chain, and Mr. Noble in his writings clearly stresses this significant compositional fact which accounted for the serious strikes there; but the Reader's Digest recently saw fit to delete references to Ukrainians in one of these articles.

Concerning Vorkuta, Mr. William E. R. Piddington, a British subject, relates his exeriences of as late as 1953–54, after Stalin's death, and shows the activities of the Ukrainian majority led by members of the UPA, the Ukrainian underground, in his work titled "Russian Frenzy—London, 1955.

Interrogating released German prisoners, the U. S. News and World Report asked, "Where have you been working?", to which they answered, "Many of us have been working on the Volga don Canal during the last few years. It has been built by 60,000 slave workers of all nationalities. The largest groups were Ukrainians and Georgians"—October 30, 1953.

Interviews with hundreds of these released prisoners have been conducted by a leading Ukrainian organization in Western Europe and disclose the Ukrainian percentage in the camps covered to range at about 60 percent.

The testimony of Dr. Joseph Scholmer as presented in his classic work, Vorkuta, is perhaps unsurpassed for methodical observation and accuracy. His description of the first mass strike ever staged in the Soviet Union is conclusive in many ways, and certainly in regard to the establishment of the general facts advanced here. He witnessed them being organized by Ukrainian and Lithuanian resistance groups and himself participated in them. The impact of Dr. Scholmer's authoritative disclosures, with relevant passages from his work, on the unrealistic thinking of many Russian experts in the West is cogently shown in this brief memorandum submitted to me by a member of the Supreme Ukrainian Liberation Council which is the foreign representation of the Ukrainian underground.

Among other things, it bears on Mr. George Sokolsky's comments on the apparent silent boycott against the work in the American market. I request that it be included as part of my statement.

Senator DOUGLAS. That will be done.

(The document referred to above is as follows:)

TWICE: SCHOLMER'S VORKUTA [1]

I. SCHOLMER AND THE "EXPERTS"

One of the most interesting books about the Soviet concentration camps has been published. This is a book by a German radiologist, Dr. Joseph Scholmer, a book about Vorkuta.[2] This extremely dramatic and forceful report tells us of the author's 3½-year-long imprisonment in this prison complex of 250,000 slave workers in the Soviet Arctic. With a keenness of a thoughtful observer the German doctor revealed not only the horrors of the Soviet concentration camps (in fact, there is little of them in the book), but also gave a penetrating analysis of the whole structure of the U. S. S. R. gathered on the basis of first-hand observations and conversations with his fellow prisoners. His eyewitness report is not only authentic, but also optimistic. The author tells us how unstable are the social and national foundations of the Soviet prison of nations.

Unfortunately, Scholmer's book has not become a best-seller in this country. There is an English translation of the book,[2] but it is little known among the American reading public. Mr. Sokolsky was right when he complained in his column that it is hard to get the work in the bookstores. "If asked in the bookstore," Mr. Sokolsky wrote, "the booksellers pretend not to have the book in stock." It is hard to get in the libraries and, therefore, the book is entirely unknown. It seems as if some long hand prevents the spread of Scholmer's book in this country, concludes Mr. Sokolsky.[3]

It is true that Scholmer's book differs considerably from all the books written on the Soviet concentration camps and, particularly, from the books on the U. S. S. R. written by the so-called Russian experts. Dr. Scholmer himself states

[1] Joseph Scholmer: Die Toten kehren zurück. Bericht eines Arztes aus Workuta. Kiepenheuer & Witsch. Köln-Berlin. 1954.

[2] Joseph Scholmer: Vorkuta. A dramatic first report on the slave city in the Soviet Arctic. Translated from the German by Robert Kee. Henry Holt & Co., New York, 1955.

[3] Sokolsky complained also about the irregular distribution of Eastman's book.

that he could not find common language with the experts after his return. Here is his relation:[4]

"At this time Berlin was packed with journalists and experts of every description. They were kings of public opinion * * *. Many of them had lived in Russia and they had all been reading Pravda for years. But as I got to know them I began to have the feeling that they were creatures from some other planet. Many of them had traveled in the Soviet Union, but never in Stolipinskis.[5] They spent all their time writing about the Russian problem, but at least knew as little about it as they did about the vegetation of tundra. These experts have a monopoly of their subject. They are capable of taking up a given point of view and defending it with as many clear, logical arguments as you like. But they produce these arguments with the facility of men whose minds are uncomplicated by true perception. They are experts on the Soviet Union as other men are experts on motorcars or building materials or nylon stockings. They know what Molotov is thinking even before he knows himself. Discretion alone prevents them from revealing it. And they know why he thought it, too. As for Malenkov, they know every hair on his head."

Scholmer's disappointment with "experts" was great. He spent a whole evening with some of these experts, but they spoke "a different language" from his. They could not make sense of what Dr. Scholmer was saying to them, because their "minds were not complicated with true perception." Scholmer relates:[6]

"When I first mentioned the words "civil war" to these people they were appalled. The possibility of rising lay outside their realm of comprehension. They had no idea that there were resistance groups in the camps. How should they? Their whole approach dates from another era and they think in terms which cannot possibly grasp the fundamental principles on which the Soviet Union is based today. But they have a great responsibility. For who but they should be telling the West what is really happening? Whether they themselves really believe in what they write is difficult to say. At least they succeed in making a living from it."

Dr. Scholmer truly could be appalled by the ignorance of experts. He brought very important news from Vorkuta to the West—the news about the very first mass strike ever held in the U. S. S. R. He was the eyewitness and the participant in the strike organized in the Soviet concentration camp by Ukrainian and Lithuanian resistance groups[7] and the strike shook the entire prison complex. The heroism of the strikers witnessed by Scholmer showed that the human spirit remains inextinguishable even in the camps of horror. Freedom-loving people never forget freedom and love it more than their lives. Here is the account of the author:[8]

"The prisoners were once again called upon to surrender, this time by loudspeakers; but they refused. They assembled at the main gate, linked arms, and formed themselves into a solid phalanx. There were loud cries of: 'Go on, shoot! It is better to die than to go on living like this!' The Ukrainians sang their national songs[9] Derevianko[10] gave the order to storm the camp. The soldiers moved forward."

This is exactly what the "experts" never knew could happen. It's because they always occupied themselves with the oppressors and not with the oppressed. They know what Molotov is thinking, but they never imparted any significance to what the people are thinking in the Soviet Union and not to their struggle for freedom. Dr. Scholmer warned the "experts":[11]

"At the end of the evening I reminded them of a story that Anatole France tells in one of his travel books. One day he went to a village in Normandy. 'The day after tomorrow,' he writes, 'this village will be celebrating the feats of its patron saint. All the ducks will be slaughtered and devoured. But as they don't know that they are going to be devoured, there is nothing tragic

[4] Joseph Scholmer: Vorkuta, p. 300–301.
[5] Stolipinskis are railway carriages for transportation of prisoners, called so after the tsarist minister Stolipin who had introduced them.
[6] Joseph Scholmer, Vorkuta, p. 245.
[7] Ibid., p. 301.
[8] Joseph Scholmer, Vorkuta, pp. 259–260.
[9] English translation is not exact. In German original Scholmer writes of Ukrainische Freiheitts Ueber—Ukrainian songs of freedom. Cf. Scholmer; Die Toten kehren zurück, p. 227, Vorkuta, p. 260.
[10] General Derevianko, military commander of Vorkuta prison complex at this time. Mysteriously died after the strike was suppressed.
[11] Scholmer, op. cit., pp. 301–302.

about their situation. Tragedy consists only in knowing, and the art of living consists in knowing and forgetting again.' "

"In this sense," concludes Dr. Scholmer, "the situation of the 'experts' is not tragic. They don't know that the Soviets are about to devour them. And those of them that do have long since forgotten."

The situation of the "experts" is not tragic, but the situation of the free world served by such "experts" is tragic. What we need in our times is a truly uncensored, balanced, and discerning knowledge of the Soviet Union. The "experts" have not helped to procure such a knowledge. The most interesting fact is that their range of vision and knowledge has uncannily balked at the boundary of the struggle for freedom which has been waged in the U. S. S. R. for years. They simply do not seem to recognize that such a problem in the U. S. S. R. exists.

It is devoutly hoped that Scholmer's book will render the "experts" a significant service should they appraise the facts contained in the book and rectify their position. They must, however, use the uncensored German original of the book. Curiously enough some interesting parts of the German original were omitted and other ones distorted in the English translation. We shall treat all these omissions and distortions in our second installment on Scholmer's book about Vorkuta.

Mr. DOBRIANSKY. For the period of the supposedly reasonable "collective leadership," the testimonies of Maria Varkony and Dr. Fedor Varkony, former Hungarian prisoners in the Russian slave-labor camps, should cause us to pause and carefully analyze the deceptive propaganda maneuvers being staged by Moscow.

Maria Varknoy, who spent 10 years in the camps, relates how the Tayshet-Lena railroad in Siberia has been built on the bones of slave-women laborers, many of them perishing in the bitter climate. As she describes it:

> The majority of the women were unable to fulfill the work norm (in heavy construction), and therefore, received penalty rations consisting of 1 pound of bread.
>
> Many women died of exhaustion * * *

In the testimony of Dr. Varkony, recently broadcast to the Soviet Union and that was over radio liberation in Europe. One finds mass murder under Khrushchev's "collective leadership," staged in June 1954 in the Kingir camps of Karaganda. In the strike held at this camp, over 500 Ukranian women were crushed to death by Russian Communist tanks of the T–34 make. The details of this glaring act of genocide committed in a forced labor camp under the present oligarchical dictatorship I wish to insert here as part of my testimony.

Senator DOUGLAS. That will be done.

(The document referred to above is as follows:)

REVOLT IN SLAVE-LABOR CAMP—500 WOMEN MASSACRED IN KINGIRI, KAZAKHSTAN (U. S. S. R.)

The message about this unprecedented heroism of Ukrainian women has been lately brought outside the Iron Curtain by the witness of the events in the camp Kingiri, near Karaganda, Kazakhstan, Dr. Fedor Varkony, a physician from Hungary who was repatriated several months back. His significant depositions given to the American authorities in Europe have only recently reached Ukrainian journalists and organizations.

A photostate of these depositions is already in United States. It was written by Dr. Varkony who returned from the Soviet concentration camp in Kingiri. In broken Russian he described on 8 pages the events which had taken place between May 16 and June 26, 1954. The revolt of slave laborers in that camp lasted 40 days in Kingiri, a locality which is not to be found on Soviet maps.

Dr. Varkony relates that on May 16, 1953, exactly 1 year prior to the uprising that eventuated on a large scale in 1954, a group of slave laborers who had been returning from work to the camp, were unexpectedly and for no reason what-

soever fired upon by Soviet guards. The next day, May 17, the prisoners refused to go to work unless the authorities of the camp punished the soldiers who killed 4 persons and wounded 10 during the shooting the day before.

This strike failed because it was not adequately prepared, and the authorities arrested 300 persons suspected as organizers of the strike.

In July 1953 the guards killed one woman in a women's camp who approached the prohibited zone. Then again the slave laborers struck and the strike was again liquidated.

In January 1954 the guards again killed one prisoner and the soldiers dragged the body into the prohibited zone so as to feign that he was killed while attempting to escape. The camps at Kingiri reacted by starting a strike which was crushed mercilessly by an armed force of MVD which subsequently arrested a large number of prisoners, chiefly Ukrainians.

In April 1954 a new and large transport of prisoners arrived at Kingiri. The newcomers managed to come to an understanding and at nightfall before May 16 dashed to take apart the fences separating the camps. At the same time they fell upon the camp prison and freed 300 prisoners. A free communication started among the camps and 4,500 men and 3,500 women formed one compact community of Kingiri. Among those freed from the camp prison was Kuznetsov, former colonel of the Soviet Army.

On May 17 the MVD troops attacked the camp, killing 76 prisoners. The drunken soldiers rushed into the women's camp and following their command, forced their way with bayonets attacking defenseless women. This already exhausted the patience of the prisoners. They chose a strike committee, composed of representatives of all nationalities, headed by Colonel Kuznetsove. The committee instituted a stern discipline in the camp and submitted the following demands to the authorities:

1. To bring immediately from Moscow a representative of the Central Committee of the Communist Party;
2. To punish Lieutenant Belyev, commander of the operative group of MVD, as well as officers and privates who took part in the mass murders of May 16 and 17;
3. To bring back to the camp the murdered and wounded prisoners.
4. To set up a medical commission to look after the injured prisoners.

The committee declared that it will not end the strike until the authorities fulfill its demands. Colonel Kuznetsov signed the demands for the committee.

The reply to these demands came in 2 days. From Moscow arrived General Bychkov, deputy director of the administration of the slave-labor camps, and General Dolgy, deputy general prosecutor. They called a meeting of prisoners and received their demands formulated in 16 points on condition that the prisoners will return to work. The prisoners replied that since their demands were accepted, they resolved to terminate the strike, and will return to work the next day.

On the next day solely the attendants remained in the camp, for all the prisoners went to work. During their absence the guards came to the camp to restore the fences dividing the previous separate camps.

On the board appeared the signs: "Do not approach, or we will shoot." It was clear that the generals broke their word. On returning from work the prisoners were warned at the gates that they would be fired upon by machineguns if they dared approach the fences. The administration of the camp was of the opinion that by restoring the fences it will render it impossible for the prisoners of several camps to try to reach an understanding.

However, hardly an hour elapsed when from the women's camp resounded the song, Columns of Partisans Are Marching. Instantly the Ukrainian prisoners arose and rushed again to take apart the fences, heedless of the continuous firing of machineguns from the watchtowers. Thus they restored intercommunication among the camps.

This was a frightful picture, relates Dr. Varkony. While the rockets were throwing light on the territory of the camps, the machineguns continued their rattle. MVD troops then darted into the camps and a bloody encounter started. For the prisoners were then defending themselves with what they could put their hands on. The committee asked the administration to remove the military from the camps. And really the troops abandoned the camps on May 20, taking with them all killed and wounded soldiers. The prisoners lost in 1 night 100 persons, men and women.

On May 20 began the negotiations between General Bychkov and the prisoners' committee, which lasted 40 days. During that period of time the camps were

under control of the partisans. The loud speakers in the camps were announcing the orders of the committee, and the Ukrainian women were preparing thousands of leaflets, flying them like kites, made hand grenades out of bottles and blasting materials, and also treated the wounded. The men were making weapons out of iron bars and awaited orders from Kuznetsov. From June 18 onward a radio station was in operation, which was manufactured out of electrical and medical instruments. The broadcasts by this station were heard in Karaganda and Alma Ata.

However, the administration was drawing up more and more MVD troops, and airplanes were incessantly circling around the camps. In the camps order was kept day and night by special guards formed by the committee.

On June 24, General Bychkov issued an ultimatum: to surrender and to come out of the camps. The answer of the prisoners was: Not a step. First bring a representative of the Central Committee of the Communist Party.

During the night of June 25 tanks rushed suddenly into the camp. There were 7 tanks of the type T–34. These were followed by 1,600 men of MVD infantry with rifles, tommy guns, and machineguns. Again an uneven encounter began. The prisoners started to defend themselves with bottles, stones, and bricks. Without notice the tanks darted against the mass of prisoners. Thereupon hundreds of Ukrainian women, in embroidered shirts, stepped forward, joining hands and their foreheads upward, faced the oncoming tanks.

In this moment of strained tension all prisoners thought the commander of the tanks would not dare trample the women under the wheels of the tanks. But the cruelest thing happened. With speed and furor the tanks attacked the innocent wretched women and crushed them all to death. There was no sobbing or moaning, only cracking of crushed bones resounded in the field of torture. Then, instantly, the soldiers attacked the prisoners. The struggle lasted from 3 a. m. to 9 p. m.

All prisoners seized by the military were at once dispatched to the railroad station. The same day 1,600 prisoners were transferred to the slave-labor camp in the Kolyma gold field, in northeastern Siberia.

More than 500 political prisoners perished that night and bloodstained floors were the witness of this drama for several months.

The women who agreed to return to work, were permitted to go back to their camp. However, 600 Ukrainian women refused to give their consent, and they were transferred to Kolyma. Kuznetsov and other members of the committee were arrested.

Anyway, says Dr. Varkony, after this period of struggle the life in the camps of Kingiri became better. The demands submitted to General Bychkov were accepted. It might be said, continued the repatriated physician, that the blood of prisoners shed liberally in the camp liquidated the terrorism of the MVD in concentration, for the regime in the camp has become much more tolerable.

Mr. DOBRIANSKY. The evidence assembled by the International Commission Against Concentration Camp Practices from released Japanese and German prisoners substantiates further the Ukrainian composition and leadership in the Russian Communist slave-labor camps.

In a report on The Strike Mechanism in Soviet Concentration Camps the writer devotes a section to the patriotic Ukrainian partisans and states:

In several places these partisans were among the chief strike organizers. At Norilsk and Taichet, for example, it was they who prepared and led the action (Monthly Information Bulletin 4, August-November 1955, pp. 19–27).

(The article referred to follows:)

III. THE STRIKE MECHANISM IN SOVIET CONCENTRATION CAMPS

The strikes that have shaken the entire Soviet concentrationary system during the past few years are a new phenomenon, and yet in certain respects they recall the phase of the development of the camps that came to an end in 1935–36.

It will be recalled that political prisoners—or, at least, those who had been involved in Communist opposition groups—had formerly enjoyed certain advantages over common-law criminals and taken advantage of them to carry on intense political activity in the camps as well as in the isolators. These isolators were

a penal institution less severe than the camps and were set up specially for privileged political prisoners. Mention might also be made here of the exact and detailed account of Anton Ciliga in his books, The Russian Enigma and Siberia: Land of Exile and Industrialization.

In the period from 1936 until a short itme ago the situation was the reverse. The special rights of the political prisoners were withdrawn and certain privileges were granted to the common laws. Imprisonment in isolators became the severest form of detention. The camps themselves came to resemble extermination camps. The death rate was very high. The CICRC pointed out the following in the judgment delivered at the conclusion of its open hearings in Brussels in May 1951: "No scientific or medical experiments with the convicts have been noted, nor any wide-scale or organized extermination similar to the kind practiced in Nazi Germany, particularly on Jews and gypsies, who were sent to the gas chambers. But extermination of prisoners does result in the Soviet camps from progressive exhaustion due to inhuman working conditions and hunger."

Any attempt at resistance was nipped in the bud, owing to the terror practiced by the administration, on the one hand, and by the common laws, on the other. Furthermore, the prisoners who were sent to the camps in the late 1930's no longer came, for the most part, from the ranks of the opposition, but were officials and experts of the regime itself. These victims of the second stage of the great purge had been drawn in, not as a result of their own activities but quite simply as a consequence of the automatic functioning of the purge. The entire political life of the camps was thus swept away.

News of the strikes that have broken out in several Soviet concentration camps demonstrates that this period is over and that political life has begun again with unprecedented vigor. It is not yet possible to give a clear picture of these strikes. After the first news of the Vorkuta strike of the summer of 1953, almost each new return to the West of former prisoners has brought additional information. We now know with certainty that before the Vorkuta outbreak there was a tremendous disruption in the Norilsk concentrationary complex and that there was an even earlier explosion of the same kind at Karaganda. There is even talk, though without adequate proof, of an insurrection in a northern camp as early as 1948. We have also received specific information about a 3-day work stoppage at the Taichet camp in January 1955, a strike at Kirguin (Kazakstan) in the summer of 1954 and another strike at Vorkuta last autumn. There has also been mention of strikes at Magadan, Mouika (on Sakhalin Island) and elsewhere. This information, which concerns only part of the areas where this movement has been launched, makes it possible to begin to see some of its leading features.

END OF THE DICTATORSHIP OF THE CRIMINALS

In order to understand the recent strikes, we must bear in mind certain facts. As in the period ending in 1935–36, political prisoners in the camps are no longer subjected to the dictatorship of the "common-laws." In the course of the reorganization of the camps in 1948–49, all prisoners were assigned to camps of various categories, the most important of which were the "special regime camps" for political prisoners, and the I. T. L.'s (Inspravitelno-troudovoi Languer—corrective labor camp) for the majority of the criminals. This reorganization has not affected the principle which requires that common-law criminals be treated better than political prisoners. Conditions in the regime camps are much more severe than those in the I. T. L.'s. Nevertheless, the reform has greatly eased the situation of political prisoners. Though it has not restored their pre-1936 privilege regime, it has freed them from the nightmare of the dictatorship of the "common-laws."

However, the chief characteristics of the "regime camps" at the present time are not due solely to the reform of 1949. The conscious and systematic action of the political prisoners, particularly of their leaders, is largely responsible.

The reform of 1949 did not completely eliminate criminals from the "regime camps." Moreover, only a very small minority of the noncriminal prisoners were political prisoners, in the strict sense of the term. The majority were innocent people, victims of arbitrary police action, such as the kulaks, the Stalinists who were eliminated during the great purge of the trials, the members of suppressed national groups, etc. Thus, the "common laws" continued to dominate the prisoners in general. However, their power had no solid basis, as their number was limited. At present, a new feature appears in the situation.

More or less organized groups, which are beginning to act in systematic fashion, are being formed among the political prisoners. The first objective is to break up the dictatorship of the criminals and to win influence over the entire body of the so-called political prisoners.

We are therefore witnessing a complex process. Owing to the weakening of the "common laws" the true political prisoners, who realize why they have been deprived of freedom, are emerging from the mass of those who are merely called such because of the way they have been arbitrarily labeled by the authorities. By doing away with the dictatorship of the criminals, they are creating for themselves the possibility of influencing the behavior of their fellow-prisoners in a systematic way.

The observations of the repatriated Japanese, as gathered and recorded by Herbert Passin, are particularly revealing in this connection. According to these witnesses, the critical moment in the life of camp 13 of Taichet occurred on May 5, 1954, when 15 Ukrainians who had helped organize the Norilsk strikes were transferred to this camp. Up to that time, the latter camp had been dominated by a common-law prisoner. The newcomers immediately set about changing the situation. In the words of the report, "The camp had been under the control of one of the criminal prisoners, but the Ukrainians organized the camp against him and one night gave him such a thorough beating that he was taken to the hospital and never showed up in camp 13 again."

A repatriated Frenchman witnessed similar events in another camp.

BREAKING UP OF THE SPY NETWORK

A similar battle took place between the true political prisoners and the administration's informers who were planted among the convicts. Here too the Japanese testimonies provide illuminating information. At camp 5 of Norilsk, where an important strike was to break out on May 7, 1953, about a score of Ukrainains who had been transferred to Norilsk after the disturbances at Karaganda won the leadership of the political prisoners by killing four convicts who were known to be administration stool-pigeons. This act was sufficient to weaken the administration's control of the camp and to impress the prisoners with the force represented by the Ukrainian nucleus.

The testimony of the men returning to Japan was entirely confirmed by those who, also coming from Norilsk, left the Iron Curtain behind them at the other end of the Soviet empire. A German army officer, who had been interned from December 1950 to mid-June 1953 in regimen camp 383/4, declared that former Ukrainian partisans who had been transferred at the end of 1952 from Karaganda to Norilsk organized a systematic offensive in an attempt to break up the informers' network by means of terrorism. Two administration spies in his camp had been murdered without anyone's being able to discover who had committed the acts. Another time, at the place where they worked, they had attacked a group of 6 men, killing 4 and seriously wounding 2 others. The two wounded men had been so terrorized by the boldness of the partisans that they refused to reveal the identity of their assailants.

POLITICAL LEADERSHIP OF THE PRISONERS

The sorting-out that took place, after the weakening of the criminals' position, between the so-called and the true political prisoners, was manifested by the way in which the strikes were lead. Spontaneous though they might have been, they were led very firmly by secret committees which were unknown to the strikers themselves. The written demands submitted by these committees to the representatives of the authorities came to the attention of the strikers only gradually.

It appears that the strike committees were obliged, at least in certain places, to act in such a way as not only to insure the success of the strike, but also to overcome the fears of the mass of prisoners. For example, according to the Japanese testimonies, the strike in camp 5 of Norilsk went through a difficult moment when the authorities announced that an additional 3-year term would be added to everyone's sentence if the disorder were not ended.

It is not quite clear how the strike leaders managed to overcome this obstacle. However, it seems that their refusal to negotiate with the local officials and their demand to be put into contact with representatives of the highest authorities were instrumental in this respect. The satisfaction which they obtained increased considerably each prisoner's self-confidence. Everyone became aware of the strength that lay in firm and concerted action.

THE UKRAINIAN PARTISANS

What is perhaps the most interesting though the least clear problem is that raised by the role of the Ukrainian partisans. As is generally known, a strong secret army, the UPA, was formed in the Ukraine during the war and fought first against the German and then against the Soviet troops. It continued operating for years, but the armed forces of the government finally succeeded in destroying the bulk of its troops. Most of the UPA veterans are now in concentration camps throughout the Soviet Union. They constitute one of the best organized groups among the political prisoners, and they are eager for action. (Many of them, however, are included in the category of "common-laws." As mentioned earlier, they are bent on getting rid of administration spies and criminals who terrorize the other prisoners. Following certain acts, they were tried and convicted on the basis of article 59–3, which deals with "banditry.")

In several places, these partisans were among the chief strike organizers. At Norilsk and Taichet, for example, it was they who prepared and led the action. During these strikes, a black flag waved over the camps. This flag was the symbol of the anarchist peasant partisans of Nestor Makhno who had won a legendary glory fighting in the southern Ukraine against the Austro-German occupants and the Cossack chief Skoropadsky until the end of 1918, against the nationalist government of Simeon Petliura until February 1919, against the white troops of General Denikin until the autumn of 1919, and those of General Wrangel until the autumn of 1920, and against the Red Army until the summer of 1921 (cf. P. Archinoff, L'Histoire du mouvement Makhnoviste, Librarie internationale, Paris).

One of the witnesses heard by the CICRC investigators, Karl Fischer, the Austrian socialist, had an opportunity to speak at great length with these former Ukrainian partisans during his confinement in the central prison of Alexandrovsk. He describes this experience in a work which he is now preparing. In order to indicate their political tendency, these men, all of whom are very young, smply introduced themselves as Ukrainian nationalists. They displayed persistent hostility toward the Great Russians. But this hostility was subordinated to their chief purpose, which was to create solidarity among all the prisoners, whoever they might be. They themselves set an example. As Karl Fischer puts it, their conduct was such that it could serve as a model. It is also rather interesting that these young men were offended when the guards referred to them as partisans of Bendera, former head of the fascist-minded antisemitic group in the UPA.

According to Karl Fischer, the chief activities of these men in the camps and prisons were directed toward destroying the dictatorship of the criminals, clearing out the administration spies and resisting the influence of the incorrigible Stalinists. They also went about systematically "expropriating" those who were rich—a term they used because of its association with the Russian revolutionary movement.

Mention might be made, in this connection, of the ideas of certain UPA theoreticians. According to a study by Max Schachtman published in the magazine New International in 1949, they stated that a totalitarian system inevitably leads, after a certain time, to the disintegration of all the living forces in a society. By organizing partisans not only in the eastern Ukraine but also in the territories formerly belonging to Poland, they planned to mobilize the political intelligence and sense of organization characteristic of the western world in order to carry their resistance into the very heart of the Soviet Union. The young men who were shaped by this movement and who at present are leading the fight inside the Soviet camps and prisons are probably not at all aware of these projects. Nevertheless, the fact remains that in breaking up their armed formations and scattering them throughout the camps, the Soviet government has made it possible for them to act upon broad strata of Soviet society.

BEHAVIOR OF NONPRISONER WORKERS

There is every reason to believe that the free population's attitude toward the prisoners has undergone a fundamental transformation during the past few years. In general, there are no longer signs of the ignoble conduct described by Elinor Lipper, Jerzy Gliksman, and others who relate how, when they were dying of thirst during the endless transport, peasants offered to sell them water at fantastic prices. This attitude is on longer to be found except among the primitive peoples of the outlying regions. Thus, according to the testimony of Joseph Scholmer, the Komis of the tundra continue to receive bonuses for every escaped Vorkuta prisoner whom they turn over to the police. But,

except for these primitives, the conduct of ordinary citizens is quite different from what it was earlier.

Up to a certain point, the prisoners can even count on the active assistance of that part of the free population with which they come into contact. Karl Fischer gives specific examples of this in his testimony for the CICRC.

All statements concerning the behavior of the free workers during the strikes are categorical about this matter. They were sympathetic toward the strikers and tried almost everywhere to manifest their solidarity with them. However, they did not think of going on strike themselves.

We are obliged to note that the wall built by the police between the prisoners and the rest of the population has been weakened, though it is still standing.

ATTITUDE OF THE AUTHORITIES

An important aspect of the strike situation was the attitude of the authorities. They tried to maneuver rather than massacre. They obviously did not know what to do. This fact, which was brought out by Joseph Scholmer in his book Vorkuta: the Story of a Slave City in the Soviet Arctic, is confirmed by all the other witnesses, European and Japanese alike.

The hesitations of the camp authorities are partly explained by the uncertainty that seems to have prevailed in the entire police force since the spring of 1953. In Grenzen der Sowjetmacht (Holzner Verlag, Wurzburg, 1955), Wilhelm Starlinger sums up his observations on the Potma camp. According to him, the rehabilitation of the "murderers in white"—the Kremlin physicians who had been accused, before the death of Stalin, of murdering several dignitaries at the order of "world Zionism"—dealt a terrible blow to the prestige of the regime and of its local representatives. This unsettling of authority occurred not only in the minds of the prisoners; the camp administrators themselves were badly shaken.

However, their sense of uncertainty was surely not the only factor that kept them from indulging in slaughter. It appears, in the light of recent testimonies, that since 1950 or thereabouts, the Soviet Government's attitude toward prisoners in concentration camps has changed radically. Until then, it was completely disinterested in camp mortality rates, which were almost unimaginably high, and simply replaced the dead by additional mass shipments. However, it had to abandon this policy of exterminating prisoners when the supply of recruits began running low. The food, clothing, living conditions, and health and medical services began to improve perceptibly.[1] The authorities concentrated particularly on the problem of the high mortality rate. From the changes that have since taken place in the running of the camps we have reason to believe that camp administrators were instructed to keep the rates down at any cost and that they were strictly supervised in regard to this matter. A German woman who was was repatriated from Vorkuta and who was interviewed by Mrs. Catherine Goetschel for the CICRC stated the following: "The Russian does not accept death. When the time comes to die, he does all he can to stay alive. The Russians feel the responsibility of death. For example, at T., a guard went mad and killed several prisoners. The head of the camp was sent to prison and the entire team was punished." In certain cases, even the method of hasty burials was dropped, the kind described, for example, in Dr. Schomer's book, and a regular procedure was instituted. Dr. Starlinger states that, in one of the Potma sectors which he observed, an autopsy was performed in almost all cases. According to the same witness, after 1950 the dead were swathed in cloth, placed in a coffin and buried in a cemetery. Though there was no funeral ceremony, each grave had to be numbered and registered. A death certificate, drawn up in seven copies and signed by a doctor, was sent to various administrative offices. At least one copy was filed in Moscow.

These efforts to keep the death-rate within normal bounds was obviously incompatible with massacring prisoners during the rebellion. In any case, local authorities were unable to have recourse to such methods without consulting the central authorities.

What we have just indicated is not a pure hypothesis. A testimony on the strike that broke out in the Kirguin Camp in the summer of 1954, an account of which is contained in the Social Democrat Sotsialistitcheski Vestnik of July–August 1955 shows every clearly how a camp administration can be taken by

[1] See Information Bulletin No. I, p. 32.

surprise, can give the order to fire upon prisoners without first contacting the Gulag and Moscow, and then, fearing possible administrative sanctions, can scheme and maneuver so as to avoid, until the last minute, having to inform Moscow of what has happened. The strike in question lasted 40 days.[2]

In fact, the time lost by the camp administration in waiting for orders from Moscow made it possible for the strike to gain ground. It took on such dimensions that any attempt to settle it by terror alone became impossible, unless the authorities decided to wipe out all the prisoners. As a result, the police finally adopted a method which cleverly combined repression and concessions.

THE 1936 HUNGER STRIKE AND THE PRESENT MOVEMENT

The last revolt of concentration-camp prisoners before the long period of deathlike silence was the hunger strike that broke out at Vorkuta in the autumn of 1936. This tragic event was described by Boris Podolak, an eye-witness, in his testimony at the C. I. C. R. C.'s open hearings in Brussels in May 1951 (see The Regime of the Concentration Camp in the Postwar World, C. I. C. R. C., Paris, 1955).

On the initiative of a rather large and well organized group of Trotskyists, and with the participation of other political groups, 400 prisoners remained lying in their bunks and refused to go to work. In a declaration addressed to the internal police of the NKVD, in which they announced the hunger strike and stated their demands, the Stalinist system was condemned as a ruthless Fascist regime. Many other prisoners expressed their sympathy with the strikers without taking part in the strike. The crisis lasted 3½ months, but at the end of 1½ or 2 months, the strikers could no longer resist artificial feeding, and only about 40 of them held out to the end. The epilog of this drama occurred in the autumn of 1937, when a special commission arrived at Vorkuta from Moscow. The strike leaders were arrested, along with a mass of other prisoners, and were crowded into a barrack that had been transformed into a prison. After a rapid investigation, they were sent to an abandoned brick works about 20 miles away which thus became a kind of death isolator. It appears that by the end of February 1938 it contained 700 prisoners. The first mass executions began on the night of May 8 to 9. Thus, the last vestiges of the political struggle within the Soviet concentrationary world were swept away.

Between that strike and the one that broke out in Vorkuta and other camps 17 years later there was not only the long period of silence. The two rebellions were separated by a veritable abyss, which becomes apparents when one studies the political nature of each.

In the statement of demands drawn up by the present-day strikers, there is no declaration concerning general political questions. One seeks in vain any open condemnation of the Soviet regime, though there can be no doubt as to the hostility that is felt toward it. In addition, their political thinking is unquestionably less articulate than that of the victims of 1936. Though the Ukrainian partisans may hoist the anarchist black flag at Norilsk, nevertheless, for others the fight against the regime merges with the fight against antisemitism. It was the elite of the October revolution that was killed off in the 1930's. The strikes of our time are the work of pariahs who are barely beginning to emerge from the totalitarian embroglio. They are less concerned with general problems than with their immediate interests.

When the hunger strike was launched in 1937, the 400 rebels were alone in their agony, and their number dwindled from day to day. Some of their fellow-prisoners, though sympathizing with them, continued nevertheless to report for work. Others turned their backs on them. However, in the movement that is shaking the camps at the present time, the strikebreakers are only a handful of men. In his book on Vorkuta, Joseph Scholmer states: "Of the approximately 1,500 miners in camp 6, only about 60 were blacklegs. They were to be found chiefly among confirmed Communists, the desiatniki, the guards, the foremen, and the technicians. The strikers did not try to influence the traitors. When the group of blacklegs assembled in front of the post, the guards protected them very carefully. They were a rather nasty-looking lot. You could sense that they were corrupt. At the beginning of the strike, the NKVD, had concentrated the blacklegs in two huts for fear of reprisals on the part of the strikers. Perhaps it was also afraid of contagion. * * * When it realized that the strikebreakers had nothing to fear, the latter went back to their places in the barracks. They did their work, and nobody paid any attention to them."

[2] See pp. 67–68 of the present Bullettin.

It is true that the men who lead the strikes have to maneuver carefully to prevent defections. But, despite everything, the revolt is carried forward by the great mass of the prisoners.

Thus, it is apparent from a preliminary examination of the facts that have been brought to the attention of international public opinion that the strikes have been a general phenomenon in the Soviet concentrationary world since 1952.

The testimonies that have been collected, both western and Asiatic, seem to establish the existence of an organizing center for each of the strikes that we know about. The necessary preliminary condition seems to have been the breaking-up by the political prisoners of the power that until then had been exercised by the common-law criminals. The events at Karaganda, which date from the autumn of 1952, seem to have marked the beginning of this critical phase in the existence of the camps. The generalizing of the strikes appears to coincide with the arrival of prisoners who had taken part in an earlier movement and, for that reason, had been removed by administrative order from their original camp.

Nevertheless, the fact remains that these strikes could not have assumed the proportions they did if the action of the leaders had not found a favorable climate among the rank and file of the camps. It is this that gives these enterprises their genuine character of acts that are both organized and spontaneous.

PAUL BARTON.

IV. The Ninety-six Day Strike in the Norilsk Camps

Among the Japanese testimonies recently gathered by Mr. Herbert Passin, the whole of which constitute a report submitted for examination to the C. I. C. R. C., several deal with the development of the strike in Norilsk, one of the chief centers of concentrationary labor. The Norilsk camps are in the Arctic Circle, near the mouth of the Yenisei, in the far northwest of the Siberian Plateau.

In view of the date of the strike and the preciseness of the facts cited, we here publish this report for its historical interest. It is based on the declarations of Japanese prisoners who, at the time of the strike, were either in camp 5, where the strike started, or in camps 3 and 4 in Norilsk itself, or at camp 5 in Kaierkan.

Each of these witnesses had only a partial view of the events. He was quite aware of what was going on around him, but could only guess what was happening in the neighboring camps. Very few of the officials or their opponents were able to grasp the situation as a whole. Many of the facts were hidden from the prisoners, and even in retrospect they were reduced to suppositions and conjectures. The authorities themselves did not succeed in learning the identity of the members of the strike committee or even the mechanism of the rebellion.

The officials were obviously very careful to conceal the number of dead and injured. As soon as the situation was in hand again, they rapidly dispersed the ringleaders by sending them to other camps or locking them up. These measures made it impossible for the internees to compare and assemble their memories of what had occurred. These conditions should be borne in mind while reading the report.

Spetz Lager 5, where the strike broke out, is in the northern part of Norilsk, just east of the new city development, the Golstroy. The other political camps, No. 6, which is for women, and No. 4, are nearby. No. 5 is about 300 yards long and about 100 yards wide. At its southeastern end, it rounds off into a semicircle of about 50 yards. At the time the strike broke out, there were several thousand inmates, including several hundred non-Soviet foreigners, such as Japanese, Hungarians, Koreans, Chinese, Germans, Czechs, and Italians. As in most of the other political camps around there, the largest national group was the Ukranians. But No. 5 had something more: several score Ukrainians who had been involved in some disturbance in the forced labor camps of Karaganda in 1952 had been transferred to Norilsk only lately. These seemed to form an important focus of the strike, providing it with leadership and boldness.

One night shortly after their arrival, for example, four prisoners known to be spies for the administration were killed. The killers were never apprehended. What is even more remarkable is that they were killed with a mattock, which

suggests that there must have been some collaboration on the part of the guards. Every incoming prisoner was subjected to a rigorous gate check, and tools were by regulation returned to the custody of the guards. Therefore, extremely skillful organization or collaboration would be necessary to smuggle something as large and conspicuous as a work mattock into the camp. This affair achieved several important purposes. It weakened the administration's control of camp affairs. It frightened administration supporters and agents. And it impressed the prisoners with the determination and effectiveness of the Ukrainians, disposing them to follow their leadership.

At the time of the strike, the main work of camp 5 was the construction of a 6-story building nearby. The work was being done together with camps 4 and 6 (the women's camp). Camp No. 10 used the same brick depot as camp 5. The No. 5 workers were divided into two shifts, day and night.

Camp 5 is surrounded by a double barbed-wire fence, the outer about 4 yards high, and the inner about 1.5 yards high. The southwestern stretch of wire gives on the brick factory. Sentries patrolled the space between the inner and the outer barbed wires, the zapretnaya zona, or forbidden zone.

Because they worked together on the same project and also because they were fellow-Ukrainians, there was a good deal of contact between the men of camp 5 and the women. They communicated quite regularly by means of notes wrapped around stones to which a string would be tied and by this thrown across. This was, of course, forbidden, but the guards were not too strict about it. In order to prevent individuals from being singled out, sometimes groups of prisoners would throw at the same time. Therefore if the guards picked up one of the letters, they could not attribute it to a specific individual.

THE FIRST STRIKE IN CAMP 5

At midday on May 7, several prisoners were throwing notes across to some women who were in the brick factory. Occasionally one of the women's notes would not carry the full distance across, falling in the zapretnaya zona. The men created a disturbance reaching their arms or poking sticks through the fence, and one of the sentries ordered them to move back. Several prisoners paid no attention to this order and continued in a leisurely way as before. At that point a guard who was new to the lager walked down the space between the two barbed-wire fences. Normally these nadzor were unarmed, but on that occasion he was carrying a pistol. Just as he approached the center of the disturbance, a prisoner pushed out a stick to rake in a note for which he had been reaching. The nadzor drew his pistol and fired, wounding him in the arm.

A crowd of prisoners immediately gathered around in anger, whereupon the sentry fired his rifle several times into the air. When they refused to disperse, he aimed at the ground and fired once again. This time, another prisoner was wounded slightly in the finger. With this, the prisoners dispersed.

The shootings stirred up a strange and reckless mood among the prisoners. According to regulations, the sentry may shoot at people between the inner and the outer barbed wire, but he may not shoot inside the camp itself. The prisoners argued that since the wounded man had been inside, the sentry had no right to shoot him. The guards argued that since his hand was outside, they did have the right to shoot him.

With the wounded at their head, a group of prisoners trooped over to the camp director's office, demanding that the sentry be brought to trial. When the director refused, they replied that, even though they were prisoners, they had certain rights. The prisoners were angry and dissatisfied, but they dispersed.

The following day, May 8, the day shift went out to work on its construction project as usual. But the assignments by the brigade chiefs, themselves prisoners, were not clear, so the day shift idled around not getting much work done. The same happened again on May 9. Then the prisoners began to feel that some firm hand had taken charge and that perhaps the brigade chiefs were under instructions to slow down. On that evening, the night shift started a sitdown strike and did not return to the camp the following morning. The day shift was therefore unable to go to work.

The sitdown strike on the construction project had an immediate effect on the day shift of Spetz lager 4 as well. It returned home and announced that it was starting a strike in sympathy with the night shift of camp 5.

Back in camp 5, the rumor spread that the strike had expanded to camp 10 and to the women's lager (No. 6) as well. The atmosphere was electric.

The night shift had run up a black flag, made of mattress ticking, on the building where they were holding out. Black flags made their appearance in camp 4 also.

The camp administration seemed somewhat uncertain about what to do, but finally food was brought into camp 5, and meals were served as usual. In camp 4, however, food was not served, whether because the administration refused to bring it in or the strike leaders decided not to accept it is not clear. In any event, the prisoners of camp 4 went without food for 3 days.

Finally on the morning of May 12, after 3 days of sitdown, the No. 5 night shift returned to camp. One of the nadzors tried to hurry the day shift out to work, but at that the prisoners balked, and a new feeling seemed to take hold of them. Therefore, about 9 a. m., the commandant announced over the loudspeaker that "sabotage"—which included refusal to work—would be punished by 3 years' extension of term. "Go to work immediately," the loudspeaker warned. But the prisoners gave no response. A group of prisoners approached the commandant near his office and demanded that someone be sent from Moscow to discuss their grievances. "You don't have the authority," they said. "Send Malenkov." Whether by instinct or by shrewd organization, the prisoners all shouted in unison so that no single person could be picked out as leader or spokesman.

The threat of a 3-year extension did not disturb the 25-year prisoners, but those with 8- or 10-year sentences that were drawing to a close became very fearful of reprisals. Some of the Japanese prisoners themselves began to think of how to get out of the camps so as not to get too involved.

On May 13 a high officer of the Norilsk Kombinat, believed by the prisoners to be its chief, arrived to look into the situation. He was, however, unable to resolved the problem, and so the same evening, a general from Krasnoyarsk flew in, believed by the prisoners to be a Major General Panikoff, Chief of the Yenisei Stroy, with headquarters in Krasnoyarsk. A desk was set up in front of the mailroom, and the general's aide spoke to the prisoners for him, the general himself saying nothing. But the prisoners made so much noise that it was impossible to carry on the discussion. "It's no use talking to you. You don't have the authority. We want to talk to someone from Moscow." The only reply the prisoners were able to get was, "No higher official will come. If you don't stop the strike immediately, you will get a 3-year extension of sentence." The same experience was repeated in camp 4.

On the following day, a high officer of the MVD, described among the prisoners as "Beria's assistant," with the rank of major general, flew in from Moscow to undertake negotiations. He asked the prisoners to have their "representatives" prepare a petition of grievances. This placed the strikers in a difficult position. Although nobody was entirely clear who the leaders might be, nobody wanted to expose them to possible reprisals. A young Ukrainian stepped forward from the crowd of pushing prisoners to offer himself. Beria's assistant refused to negotiate unless the "representatives" came forward. A quick conference among the prisoners led to the designation of 7 or 8 persons as "explainers," not as "representatives" or "leaders.' Beria's assistant accepted this group to negotiate with.

A list of grievances had been prepared by the strike leadership, and it was handed over. These were formulated in a secret session of the leadership, and the ordinary prisoners neither participated nor had an opportunity to express approval or disapproval. However, when they learned the demands, they were extremely pleased and proud. The following demands were made:

1. Application of the amnesty to the political prisoners.
2. Better food rations.
3. An 8-hour working day. (At that time the working day was 10 hours, and counting commuting time, 12 hours.)
4. Better cultural facilities for the prisoners with 15- to 25-year sentences. ("The improvement of our knowledge is important also for the construction of the Soviet Union," they argued.)
5. Transfer from Norilsk to some less harsh climate; or else more suitable work in Norilsk itself.
6. Elimination of the disparities in working conditions between the different work places.
7. An absolute end to discrimination against national minorities.
8. Transfer of the camp commandant.
9. A rigid accounting of the Kombinat book. (The charge was that the "camp officials are middlemen who exploit our labor.")

10. The removal of the identification numbers on clothing.
11. An increase in the amount of money they could send home.
12. No locking of the barracks at night.
13. No reprisals.

The MVD man was extremely conciliatory.

On May 15, an announcement was posted on the bulletin board in front of the dining hall to the effect that "The complaints and demands will be investigated and action taken immediately. In the meantime, go back to work." The word thereupon went around to end the strike and await the outcome of the investigation.

In camp 4, a similar conference took place. The MVD man impressed the prisoners favorably with his sincerity, and so the strike was called off there too.

THE SECOND STRIKE IN CAMP 5

But within a few days the prisoners began to feel that the authorities were not playing fair. As day after day passed, the administration gave no clear answer to the demands they had submitted to Beria's assistant. There was also a series of moves that made the prisoners suspicious.

On May 9 several hundred foreign prisoners, including most of the Japanese, were transferred to barracks in the semicircular southeastern tip of the camp. They were told that as a result of the amnesty following Stalin's death, foreign prisoners would soon be sent home, and that this transfer was a preliminary. The foreign prisoners were, however, very suspicious of this explanation.

Then, on the following day, May 20, a major shift took place. About half of the prisoners were transferred out of camp 5, some to camp 4 and some to a new camp about a mile south that was still under construction and had received as yet no number. The feeling among the prisoners was that this was a trick to isolate the leaders, or to separate the tough from the weak prisoners or to reduce the number of prisoners in camp 5, or to divide them into groups of manageable size. In any event, the prisoners saw the transfer as an ominous move. It looked like a violation of their demand that there be no reprisals and a preliminary to some drastic action.

There were no Japanese prisoners in the group that was transferred, so its fate is not entirely clear to us. From their position in the new barracks, however, the Japanese prisoners heard the firing of machine guns pushing the group along. The firing was also heard by the prisoners in camp 4. It was not clear what provoked the firing or whether any prisoners were killed or wounded, but the rumor spread both in camp 5 and in camp 4 that several dozens had been hurt. The general belief was that the intransigeant Ukrainian leaders were being separated out for isolation, punishment, or even worse. The firing suggested that they were being shot right then and there. A similar separation was taking place in the other camps that had been on strike.

On the following day, the resentment of the remaining prisoners of camp 5 broke out in another strike. Whether in response to the same conditions or as a result of good communications or organization, the strike recommenced in camp 4 as well.

Just past midnight—that is, early in the morning of May 22—a fire truck entered the camp and pulled up alongside a water main near the camp bakery. At that, one of the hadzors started to bolt barracks B2. However, some prisoners who were not yet fully asleep overheard this and woke up the others. Suspecting that this was a move to isolate the barracks from contact with each other in order to gain more complete control of the camp, they were thoroughly aroused and, breaking open the windows, went around smashing the locks on the other barracks and calling the prisoners to come out. Then a group of prisoners attacked the truck. The driver, in alarm, turned about and made straight for the gate, injuring a prisoner as he did so.

The prisoners were in a state of great excitement, and they took over full control of the camp. They kept the guards out, and refused to pay attention to the administration. Orders passed around organizing camp activities, but nobody pried into the question of where they came from.

All day, on May 22, the excitement continued, with the prisoners in firm control and doing their own policing. All day long the camp loudspeaker announced: "High officials from Moscow are on their way. If the strike continues, you will be firmly suppressed."

On the evening of the 22d, about a platoon of Red army troops marched into the camp through the main gate. A group of prisoners who were near the

commandant's office went over to meet them near the eastern edge of the warehouse, and started a discussion. The argument became heated, the officer in charge alternating between conciliation and threats.

The officer warned, "If you come any closer, we shoot," at the same time firing his pistol into the sky. This seemed to be a signal for the guards to open fire. The prisoners flopped to the ground, and the officer backed off. When the prisoners suddenly realized that the firing was only a threat, they grabbed bricks and sticks and went for the officers, pushing them in front of the store. At this, support fire commenced, the angle of fire being at about the level of the second story. The prisoners then withdrew to the front of the drying room, and the officer passed out of the gate under cover. The prisoners, still excited, stayed where they were in front of the drying room, and the loudspeaker again gave the order to disperse. When there was no response, firing began for the third time, but this time the angle of fire was lower, and the prisoners dispersed quickly.

The following day, the 23d, at nightfall, the authorities began distributing soldiers in order to regain their control of the camp. The soldiers surrounded the camp. All exits were blocked. The troops were lined up all along the enclosure.

With these arrangements made, negotiations between the authorities and the prisoners recommenced. When the prisoners refused to submit, a company of troops entered through both the front and the back gates, forming a semicircle as they advanced. The prisoners were pressed onto the road between the eastern tip of the warehouse and the bakery. The unit that was deployed in the direction of the hospital outside the barbed wire began firing above the prisoners. But this did not seem to be very effective. Then, when the unit that came through the back gate had taken cover in the shadow of the buildings, the unit from the front gate opened fire straight into the crowd of prisoners. There were many casualties. Some of the mental patients, apparently alarmed by the firing, were caught in the line of fire, and there seem to have been some casualties among them too.

The prisoners seemed completely stunned by the pointblank fire and surrendered meekly, allowing themselves to be assembled near the camp jail.

The Japanese prisoners were not able to form a clear idea of the number of dead and wounded. One stated that he saw corpses littering the path all the way from the drying room to the jail. Later on, 7 or 8 trucks came to remove the dead and wounded.

IN THE OTHER CAMPS

While these events had been taking place in camp 5, it will be recalled that strikes had broken out in other political camps in the Norilsk area as well. Most of these were of the character of sympathy strikes. In addition to camp 4, whose strike took a course similar to that of No. 5, there were strikes reported for camps 2, 3, 6, 10, and 25 in Norilsk proper, and for two coal-mining camps, Kairkan 5, and a camp near Dudinka. The conflict had taken on the proportions of a general strike among the political camps.

In Kairkan 5, a coal-mining camp for politicals, Ukrainians seem to have taken over control. It was reported that as a preliminary to the strike itself, a number of administration spies who had been planted among the prisoners were killed.

It was also reported that Lager 10 prisoners stole automatic rifles and pistols, incarcerated the camp commandant in the jail and held him for ransom. According to the truckdrivers, from whom the Japanese heard this story, a real pitched battle between the armed prisoners and the troops broke out. The prisoners were finally encircled and cut to pieces in the vicinity of the main gate of camp 10.

Several Japanese who were being transferred from No. 5 to the new unnumbered camp overheard firing and screaming in camp 6, the women's camp, as they marched past.

The prisoners of camp 3 took over control of their camp, setting up barricades at the gates. As in camp 5, there were futile conferences with the local high-ranking officers, including General Panikoff from the Yeniesi Stroy, followed by the friendly conference with Beria's assistant.

The strike dragged on inconclusively, with no concessions to the strikers, but also no important repressive action. Food was not cut off and no drastic suppression was resorted to. The prisoners operated the camp, and they continued to fly their black flag. Local townspeople, who were mainly former prisoners themselves, and prisoners from other camps demonstrated their

solidarity by throwing food and cigarettes into camp 3 as they passed by. The prisoners made up leaflets, which they flew into the wind on kites, stating their side of the case. Also, quite mysteriously, printed leaflets listing the strikers' demands began to appear in Norilsk town itself.

By August 11, however, the authorities, having exhausted all other means, apparently resolved on drastic measures. At about 11 p. m. on that night, troops surrounded the camp and began firing into the compound. The firing caused great agitation in the other camps and in the town. "I stayed up all night," said one Japanese released prisoner, who lived in the town, "listening with both horror and fascination. We knew what was going on." The firing when on sporadically until about 6 a. m. of the 12th.

Japanese estimates place the number of casualties at about 1,500 killed an d wounded out of a total camp population of about 2,500 prisoners. Emergency first aid and hospital mobilization lasted for about 3 days.

With this, the disorders in Norilsk which had started on May 7, came to an end. They had lasted 96 days in all, starting before the Vorkuta and East Berlin uprisings, and continuing after these had ended.

Mr. DOBRIANSKY. In a succeeding article on The 96-Day Strike in the Norilsk Camps, it is observed that "As in most of the other political camps around there, the largest national group was the Ukrainians," Monthly Information Bulletin 4, August–November 1955, pages 28–35.

Another instructive report on Modifications of the Regime in the Tayshet Camps from the Spring of 1953 to November 1954 strikes upon a very important note when in respect to Ukrainian leadership, it states "Their example of boldness and self-respect—and even more important, that they could get away with it—stirred the camp 13 prisoners deeply," Monthly Information Bulletin 5, December 1955, pages 23–27.

(The article referred to follows:)

III. MODIFICATIONS OF THE REGIME IN THE TAYSHET CAMPS FROM THE SPRING OF 1953 TO NOVEMBER 1954

> The following is a further extract from Mr. Herbert Passin's report which was drawn up on the basis of recent declarations by Japanese prisoners returning from the U. S. S. R., and which was submitted by him to the C. I. C. R. C. The present text deals with modification of the regime in the Tayshet camps since 1953. The Tayshet Combinat (camps and coal mines) is in the Krasnoyarsk region.[1]

Tayshet went over to a wage system only in the spring of 1953. Until that time, prisoners had received their pay in food—bread and kasha. Fulfillment of the norm brought 100 grams of bread and 400 of kasha; 120 percent of the norm, twice as much of both. But under the new regulations, wages were paid in cash. A 3-month transition period leading into the full operation of the new system was established. During this time, prisoners were allowed to draw advance payments upon request up to 100 rubles; an extra 100 rubles could be drawn upon special petition. After this transition period, all payments were to be made in cash. As in Norilsk, the sudden apearance of cash on a large scale brought on a rash of thievery, and many of the prisoners took to depositing their earnings with the administration for safekeeping. By the end of 1954, some prisoners had worked up accounts of more than 1,000 rubles. At about the same time, the food ration itself was improved, and a fairly well stocked store was open. All of these developments added up to a real incentive for the prisoners to work. They could buy things with their money, and if they wanted more, they could earn it by working over the norm. By the end of 1953, prisoners were allowed to own watches and radios, which they could buy in the store, as personal property.

---

[1] Cf. Information Bulletin No. 4, The Ninety-six Day Strike in the Norilsk Camps, p. 28.

In the year 1954, the changes that had started after Stalin's death continued apace. In March of that year, barbed wire within the camps was removed. At the same time, the humilitating identification numbers on the clothing were removed. In April, the so-called zachot system was introduced. By overfulfilling the norms, the prisoners were able to earn credits for the commutation of their sentence at the following rates:

Number of days reduction of sentence for 1 day's overfulfillment of the norm by

Type of work	Up to 5 percent	6 to 10 percent	11 to 20 percent	21 percent and over
Inside camp; or light work	0.5	1.0	1.0	1.0
Work with machines	.5	1.0	1.5	1.5
Heavy work (lumbering, etc.)	.5	1.0	1.5	2.0

Then, on April 26, it was announced that prisoners under the age of 18 who had finished one-third of their term without incident would be released. All of these changes, coming in regular order after Stalin's death, seemed to confirm the prisoners' expectations.

But on May 5, 1954, a new development took place; 15 Ukranians who had taken a leading part in the Norilsk strike arrived in camp 13. Their transfer was part of the policy of dispersal of the strike leadership. For the first time the Taysheet prisoners learned of the strike, and for the first time they met fellow prisoners who were not afraid to stand up to the administration. The camp authorities seemed somewhat afraid of the new arrivals, so for the first few months they did not assign them any heavy work. The Ukranians thrilled the prisoners with their detailed stories about Norilsk. The moral of their story, which they repeated over and over again, as that the prisoners should assert themselves and demand their rights. "Something new is happening in the Soviet Union," they argued. "Beria's day is over!" They would shout back at the guards, "Now we are the ones who respect the laws of the Soviet Union. Don't try to pull anything on us!" In very short order they took over control of camp 13. Until then, the camp had been under the control of one of the criminal prisoners, but the Ukrainians organized the camp against him and one night gave him such a thorough beating that he was taken to the hospital and never showed up in camp 13 again. At night, the Ukrainians used to sit around singing Ukrainian songs. Their examples of boldness and self-respect—and even more important, that they could get away with it—stirred the camp 13 prisoners deeply.

In the next few months, many changes began to make their appearance in Taysheet No. 13. They were of several kinds. First there were actual changes in the regulations governing living conditions, working conditions, and prison sentences. Then there were changes in the manner of execution of regulations. There had always been rules and regulations on the books for the protection of the prisoners, but they were often disregarded by camp officials. The regulations, for example, called for 1 day of rest per week; but if the camp officials wanted to meet some quota, then they disregarded this right of the prisoners and required them to work anyway. After the arrival of the Ukrainians in camp 13, the regulations were meticulously observed. Another important change as the reduction of the "intermediate exploitation," which the prisoners particularly resented: having to bribe the work chief to receive credit for filling the norm, overcharges on "administrative expenses," and so on. There seems also to have been a real change in attitude on the part of the camp authorities; they showed much more respect not only for the rights of the prisoners but for their person as well. The prisoners also seemed to feel more self-confident and proud of themselves, and less inclined to submit humbly to official arrogance. It is also important that the prisoners found it possible to stand up to authority without fear of reprisals and in the full expectation that they could compel the authorities to accept some of their demands.

Let us look in a little more detail at the changes that took place in Tayshet No. 13 after the arrival of the Ukrainians.

LIVING CONDITIONS

June 1954: Japanese prisoners were allowed to correspond with their families in Japan. Other foreign prisoners had already received this privilege.

June 1954: The use of food-ration reduction as punishment was abolished. Until that time, prisoners who fulfilled less than 60 percent of the norm had their rations reduced to 300 grams of bread.

Midsummer 1954: There was a change in the behaviour and manner of the guards. When they used to line up the work brigades for the day, they would shout a routine series of warnings: "No talking on the line of march! Walk in the middle of the road! Don't look sideways! If you drop something, leave it; don't try to pick it up! No eating on the line of march! I shall shoot without warning!" After the change, this formula, customarily accompanied by much cursing and shouting, was reduced to the simple statement: "Don't try to escape or you will be shot."

August 1954: Family visits were permitted. This did not affect the foreign prisoners, but it was potentially a big boon to Russian prisoners whose families could afford the trip. A special guest house where the prisoners could meet their visitors was set up next to the gatehouse of camp 13. The first beneficiary was a brigade leader with a good work record, who received a visit from his wife. He was given a 3-day vacation without work, and then upon petition he received 5 more days of liberty after working hours. He was therefore able to spend 8 days with his wife. Since at that time there were no other family visitors, the brigade leader and his wife had the guest house entirely to themselves.

September 1954: It was announced that prisoners with a good record could petition to live outside of the camp, an arrangement that is to be distinguished from "temporary parole." Under the new system, the camp director could, at his discretion, permit a worker with a good record to live outside the prison camp, although continuing to work at regular lager labor. However, the director had to assume responsibility for the prisoner's good behaviour. Therefore, although the permissive regulation was in existence, as of January 1955, when our Japanese informants left Tayshet, there had been no case of outside residence under this provision.

October 1954: Prisoners were allowed to grow their hair long. Until that time, they had either been shaven clean or had a crew cut.

WORKING CONDITIONS

June 1954: The work day was reduced from 10 to 8 hours. Also a more careful check was kept on the number of hours worked. Formerly work records had been very loose, and a 10-hour working day often stretched to 12 or 13 hours without the prisoners receiving any extra credit. Under the new system, the total work day, including transportation time, did not exceed 10 hours.

June 1954: Piecework rates were raised 20 percent.

June 1954: There was a relaxation of the guarding of prisoners and an extension of the bes konvoi or unguarded convoy, system. Until then, a group of prisoners, even if it consisted of only 1 man, had to be under control of 2 armed guards. Even from the standpoint of the authorities this was a wasteful arrangement. If a single prisoner had to leave the area under guard, then 2 additional guards had to be called to accompany him, or else the entire work group had to be moved with him and then returned to its original working place when he returned. Under the new system, officials were given more discretionary authority to permit prisoners to move about without armed guard.

June 1954: There was also a change in the system of guarding workplaces. Until June 1954, every workplace was surrounded by a double barbed-wire fence. The first barbed wire was marked by red flags. Anyone stepping beyond the red flag into the zapretnaya zone, or forbidden zone, would be fired upon by the guards. Under the new system, however, the zone of toleration was expanded. Now if a prisoner passes the red flag, the guard calls out warning. Ten meters beyond the red flags, there are notices in black, warning "Halt, or you will be shot." Only when a prisoner passes these black signs will the guards start shooting.

Winter 1954: When the temperature fell below —42° C., work was stopped. Although this regulation had existed before, it had not been observed scrupulously, prisoners often working in —50° C. and more.

PENAL REGULATION

June 1954: On medical certification of unfitness for work, lame and crippled prisoners were to be released, regardless of length of time served.

June 1954: Any prisoner with a good record and "outstanding" work performance could petition for release after completion of two-thirds of his sentence.

About July 1954: It was announced that upon petition sentences under article 58 would be reexamined. Prisoners uho upon reexamination were adjudged innocent of the charges on which they had been imprisoned would be released without regard to the length of time they had served. As of the end of 1954, of the 1,000 prisoners in camp 13 who had been sentenced under article 58, 25 were released as "innocent." They had all been sentenced to 25 years.

August 1954: It was announced that the camp director could, at his discretion, recommend immediate release for prisoners with "outstanding" records. In this case, the director would submit a request for judicial review to higher authorities. The reviewing authority could change the sentence without regard to the length of time served by the prisoners. The only qualification here was that the camp director retained responsibility for the conduct of any prisoner released on his recommendation. As of January 1955, there had been no releases under this new regulation in Tayshet No. 13.

November 1954: Russian and foreign political prisoners were separated into different camps.

Mr. DOBRIANSKY. The psychological and spiritual effect of such leadership in the ghastly circumstances of a typical forced-labor camp cannot be too strongly emphasized. Similar leadership on our part, pointing to the complete abolition of such forced labor likewise cannot be taken lightly. Because of their solid contribution to the general picture of forced labor in Ukraine and of Ukrainians, I ask for the full incorporation of these three reports in this hearing.

Senator DOUGLAS. That will be done.

Mr. DOBRIANSKY. This general analysis of Russian Communist forced labor in Ukraine and of Ukrainians establishes the following points of conclusion:

(1) That for political offenses the largest single national group in the forced-labor camps is the Ukrainians who with courage, fearlessness, and the cooperation of other non-Russian patriots have formed a leadership in these camps as part of the greater struggle for human dignity and national self-determination and independence.

(2) That the opposition to the colonial and imperialist regime of Moscow is not, as some mistakenly think, latent or potential but, instead, very much active; and the great unrest, strikes, and resistance in the forced-labor camps to which large and heavy economic projects are assigned, constituted a major contributing factor to the party's change in maneuvers at the recent 20th congress.

(3) That if our many resolutions and official statements on liberation of the captive nations, national self-determination, freedom with justice, and close international collaboration are to mean anything, we should speedily pass this measure on abolishing forced labor which in the Soviet Union is inextricably bound up with Russian Communist colonialism and imperialism, political tyranny, and genocide.

(4) That with all the wealth of evidence and data at our disposal we should entertain no fear of any participation of Moscow in the International Labor Organization and with greater activity and cooperation with other free nations exercise our leadership in the formulation of an international convention which will conduce to the abolition of forced labor for political and economc purposes.

(5) That by even taking this step we shall, notably in these days of clever Moscow tactics, be creating a great pressure of freedom aimed

at the oligarchial dictatorship and great hope and comfort to the millions rotting away in the forced-labor camps of the Soviet Union and for whom the amnesty ukase of September 17, 1955, has no application.

To permit relatively minor considerations to obstruct such necessary participation and leadership by us in the ILO can only cause one to wonder about our keen awareness of the struggle in which we are engaged. We have a moral responsibility toward those in captivity as well as to ourselves in freedom and its preservation. This responsibility is more than ever before emphasized by the fact that we stand today in the direct path of Russian Communist ambition for world domination.

As one of our Department of State officials, Mr. Francis B. Stevens, has been quoted to say:

> The imperialistic urges of the Tsars—urges which were translated into efforts to penetrate the Near East, the Far East, and Eastern Europe—did not die with the Tsars. The history of the past 20 years is replete with examples of the anxiety of the Soviet leaders to give expression to this historic imperialism (Washington Post, August 28, 1953).

The strikes and rebellions by the unassisted captives of this Russian totalitarian drive are, whether we are aware of it or not, an integral part of our struggle for freedom. The excellent editorial in the New York Times this past Monday on Murder in Tiflis, which parallels in part my own analysis submitted earlier this month to the House Un-American Activities Committee, asks:

> And why should not Georgians rebel? Why should Georgia—or the Ukraine, or Armenia, or Poland, or any of the captive Sovietized areas—be denied free self-determination in an era when Moscow hypocritically preaches freedom to what remains of the colonial world?

I therefore request that this fitting editorial be appended to my testimony because similar and definitely related questions may be pointedly raised in the International Labor Organization by our delegates, seeking freedom of labor for our indisputable allies in the colonial empire of Moscow.

Senator DOUGLAS. Thank you very much, Professor Dobrianski. We will see that it is copied in.

(The editorial referred to follows:)

[From the New York Times, April 23, 1956]

MURDER IN TIFLIS

A new historic date has passed into the annals of the Soviet people, March 9, 1956. It was on that date that Soviet troops in Tiflis opened fire on the city's people, killing up to 100, according to reliable sources, and wounding probably many more. Machinegun fire was the answer of the Soviet regime when the people of Tiflis marched on their post office. With that murderous blast, the mask of benevolence and kindness the post-Stalin regime has tried to wear came off and the brutal visage of the oppressors became unmistakable. "We will never forget March 9," one Tiflis citizen told an American reporter there, and we of the free world cannot forget that date either. It must go on the honor roster with the dates of the Kronstadt rebellion 3½ decades ago, of the East German uprising, of the strike at the Vorkuta slave labor camp.

It was nominally to commemorate the 3d anniversary of Stalin's death that the crowds gathered in Tiflis. But it was not Stalinist despotism that the people of Georgia sought to honor. It was Georgian nationalism that drove them on to defy the massed troops, and Stalin figured only as the symbol of a Georgian being victimized by Moscow, as Georgia has so often been victimized by Moscow in the past. And why should not Georgians rebel? Why should Georgia—or

the Ukraine, or Armenia, or Poland, or any of the captive Sovietized areas—be denied free self-determination in an era when Moscow hypocritically preaches freedom to what remains of the colonial world?

Messrs. Khrushchev and Bulganin are in Great Britain. Is it too much to expect that they will be asked to explain this deed? Why should we suppose that they, who were willing to have machineguns turned on their own people, would have any hesitation to turn even more powerful weapons on free people if they could do so with impunity?

Senator DOUGLAS. Now, Professor Dobriansky, I would like to ask this question, but I will do so only if I understand you are an American citizen. Is that true?

Mr. DOBRIANSKY. Oh, yes.

Senator DOUGLAS. Now, in the letter from Assistant Secretary Robert Hill to Senator Lister Hill on this resolution under date of April 11 of this year, in which the Department of State opposes the resolution in question, Mr. Hill says that he is interested only in the connection that the U. S. S. R. has embraced the idea of the convention and has called upon the International Labor Organization, and this is in quotes—

to adopt as broad and radical an instrument as possible.

Then Secretary Hill continues:

Endorsement of the convention form by the U. S. S. R. is indicative of what might be expected from the adoption of this form of action.

Now, while not directly stated, there is at least a shadow of an implication in this statement that adoption of this resolution will not be in the Nation's interest and might possibly play into the hands of Soviet Russia.

Now, do you have any opinion on that?

Mr. DOBRIANSKY. Oh, I certainly do, Mr. Chairman. In fact, I was present when Senator Humphrey expressed his opinions on it and I wholeheartedly support his sentiments and ideas and opinions on this particular measure.

It reminds me again of the battle that we had with regard to the Genocide Convention, namely, the fear that—of course, I recognize the constitutional problem that was involved there, but it was brought up also by certain people of the ABA at that time, namely, that we would be getting into an area where we are not too sure of ourselves, with regard to facts and information and the like.

Now, I am not an international lawyer—I left that to Dr. Lemkin at that time, but I handled this area of data and facts and the U. S. S. R. subsequently ratified that convention.

I pointed out in the first paragraph of my statement here, namely, that had we ratified that convention before the Soviet Union, and even if the Soviet Union had done so, we would have been today, in an excellent position to take up all these statements of Khrushchev and others at the 20th Party Congress, statements that substantiated precisely what we were stating here at the time of the McMahon hearings about genocide, mass murders, and the like.

When it comes to this matter of forced labor, why we have humans, people that have been in these slave-labor camps. I worked with Congressman Kersten at the time that we had the House committee in the House of Representatives, a select committee to investigate Communist aggression. We did not have the time or the resources to go

down the line and take up the hundreds that are in this country who have been in Kolyma, who have been at Vorkuta, and not only that, but their physical bodies show the marks of their past experiences.

To me, if we ever enter the ILO and formulate this international convention, that would, to my mind, be the grandest opportunity we could have to embarrass them with truth and really to present this truth to them.

Unfortunately, if I might express my opinion here on this matter, it always seems that when these significant questions come up, there is some degree of opposition from the State Department which seems to spell "let's do nothing," and just wait and accept this passively.

Senator DOUGLAS. I am very glad to have you express your point of view and I want to make it clear for the record that I was not asking this question on public policy unless I had been assured you were a citizen.

Mr. DOBRIANSKY. Our organization is made up of citizens.

Senator DOUGLAS. Thank you very much.

We will meet at 2 o'clock this afternoon and we regret that we are not able to hear Mr. Zissu this morning, as I have an appointment now. Mr. Zissu, would you be willing to testify this afternoon?

Mr. ZISSU. Yes.

Senator DOUGLAS. Then we will hear Mr. David Dallin, to whom Mr. Dobriansky has referred; Mr. Charles Greenidge, director general of the Anti-Slavery Society of Great Britain; Dr. Michael Devenis, Lithuanian-American Council; and Dr. Stanislaus Skrzypek, economic analyst and specialist in Polish and East European economics.

(Whereupon, at 12:35 p. m., the subcommittee was recessed to convene at 2 p. m.)

AFTERNOON SESSION

(The subcommittee reconvened at 2:25 p. m., Senator John F. Kennedy, presiding.)

Senator KENNEDY. The committee will come to order.

The first witness is Mr. Zissu, of the Rumanian National Committee. We are glad to see you, Mr. Zissu. Would you proceed with your statement?

Mr. ZISSU. Thank you.

STATEMENT BY IANCU ZISSU, MEMBER OF THE RUMANIAN NATIONAL COMMITTEE

Mr. ZISSU. The main obstacle faced by any attempt to get a clear picture of the present situation in Rumania is the fact that the country is under the rule of a dictatorial regime.

Aside from a handful of officials, people may not leave the country. The strictest censorship, characteristic of Communist totalitarianism, further precludes information from reaching the outside world. Even the Official Gazette, whose contents should presumably be known to all citizens, is made available only to the state authorities, and is not on sale in Rumania.

The present government of my country, in other words, is deliberately concealing its own actions. It has, that is, things to conceal not only from the free world but from its own subjects.

Now, in pre-Communist Rumania forced labor applied exclusively to common criminals duly sentenced to terms thereof by due process of law. Since the Communists were installed in power by Soviet Russia, forced labor has been extended to political prisoners, too, with or without benefit of trial. Articles 36 and 37 of the Criminal Code now in effect prescribe "labor of an industrial or agricultural nature or of public use" for purely political offenses.

Furthermore, decree No. 187/1949 states that—

> acts of commission or omission that violate the social, economic, or political structure * * * or that disturb the legal order set up by the people under the leadership of the working class, are considered to be acts endangering the commonwealth.

And—

> such acts deemed to be dangerous to society are punishable, even though the law may not specifically provide for such offenses.

The decree makes it clear that—

> in such cases the grounds and limits of responsibility shall be determined in accordance with existing legal provisions that deal with similar offenses.

Nor is that all. The decree goes a step further and says:

> In handing down sentences for such offenses, the court shall take into account * * * the degree of social danger presented by the offense and by the defendant.

It is quite obvious from these quotations that the sole purpose of the law is now to safeguard the political regime, justice is but a branch of the executive power, and the citizen himself has no rights that can be validated in law.

Evidence to this effect is to be found in the 1949 decree law for the organization of the courts. Article 2 of that legislation states that the main purpose of justice in Rumania is "to strengthen and promote the people's democracy."

There are the other legal provisions for reprisals against political opposition. Law No. 70/1950, which punishes so-called economic offenses, is so loosely worded that almost any act can be interpreted as a punishable economic offense. Such things as "divulging economic information," the "failure to fulfill labor contracts," "errors in regard to the quality of products" may involve, not only the actual perpetrator, they may legally implicate accomplices and "instigators," and provide sentences for such "accessories" as well as for the offenders themselves.

All the above, aside from everything else that may be said about them, are expressly designed for the purpose of making it legally possible to recruit forced labor. While providing the authorities with a readily available inexpensive labor, these provisions are aimed at liquidating all political opposition.

Indeed, roundabout ways of recruiting forced labor have been introduced in other legal texts by the present Communist government of Rumania. Decree No. 351/1949 set up so-called reeducation centers for "vagrants, beggars, prostitutes, and panders." Such reeducation centers are under the authority and control of the Ministry of Labor.

In the terms of this iniquitous decree, as elaborated in Ordinance No. 1720, issued by the Ministry of Domestic Trade, "vagrants" are

people who have no steady employment. However, no one can aspire to steady employment unless he or she is admitted to membership in one or another of the labor unions. And membership entails endorsement by the Communist Party. In other words, it is the ruling party that determines ultimately who is to be considered legally a "vagrant." It might be added that food and clothing cards are available only to members of the labor unions, so-called.

The culmination of this system is provided in the law for the punishment of crimes that threaten the state security and the prosperity of the national economy. This elaborately titled law bears No. 16/1949. It prescribes the death penalty for those found to prejudice the state power. Like all the rest, this piece of legislation is purposely worded so loosely that even the mildest form of criticism is open to interpretation by the courts as "prejudicial to the state," and may cost the offender his or her life.

The ferocity of this piece of legislation is further apparent in that even acts of omission or negligence may easily entail the death penalty, at the discretion of the courts.

But even the deliberate elasticity of the actual texts involving heavy penalties falls short as a means to coerce and subdue the workers, when compared with the everyday abuses and arbitrary practices of the administration.

Perhaps the main explanation for the current administrative misrule in Rumania must be sought in the fact that that administration is itself wholly subservient to Moscow. The Bucharest Government is under constant pressure to produce and export for the sole benefit of the Soviet Government. In thus meeting its obligation to provide fuel for the Soviet war machine and economic plans, the Government resorts to the most ruthless and inhuman methods. This, of course, in no way implies that it is absolved of guilt. On the contrary, in making itself the willing tool of an alien imperialistic system, it deserves amply the loathing with which it is viewed by all Rumanians

Under the existing system, even the workers who are considered free—that is, those who do not work under sentence—are subject to the most arbitrary rules. They may, at the discretion of the authorities, be assigned to certain jobs, shifted and transferred, and frozen on their job. Working conditions, wages, compulsory quotas of individual or team production, and so forth are all set by the administration. The workers have no way of protesting. They have no redress. Even the labor unions to which they belong are not set up to protect them. They are mere extensions of the administration, organs of the regime itself.

There have been instances where entire populations have been forcibly transferred from one agricultural region to another, or simply deported into industrial areas. In such cases, no account whatsoever is taken of available housing, of provisioning, or of the most elementary requirements of hygiene.

There have even been deportations to the Soviet Union—for work in the coal mines of the Ukraine, for farm work in Uzbekistan or in the depths of Siberia. No prior medical examination is provided in such cases to the deportees—who are in most cases officially described as volunteer workers.

The ultimate purpose is, as previously pointed out, to provide Soviet Russia with cheap labor and cheap goods.

Available information shows the existence of almost 70 work camps inside Rumania, where forced labor is employed. It is, of course, impossible to determine the number of such slave-labor camps in the Soviet Union. Nor can we say exactly how many of our people have been deported to that country. Estimates, however, range as high or higher than 200,000.

In view of the current 5-year plan for 1955–60, radio Moscow has stated, some 3 million workers are in the process of mobilization at this time. The statement came on April 7, 1956. The majority of these are presumably to be recruited from the captive countries of southeastern Europe.

Nowhere, of course, can people be found to go willingly, as volunteers. However, since those who refuse to do so are liable to lose their current jobs, and since, on the other hand, there is no conceivable way for these unfortunate workers to stand up against the policy of terror and coercion of the Communist regimes, the drive can be confidently expected to succeed as planned.

Only the pressure of international public opinion, and the determined intervention of the free nations of the world is apt to have any effect under these circumstances. Both within the existing international organizations and outside them, such pressure stands a chance of resulting in forcing the hand of the so-called regimes of popular democracy to abandon and abolish the system of forced labor.

Since these governments are at present members of the United Nations, as well as of other international organizations, whose charters preclude the use of forced labor, they are not altogether exempt from such pressure.

Senator KENNEDY. I want to thank you very much for your very helpful statement.

Mr. ZISSU. Thank you.

With your permission I will file with the committee an additional paper containing more details and evidence.

Senator KENNEDY. Without objection, that will be placed in the record.

(The document above referred to follows:)

II. THE REGIME OF FORCED LABOR IN RUMANIA

The regime of forced labor under the Communist dispensation in today's Rumania is in no way limited to the slave-labor camps and to the so-called volunteer contingents working on the current projects and developments. Indeed, work under duress, subject to utterly arbitrary regulations, under conditions that maintain the individual worker unprotected in a state of virtual slavery, is a characteristic feature of the Communist regime of Rumania. The very notion of personal liberty and of elementary human dignity is negated by the existing legislation provided for what is ostensibly the privileged class under that regime.

There is, therefore, no need whatsoever to adduce any testimony other than that contained in the current laws, decrees, orders, and regulations that govern labor conditions, to show beyond a shadow of possible doubt the general conditions that prevail in Rumania at this time.

Let us, in the first place, consider the nature and role of the so-called trade and labor unions under the Communist regime. In this respect, as in every other, the model is that provided by the Soviet Union itself, whose government forcibly installed and maintained in power the present Bucharest government. It will be recalled that the Ninth Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union proclaimed in 1920 that "The tasks of trade unions lie primarily in the field of economic organization and education. The trade unions must perform

these tasks, not in the capacity of an independent, separately organized force, but in that of one of the main branches of governmental machinery, guided by the Communist Party."

The resolution proposed by Lenin to the 10th Congress, in 1921, states that the role of the unions is to be "a school of communism"; and the 15th Congress, in 1925, adopted a resolution stating that "the unions were set up in order to build up our Communist Party."

The official textbook on administrative law of 1940 gives further precisions: "The trade unions are not a party organization, but in fact they carry out the directives of the party. All leadership organs of the trade unions consist primarily of Communists who execute the party line in all work of these unions."

This means in effect that labor unions are no longer an organ of protection for the workers, but an instrument for carrying out government policies. That this is so, has been acknowledged in so many words by the Communist-type unions themselves, at the 10th Congress of Trade Unions of the Soviet Union, in 1949: "Soviet trade unions conduct their entire work under the directives of the Communist Party, the organizing and directing force of the Soviet Union." The Government-imposed statute of labor unions in the Soviet Union, indeed, dispels any doubt that might still persist in this respect.

In the so-called Rumanian People's Republic, the situation is as follows:

Although the law No. 52, of 1945, starts out by proclaiming the liberty of unions, the restrictions laid down in article 7 of that law effectively annuls any semblance of liberty. Furthermore, the decision No. 83, published in the Official Bulletin No. 16, of February 3, 1951, states unambiguously that, "They (i. e., the Communist Party that calls itself the Rumanian Workers' Party) have not sufficiently directed the party's organizations, the labor unions, and the Union of Working Youth. Union committees have not been sufficiently instructed * * * and have not taken efficient and systematic measures to enforce discipline in the field of labor; they have not cooperated sufficiently with management to sanction unruly and undisciplined elements."

This is clear enough: Labor unions in today's Rumania are but a means of enforcing administrative policies, under the directives of the Communist Party, to assure labor "discipline."

Turning next to the collective labor contracts, that are ostensibly negotiated between the union representatives and those of individual enterprise managements, we find the following rule laid down in article 3 of the labor code: "The collective contract is an agreement between the union committee, representing the salaried workers, and those furnishing employment." But, when the management of any enterprise (all of which have been "nationalized") bargains with a labor union's representatives (all of whom are designated by the Communist cell of the enterprise), it is obvious that what goes on is in no way a free discussion between labor and management, but simply an arrangement between two instruments of the same administration. The sole directive is that handed down to both by the Communist Party, and the whole procedure is no more than a sinister farce. The workers themselves have no word whatsoever in the alleged bargaining.

The final part of article 3 specifies, indeed, that whereas the enterprise management has the obligation to "improve the workers' living standards," the workers are under obligation to fulfill the economic state plan. However, nowhere in the current legislation can there be found any provision that assures the workers of their rights, but only such provisions as play against them, should they fail to carry out contract obligations, it is obvious that there is nothing bilateral or reciprocal in such labor agreements. The workers can in no case resort legally to strikes: Strikes as such are wholly outlawed; they are, indeed, the most serious form of "economic sabotage," entailing the death penalty.

As a matter of fact, there is nothing any management could conceivably do to improve the workers' living standards: Everything, from salary rates to working conditions, covering every aspect of the workers' lives, is determined solely by general government legislation, which enterprise managements may in no way alter.

It should be noted, too, that labor contracts, once signed, become obligatory even to nonunion members (art. 5 of the labor code). Upon signature, such contracts must be registered with the competent ministries and with the so-called General Confederation of Labor, both of which authorities have the legal power to eliminate any clause that appears to run counter either to existing laws and regulations or to the state economic plan (art. 7). Furthermore, article 11

requires that certain authorities must constantly watch over the execution of such contracts, thus providing yet another administrative means of control.

But, on the other hand, a salaried worker may be dismissed, according to article 20, for "total or partial nonexecution of his contractual obligations or for nonrespect of labor regulations" (clauses d and e) as well as for "that worker's arrest for a period in excess of 2 months" (clause g). It is clear enough that, under existing conditions in Rumania, where arbitrary arrest for unspecified reasons and for indeterminate periods is an everyday occurrence, and when "partial nonfulfillment" can be trumped up as a charge without the slightest difficulty against any worker whatsoever, the worker himself can do absolutely nothing to forestall dismissal.

As for internal discipline in individual enterprises, this too is based wholly on rules and regulations provided and elaborated by the ministries and unions, according to article 25. The labor code provides, in addition, that "units set up by the Grand National Assembly's Presidium can have special disciplinary codes."

It is hardly necessary to insist upon the purely arbitrary labor conditions set up by the foregoing legislative provisions. They amount in effect to a wholly coercitive regime of exceptions.

Working hours are set at 8 daily by article 49. However, "the competent ministry, in agreement with the unions, may indicate special categories of salaried workers, technical or administrative, whose working day need not be limited to 8 hours." Overtime is limited by article 57 to 120 hours yearly, however, this may be changed "in exceptional cases."

But perhaps the most iniquitous general provision of the labor code is that of article 111, which reads as follows: "The citizens of the Rumanian People's Republic, in exceptional cases, in order to forestall and to fight calamities, and to cover the lack of labor in view of the execution of important state labor tasks, may be called upon to fulfill certain temporary obligations of labor. The call to fulfill these temporary obligations of labor shall be made for a determined duration by decision of the Council of Ministers."

And, as though even this arbitrary measure were not enough to set up conditions of legalized servitude in every way comparable to a regime of slave labor, article 130 expressly gives the legal right to the Council of Ministers to establish "special working conditions setting aside the provisions of the labor code." This, incidentally, confirms that there is no separation of powers under the present regime of Rumania, and that such are the discretionary powers of the executive that a simple decision of the Council of Ministers can at any time suspend or annul general legislative provisions.

The regime of what passes for social security in Rumania today is set forth in articles 95, 103, and 107. The "protection" of labor is "assured" by the Ministry of Labor jointly with the General Confederation of Labor; these organs determining the rights of workers to social security. Article 108 states that "the payment of assistance and pensions, as well as their amount and mode of obtention shall be determined by orders to be issued by the General Confederation of Labor, with the approval of the Council of Ministers." And article 109 elaborates to the effect that "the right to a pension and to any other sort of payment shall be established by the Ministry of Labor in collaboration with the General Confederation of Labor."

The implication is obvious enough. It corresponds to the reality; assistance and pensions are no longer determined in virtue of certain precise legal provisions; they remain directly subject to the discretionary and arbitrary appreciation of organs of a political nature. Emoluments and retirement pay, that is, are granted from case to case, and constantly open to withholding, in accordance with purely political criteria and standards.

What of the labor unions themselves? The law on unions, of January 21, 1945, requires that every union have the prior approval to organize, to be granted by the Ministry of Labor. The criteria are, of course, purely political, in considering such applications for approval.

The workers do not elect their delegates: a single list is presented for election, and that is drawn up by the local Communist organization. However, once elected, these so-called union delegates have extensive powers. They are in effect the agents whose task it is to see to it that orders from above are carried out by the union members. It is they who assure "labor discipline" and who direct political activities of the union members. Indeed, it is they who, according to article 99 of the above-cited law, directly control all personnel hiring: "Enterprise managements must report to the factory committee of the trade

union the names of prospective employees. The factory committee shall have the right to object, within 3 days, to any new appointment that fails to conform with some provision of the law."

One outcome is that union delegates can, and do, effectively prevent the hiring of anyone whose political record is dubious from the point of view of the Communist Party, that is to say, of the administration. What this in turn means to the rejected worker is nothing short of catastrophic; it is the loss of food and clothing cards, with the prospect of slow starvation for himself and his family.

As members of the so-called labor dispute boards, too, these delegates can decide the dismissal of any employee of their plant, factory, or enterprise (art. 21). This may hinge, according to article 20, upon the conviction or arrest of the respective worker, as well as upon his "failure to fulfill his duties, under the terms of the labor contract or regulations."

Lastly, likewise in their capacity as members of the board, the delegates sit in judgment on all grievances of the workers (arts. 114 and 115).

But that is far from the end of the story. Articles 100 and 101 permit the union to exempt from all or part of his work obligations any "activist" engaged in carrying out "union duties," and may transfer him temporarily to the service of the union. On completion of such union tasks, the "activist" must then be reinstated by the enterprise in his previous position (article 102). These provisions, in short, establish a preferential regime for trusty party members, that is, for the more active Communist agents. For an "activist," also referred to as an "agitator" or a "militant," does not represent the workers in even the remotest manner. Instead of standing up for the workers' rights, such as they are, and defending them as against the management, his job is, on the contrary, to watch the others, to speed up work, and to see to it that individual and plant output quotas, in fulfillment and overfulfillment of the state plan, are regularly met. The "activist" is in effect but a terrorist agent of the Communist Party, that is, of the administration.

Production is the supreme object of the law, not the worker. Article 27 of the labor code reads as follows: "The competent ministries shall establish, in agreement with the unions concerned, standards of output for every branch of industrial activity, determining the quantity and quality of production or operations to be achieved by the employees within a specified period of time, under normal conditions."

The "norm," that is, determines in every individual case whether or not the basic wage shall be paid the worker.

Article 28 is explicit: "When an employee, through his own fault, fails to attain the set standard of output, he shall be paid in accordance with the quantity and quality of his actual output." Similarly article 33: "Manual workers and clerical employees shall receive wages proportionate with the quality and quantity of the work they accomplish, according to rates that depend upon professional qualification, and in accordance with wage and salary scales as established by decision of the Council of Ministers.

This means, among other more obvious things, that failure to meet the assigned "norm" results in the loss of the basic wage and in the substitution of piecework pay. However, piece rates also depend upon certain standard requirements: Article 36 states unambiguously that the piece rate is determined by dividing the time rate by the standard of output. Hence it is the "norm" alone that actually determines the wages of workers. The higher that "norm" is set, the lower is the time unit paid, and the more work is required from the individual workers to allow him to earn the same wages.

It is, of course, the Communist practice to increase these "norms" constantly. Every conceivable speedup method is used to increase production to the detriment of labor. And this is expressly provided for in article 27 of the Labor Code: "Norms" may be "corrected" in the following cases: (*a*) If errors are discovered in the calculation of the component elements of the production process; and (*b*) if new production methods, designed to standardize working procedures or to improve the technological process are introduced."

These ends are achieved in practice by "stakhanovism" and by "Socialist competition." Here again, the model is that provided by the Soviet Union itself. The results are in every case detrimental to the workers. By an immense temporary effort, the "norm" is surpassed by an individual worker or by a team ("brigade") or gang. The new result is then set up as the "norm" for all the other workers and gangs. This is the main task of the "activists": To

stimulate exceptional performances, which are then adopted as minimum requirements.

And so the "norms" are set and revised by the union "representatives" and by the competent ministry, and approved by the Council of Ministers, that is to say by bodies that are under the direct control of the Communist Party, without the intervention of any real representative of the workers themselves. Through special schools and courses, the so-called Rumanian Workers' Party, moreover, is turning out experts precisely for the purpose of "recalculating and revising" the norms in every field of production. A special decision to that effect, numbered 2410/1950, may be found published in the Official Bulletin No. 105, of November 17, 1950.

By this iniquitous system of "norms," the Communist Party of Rumania is, in effect, doing nothing but forcing through the economic state plan, itself subordinate in every respect to that of the Soviet Union, in utter disregard of Rumanian labor. In so doing it is ruthlessly exploiting and squeezing that allegedly privileged class, the workers.

Under these circumstances it is not difficult to understand why, especially with all the country's production being drained into the Soviet Union, such Communist working methods as "stakhanovism" and "Socialist competitions" are bitterly hated by the workers of Rumania, and why they rightly consider all "activists" to be their enemies.

Labor disputes are also dealt with in the current Labor Code. Article 121 sets up so-called labor-dispute boards to function "within the framework of establishments of the Socialist sector." Decisions must be taken "unanimously" by the members, whose number is to be equally divided between the representatives of managment and of the workers. The regulations issued by the Council of Ministers (No. 1133, of October 24, 1950) fixes that number at a maximum of four. But, as has already been pointed out, it is impossible to speak of "disputes" in connection with these boards, seeing that their members do not in reality represent two opposing sides, but are simply party functionaries.

As a matter of fact, these boards are nothing but disciplinary commissions set up to keep the workers in line. Articles 10, 20, and 21 of the regulations mentioned above give the clue to the true nature of the boards, which "may discharge any worker found to be unfit for his job, unwilling to carry out his assigned duties, or arrested or convicted." Decisions handed down by the boards may come up for appeal, not before any court, however, but before higher administrative authorities (art. 117 of the Labor Code). And the decision of the appeal commissions, according to article 125, may be brought up for review, "not by the courts, but by the next superior authorities."

It should be pointed out, in passing, that appeals to the courts could very well have been provided for in the Labor Code, instead of expressly denied. For, after all, the courts being composed of a majority of so-called "popular assessors," and the members of the bar being, in effect, nothing but party functionaries themselves, the outcome of any review before a court could have been counted upon to conform to the political aims of the Communist Party. But even this slim chance is taken from the workers.

Yet the stringencies outlined above, inconceivable though they be under any system of democracy, still seemed insufficient to the Communist administration of Bucharest and to its principals in the Kremlin. So a decree, numbered 207/1951 and published in the Official Bulletin No. 113, of November 21, 1951, introduced what can be described only as legalized peonage to Rumania. Article 1 of that decree states bluntly that, "Manual workers, clerical employees, engineers, and technicians of state enterprises and agencies, construction projects, and mass organizations shall not leave their employment without prior consent from the head of the respective unit."

Article 6 clinches the matter: "No person may be given employment unless legally released from previous employment."

Other articles make it statutory for all workers to accept whatever jobs may be assigned to them, anywhere within the country. Job transfers are similarly obligatory in all cases. Thus, in effect, everyone who is "in the field of labor" loses the right to seek employment freely, and becomes, by the same token, a mere "unit of work," to be used where and how the administration decides, for the exclusive benefit of the state plan.

Already the decree, No. 243, amended by a Journal of the Council of Ministers (No. 1137), and published in the Official Bulletin No. 101, of November 6, 1950, required all workers to register with the police authorities in order to obtain identity and labor cards. This measure, while permitting the authorities to

identify immediately at any moment all persons excluded from "the field of labor," and who thereby become liable to be either deported or sent to forced-labor camps or concentration camps, allows the police to watch every step of the "favored" of the regime, the workers themselves.

Article 22 of the decree reads as follows: "No person may change residence without prior obtention of an official transfer permit from the militia."

A series of orders issued by the Ministry of Labor and published in the Official Bulletin No. 41, of May 13, 1950; No. 63, of July 27, 1950, make the possession of labor cards mandatory for all workers. And further control measures are to be found in the decree No. 86, published in the Official Bulletin No. 4, of March 7, 1949, which sets up the so-called Offices for the Distribution of Labor, and whose articles 1 and 3 envisage such distributions of labor to be made according to governmental requirements.

Yet another means of political pressure and intimidation of the workers is available to the administration: the food and clothing cards that are distributed only to those "in the field of labor." The threat of losing one's job is aggravated to an understandable degree by the concomitant loss of one's food and clothing cards. The latter are, indeed, one of the main institutions of a Communist regime: a most effective means of blackmail through hunger. An ordinance of the Ministry of Domestic Trade (No. 1720), published in the Official Bulletin No. 113, of December 11, 1950, bars persons who do not belong to one or another of the unions from the enjoyment of food and clothing cards. This, incidentally, constitutes clear-cut evidence of the alleged "freedom" of joining or not a union. Such discrimination, ostensibly favoring the "working class," serves to point up the system of servitude established by the Communist regime in Rumania.

It remains to mention a terroristic law of general character, that further adds to the means of coercing the workers, available to the administration. This is the so-called Law for the Punishment of Crimes Threatening the State Security and the Prosperity of National Economy (No. 16, of January 15, 1949), amended by decree No. 199, published in the Official Bulletin No. 64, of August 12, 1950, to prescribe the death penalty for such crimes. This law avoids defining such offenses, even those involving "treason" and "prejudices to the state power"; all its provisions are loosely worded and deliberately left vague, though capital punishment is at stake.

Under the terms of this parody of a law, the mildest form of criticism can be interpreted by the courts to "prejudice" the state and cost the offender his life or at least a long term of hard labor. The ferocity of this legislation may be judged by the fact that it provides similar punishment for acts of "omission and negligence," and, to leave no loophole unprovided for, the decree prescribes that when any offense is not expressly provided for in the terms of the law, the offender may be sentenced in accordance with any other existing law, "in relation to the degree of social danger" he shall be found to present.

In conclusion, therefore, the government of the so-called Rumanian People's Republic is guilty of the following:

The violation of article 20 (Nos. 1 and 2) of the Universal Declaration on Human Rights, through the provisions of article 7 of law No. 52/1945 and those of the decision No. 1720 of the Ministry of Domestic Trade, published in the Official Bulletin No. 113, of December 11, 1950.

The violation of article 13 (No. 1) of the Declaration on Human Rights, through the provisions of articles 22 and 23 of decree No. 243/1950 and of the decision No. 1137/1950 of the Council of Ministers.

The violation of articles 4 and 25 (No. 1) of the Declaration on Human Rights, through the provisions of articles 1 and 6 of the decree published in the Official Bulletin No. 113, of November 21, 1951.

The violation of article 22 of the Declaration on Human Rights, through the provisions of article 109 of the labor code.

The violation of article 23 (No. 4) of the Declaration on Human Rights, through the provisions of article 7 of law No. 52/1945.

The violation of article 12 of the Declaration on Human Rights, through the provisions of articles 22 and 23 of decree No. 243/1950.

The violation of article 23 (No. 1) of the Declaration on Human Rights, through the provisions of articles 49, 57, and 111 of the labor code.

The violation of article 10 of the Declaration on Human Rights, through the provisions of articles 117 and 125 of the labor code.

The violation of article 19 of the Declaration on Human Rights, through the provisions of law No. 16/1949, as amended by the decree No. 199, published in the Official Bulletin No. 64, of August 12, 1950.

The violation of article 3 of the Declaration on Human Rights, through the provisions of decree No. 199/1950.

Senator KENNEDY. Mr. David Dallin, author of *Forced Labor in the Soviet Union.* And Mr. Dallin is a great expert on the Soviet Union and the Soviet system.

We are very glad to have you. As a reader of some of your books on the Soviet Union, I will be very interested in what you have to say.

You are now at Yale?

Dr. DALLIN. No, I am not a teacher now. I am just a writer.

STATEMENT OF DR. DAVID DALLIN, AUTHOR OF FORCED LABOR IN SOVIET RUSSIA

Dr. DALLIN. Mr. Chairman, I will permit myself first, to say a few words about the situation in Russia, with regard to forced labor, and, secondly, to answer the question which was put to me about a possible international convention on forced labor.

As far as the situation in Russia is concerned, Russia's gradual rehabilitation, and particularly the upsurge of her industry under the successive 5-year plans, benefited considerably from the forced labor system. Prewar mining, building, and industrial development sites, at which forced labor was employed, were renovated and expanded since the end of the war. New canals were built, new railroads constructed, and new mines operated. In addition to the ambitious projects which had existed before the war, a number of new ones emerged; small units grew to tremendous size. Forced labor was required in great masses. Among the most important areas of development in the postwar era was the Vorkuta region in the Komi Republic, beyond the Arctic Circle, which attained importance as a source of coal for Leningrad. While the exact number of inmates of the Vorkuts camps remains unknown, it is estimated to total about 500,000.

Another coal mining region rich in forced labor is the area in central Asia where the Karaganda camps are located, which have grown considerably since the war. The formerly small camps of Norilsk, situated beyond the Arctic Circle in north Siberia, have become the center of a new "Yenisei industrial plant."

Norilsk is now a booming city with a population of at least 120,000 prisoners. Founded in 1939, Norilsk served at first as a producer of nickel, copper, and platinum. After the war the northern part of the Yenisei River was closed to foreign travel; while the bulk of German prisoners of war, who had been living in special camps for Germans, were returned to their homeland after a few years, those among them who had been charged with crimes (mainly theft, and often falsely) were shipped to the general Soviet penal institutions; their sentences were often as long as 25 years. A large number of them were repatriated in 1953–54, after Stalin's death.

And this is one of the most important sources of our knowledge of the present situation in the Soviet labor camps.

Fluctuations in living conditions of the Soviet labor camps have been a regular feature of their history during the last 25 years. In the first 2 years after the war physical conditions were at an unprecedented low, in Russia. But about 1947–48 a certain improvement set in which continued for the next 5 or 6 years. Food allotments have improved since 1948 so that for the working part of the

labor population—unlike for those who are unable to work—starvation has ceased.

Two important factors made improvement in labor camp conditions necessary. One was a purely economic factor. The huge loss in male manpower brought about by the internal policy of the government during the 1930's and to an even greater extent by the war is well known. In addition, from 3 to 5 million men have been kept in the armed forces after the war. Despite the vastness of the country, Russia's human resources are now nearly exhausted; the ambitious 5-year plans, the unprecedented development of war industries, and the evergrowing need of food make every ablebodied worker highly valuable. The traditional Soviet disregard of the individual and the waste of manpower since the first days of industrialization and collectivization have started to tell. A new policy in respect to the unfree labor in the concentration camps has been imposed on the government.

But the second reason is more important to us in this country.

The second reason why living conditions in the camps had to be improved is rooted in political considerations. Since about 1947–48 the non-Soviet world has reacted to the Soviet forced labor system with such a flood of indignation and protests that Moscow could not remain indifferent. It was remarkable that Stalin had succeeded in building and maintaining an iron curtain around his concentration camps and that they remained almost unknown to the West for about 15 years. But since 1942–45 one group after another of former inmates have appeared in various places abroad. Poles interned in Russia in 1939–40 and released in 1942 came to London and New York to tell their story. When the Allied armies occupied Central Europe in 1945 they found there thousands of displaced Russians, former prisoners of Soviet labor camps. American trade unions, in particular, the American Federation of Labor persistently demanded of the International Labor Office that forced labor in Russia be investigated. Since about 1948 slave labor in Russia has been a paramount topic of discussion in the United Nations. An ad hoc committee of that body was set up to investigate and report on forced labor everywhere, including countries which would not permit direct investigation; its report was published in 1953.

It would be no exaggeration to say that since the great purge of the late 1930's there has been no other Soviet issue which has lowered Soviet prestige and provoked anti-Russian feelings to the extent that has the system of compulsory labor. Among the postwar inmates of the labor camps have been thousands of Germans, Japanese, and Italians, and smaller numbers of other nationals, including nationals of the allied countries. It was clear to Moscow that one day most of these men would have to be repatriated, because not even under Stalin could they be summarily liquidated. Back home, these witnesses would inflict new wounds on Soviet prestige if the old attitude toward prisoners continued.

While living conditions have improved in some degree, in the Soviet labor camps, the general Soviet punitive system has become more and more severe.

On the island of Novaya Zemla there is a camp which is a land of no return; because of climatic conditions, inmates of other camps sent to Novaya Zemla as punishment have little hope of ever seeing their homeland again.

In the prewar era the average term of a prisoner in a labor camp was 5 to 6 years; since the war, sentences under 10 years for political prisoners have been rare, and vary from 10 to 25 years, so that the average term has been doubled or trebled. This increase in severity, which was in line with the general political course of Stalin, helped also to relieve the manpower shortage in the economy of the Far East and Far North and helped considerably to augment the population of the labor camps.

The result was a wave of strikes in the corrective labor camps at various times in 1953, 1954, 1955. A strike at Norilsk started in May 1953, was broken off, and then resumed in August of the same year. It was suppressed by military force. According to reports from Norilsk, the number of dead and wounded reached 1,500 out of a total of 2,500 prisoners of this section of the camp.

In the camps of Karaganda the first strikes occurred in 1952, and others between the 15th and 17th of May 1954. About 200 men and women were killed and 140 wounded. In Kinguir in Kazakhstan, strikes broke out in the summer of 1954. On the island of Sakhalin strikes broke out during 1953 and 1955.

In the camps of Taishet (Siberian railroad) strikes occurred in May 1955. Of great importance were the repeated strikes in the extensive Vorkuta camps where a large mass of political prisoners has been concentrated. The strikes occurred in the summer of 1953, the fall of 1954, and summer of 1955. Large numbers of prisoners were killed by guards in the fighting.

The Kolyma camps, with more than 150,000 inmates, in eastern Siberia, revolted in May 1954. Two hundred were killed and one hundred were wounded by guards.

The changes made in camp regulations as a result of this unrest and other conditions were not insignificant. The old filthy barracks were replaced by new ones. Now beds are in general clean and the elite among the inmates have the privilege of separate beds. Food of the relatively "well paid" male working population is satisfactory. The working time has been reduced to 10 hours a day, and now even to 8 hours, with 3 or 4 days off a month. Medical care and medications, while insufficient, are available in the larger camps.

Senator KENNEDY. Excuse me, Doctor. What do you rely on for your information on these facts? What is your source for this information?

Dr. DALLIN. Well, a number of books on this issue, written by former inmates have appeared recently. Besides there is a committee in Paris on concentration camps; it consists of former inmates of German concentration camps of the wartime. They have been investigating, interrogating, and interviewing scores and scores of former inmates coming out of the Russian labor camps. They have gathered rich material. From these sources I take the most important facts for my report to you.

Senator KENNEDY. And you have no doubt of their reliability?

Dr. DALLIN. No. I am checking everything. There must be at least 3, 4, or 5 reports about each camp, each section of the camps; and more than a few people have come out from the same camp. So, one can corroborate and try to check the one against the other.

Senator KENNEDY. I see; thank you.

Dr. DALLIN. I have been very cautious and careful in selecting these figures; they are certainly not exaggerated.

Senator KENNEDY. Thank you.

Dr. DALLIN. Medical care and medications, as I said, while insufficient, are available in the larger camps. The attitude of the administration has improved too. As a rule, inmates are not beaten any more, and punishment by confinement in dungeons is not as frequent as before. In the majority of the camps, loudspeakers broadcast news from Moscow, and Moscow and local papers are available. The prisoners, some of whom are politically intelligent, are, in general, aware of world events.

The improvements in living conditions of the corrective labor camps have not eradicated the forced labor system in Russia. Forced labor, which is actually slave labor, has developed as a component part of the penal system of communism and as a powerful lever of its economic policy.

The fate of slave labor and other vestiges of Stalinism depend on the fate of the Communist dictatorship in Russia in general. But these changes of the forced labor system in Russia in the last few years are due in part, as I mentioned before, to the pressure of a worldwide public opinion.

The damage which was done to the Soviet prestige abroad by a revelation of its slave system was so great that even before Stalin's death, certain changes were made. To an even larger degree this is true of the post-Stalin era.

In this international movement against forced labor—and this is what I would like to emphasize—the United States played a leading role at least for a certain time. In the U. N., or before the Ad Hoc Committee, or in the ILO, spokesmen of American labor, vigorously supported by the United States Government, exposed the Soviet system of slavery better than the representatives of any other nation.

Since a few years, however, Mr. Chairman, this dynamism on the part of the United States ceased. Its pressure weakened. And the United States did not play an important role in the international discussions which now revolve around the issue of a treaty on forced labor.

The United States has not even answered the questionnaires submitted by the ILO, and did not indicate what kind of international agreement, if any, it would prefer. Whereas American activity was lessening in these last years, at the other, the Russian pole of the international family, activity was increasing. It is only 4 years now since the Soviet Union was proudly and foolishly rejecting inquiries and questionnaires. In November of 1952, for instance, 3 months before Stalin's death, the Soviet delegation to the United Nations answered a letter of the Ad Hoc Committee as follows:

> The delegation of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics to the United Nations presents its compliments to the United Nations Secretariat and herewith returns unexamined the document attached to the Secretariat's letter of the 22d of November 1952 since these documents contain slanderous fabrications concerning the Soviet Union.

In this way the Soviet Government, along with the satellites, isolated themselves not only from the western nations but even from those peoples whom we term today "middle of the roaders" or "neutrals" such as India, Indonesia, Sweden, and a few others. Our

position was, on the contrary, easier at the time—I mean the American position. The support of our policy on this particular issue was pretty much universal.

In the post-Stalin era, Moscow has changed its tactics in more than one respect. Today Moscow tries to appear as the most consistent enemy of forced labor. It will be glad, its Government says, to sign an international convention against forced labor. But it will certainly try to introduce terms and paragraphs in this convention which will be pointed at the West, especially against the United States.

It will try to propagate the idea that our wage sysem is just a new form of slavery. If a convention will be ratified, the Soviet Government will start the new era with the suggestion to send an investigation committee to this country, one of the freest countries of the world.

If we, in principle, reject the idea of a treaty on forced labor, if we do not actively participate in these discussions, if we show reluctance and hesitation, this will be ruthlessly used by the other side as proof that the United States is afraid of an international investigation because, unlike in the so-called Socialist countries, our whole social system, America's whole social system is based on forced labor.

That is what they are saying and will be repeating. And let us not deceive ourselves. Let us not believe that the whole world is well informed on where compulsion and slavery really exist. There are millions in Asia and Africa, and considerable masses in Europe, especially in southern Europe, whom we have still to convince. Let us not believe that Communist propaganda, crude and false as it is, makes no impression on backward nations.

A number of legal and technical questions arise when we approach the issue of international treaties on forced labor. There is still time, although not very much time to resolve them and to take positions. The basic and the most important task, however, is not to throw away the great prestige which we have won throughout the world in our fight against forced labor and to juxtapose to the consistent, deceiving Soviet propaganda a better, a superior type of propaganda which will be based on truth and lofty ideals.

Senator KENNEDY. Doctor, you feel that this Senate Joint Resolution 117 introduced by Senator Humphrey would be an important step forward in indicating that the United States was vitally interested in the passing of the convention?

Dr. DALLIN. You mean this resolution?

Senator KENNEDY. Yes.

Dr. DALLIN. I would support it; yes.

Senator KENNEDY. You feel that it would be great progress?

Dr. DALLIN. Yes; it would mean great progress.

Senator KENNEDY. You stated that there was some competition between the East and the West over who would take the leadership in this field. What else could the United States do? What else can we do beyond passing this resolution in order to maintain our leadership in the fight against forced labor?

Dr. DALLIN. The United States is in a position to spread throughout the world more accurate information about forced labor. Our information agency, the Voice of America, and other means of propaganda can be very helpful. We can help to publish books, periodicals, and our political leaders and Government leaders are obliged to appear from time to time in meetings or on the radio and repeatedly to

emphasize our position in regard to forced labor, to make it a burning question and not to let it be forgotten, as it appears to have been the case in the last few years.

Senator KENNEDY. Dr. Dallin, I want to thank you for coming down. I think that your feeling is that the report of the Ad Hoc Committee was extremely helpful in spotlighting the Communist charges against the United States.

Dr. DALLIN. That is correct.

Senator KENNEDY. And exposing them for being without substance, and at the same time demonstrating that their own procedures were inferior. We want to thank you for coming down. Your statement and the books you have written on this problem have been most helpful.

Dr. DALLIN. Thank you.

Senator KENNEDY. There will be printed in the appendix of the Record an article by David J. Dallin, associate editor of the New Leader, published by the New Leader in its March 29, 1947, edition, entitled "Concentration Camps in Soviet Russia."

Our next witness will be Mr. Charles W. Greenidge.

STATEMENT OF CHARLES W. GREENIDGE, DIRECTOR GENERAL, ANTISLAVERY SOCIETY OF GREAT BRITAIN

Mr. GREENIDGE. Thank you for giving me this opportunity to speak to the Foreign Relations Committee of the United States.

In the 15 years that I have been secretary of the Antislavery Society, I have met a great number of people who have asked me the question, "Is there still any need for an Antislavery Society? Is there still any slavery in the world?" And most of those people, I have found, believed that slavery had been abolished throughout the world, when it was abolished in the colonies of Europe and nations and in the United States of America.

Of course, my answer to them has been that there are still millions of people in the world in the grip of slavery; even if they are not as numerous as those in the grip of forced labor.

I believe, sir, that you would like information both on slavery and on forced labor in the areas in which the Antislavery Society has studied it. Those are the Portuguese colonies in Africa, and in the Union of South Africa. But with your permission, sir, I would like to speak first of slavery.

The two institutions have certain resemblances; both are exaction of involuntary labor. But in either respects they differ. Slavery is the status of a person over whom rights of ownership are exercised. Forced labor is the exaction of involuntary labor or based on the theory that it is a penalty, either for crime or for divergence of political views from those of the prevailing government, and so on. So that the two institutions have to be kept clearly apart. They were separately treated by the League of Nations, and it looks as if they will continue to be separately treated by the United Nations.

Well, slavery is still found in the world. It is found under four forms. There is still the old chattel slavery where people are born slaves, live, and die as slaves. They are both sold and inherited. Then that form of slavery is now found only in the Arabian Penin-

sula. And, if I may, I will return to that when I have just outlined the other forms of slavery, sir.

In foreign countries, inhabited largely by Chinese, as well as in Japan, children are sold into slavery by needy parents who sometimes are unable to maintain large families.

And, then, we come back to the continent of Africa, it is still the practice for Africans living in the tribal state to sell their daughters into marriage without their consent; sometimes even before they are born. And they then become the property of their husband. And of course, their children, too.

The husband can resell his wife if he wishes to do so to another man. And if he dies before her, she is inherited by his heir-at-law, and has to marry either the heir or any man to whom he sells her.

Well, that practice is still prevalent in many areas of Africa, south of the Sahara. And the last form of slavery that I wish to mention is the one what is most prevalent in certain Latin American Republics on the Pacific side of South America.

That is a mixture of debt bondage and peonage serfdom. It usually begins as serfdom.

In those countries, the immigrant Spanish population has disposed the aboriginal American Indians of the worthwhile land. And the only way that those aboriginal Indians can get land on which to live is to agree to work on the landlords' estates for a specified number of days per week, usually three, without payment. And then the landlord rivets the shackles more firmly on them by keeping a shop, the only shop, on the estate from which the aboriginal Indian, called by the Spanish, a peon, buys such goods as he is unable to produce himself. Credit is given to him. The debt is never paid; the man's earnings do not permit of it. When he dies, the debt is inherited by his family. And the status become hereditary; and so on goes it from generation to generation.

In 1946, the American Presbyterian Church sent a mission to those three Republics: Ecuador, Bolivia, and Peru. And they found this condition that I have described. And they estimated the number of people held in the grip of it was as much as 8 million. But 2 years ago, Bolivia instituted a land reform, by which the Government of Bolivia claims that 2½ million people have been released from this status. Whether that law is really enforced and operative or not, I am unable to say.

Well, if I may return to Arabia, sir, the evidence of the existence of slavery in Arabia comes from unofficial, as well as, official sources.

The legal status of slavery has never been abolished in Saudi Arabia, in Yemen, the Sultanate of Oman, and certain small areas in the Aden Protectorate. The Aden Protectorate is under the military protection of Great Britain and Great Britain controls their foreign relations. But she has no control of their internal domestic affairs.

The British can advise the rulers what to do, but they have no power of enforcing their advice in international affairs.

Well, as regards to Saudi Arabia, we have the writings of several men who have lived in that country and are favorable to the Arabian way of life. Notably among them are the books of Eldon Rutter, an Englishman who has lived there most of his life. And he says that slavery is prevalent throughout Arabia, and that there is a slave

market still exists in Mecca. And he goes further and says—he speaks Eldon Rutter's book—I think his books were published in the late thirties—but more recently than his book is a book written by Col. Gerald Degorey, another Englishman, who was very closely associated with the late King Ibn Saud, and received high honors from Ibn Saud.

He now lives in Iraq. And in a book that he wrote, published in 1950 called Arabian Journey he supports the statements of Eldon Rutter that slavery is prevalent in Saudi Arabia, and that the slave market still exists in Mecca. And he goes further and say—he speaks of some of the countries from which slaves are imported. He mentions that as late as 1947 slaves were brought in from the coast of Baluchistan, which is in Pakistan now, and also from Iran. And he also mentioned that women were being brought from Syria and sold as concubines in Saudi Arabia.

There are several other writers who testify in similar ways.

But, now, sir, I come to the official evidence. In 1936, the late King Ibn Saud made a decree regulating the condition of slaves in this country. And he, in that decree, prohibited the importation of slaves; and he also prohibited the selling of free persons into slavery. The decree went on to regulate—it also went on to regulate the condition of people who were already slaves. And it even went so far as to give slaves rights to emancipation if they persistently received ill treatment from their masters. They could appear before a tribunal and prove persistent cruelty, and if they succeded, they could get their freedom from their master. They were also given certain rights by which they could buy their freedom.

Well, it is inconceivable that any government would have made a law to regulate the state of slaves if there was no slave in the country. And denial that there is slavery there certainly is rebutted by the fact that that law is on the statute book.

In addition to that we have recently had another valuable piece of official evidence. That has been furnished by a report made by the French Ambassador in Saudi Arabia to his government in Paris. That was written in November of 1953, and in that letter the French Ambassdor states, informs his government, that he had collected evidence from people in Jidda, the town in which he lived, which he regarded as reliable, and he found that slave traders in Saudi Arabia sent Africans who had become naturalized citizens of Saudi Arabia back to Africa to entice other Africans to accompany them on pilgrimages to Mecca. When they went to Africa these false missionaries of Islam pretended to be missionaries and many Africans were influenced to accompany them on the pilgrimage to Mecca and on arrival in Saudi Arabia they were arrested by the Saudi Arabian authorities and put in prison and kept there until they were delivered over to the slave traders and in due course sold into slavery.

It is believed that there has been an increase of this slave trade into Saudi Arabia since the revenues have been pouring into the country from oil royalties. The price of slaves in the country has risen considerably. An attractive girl will fetch now as much as in English money £400, and an able-bodied man about £150. Formerly the prices were very, very much less, in fact, a fraction of those prices.

Senator KENNEDY. What conclusion do you come to from your analysis of these situations?

Mr. GREENIDGE. Well, sir, I feel that the influence of the United States Government would be valuable in persuading the Saudi Arabian Government to enforce its own law. They have that law of Ibn Saud of 1936 on their statute book and I feel that if they would enforce that law that it would bring this slave trade to an end.

If, instead of encouraging people to come into the country to be enslaved, they would throw their influence on the other side and protect them when they came there, it would cut off the slave trade from Africa.

Senator KENNEDY. Do you feel that it is within the power of the United Nations to bring an end to the situation you described in South America and in Portuguese Africa and in Saudi Arabia?

Mr. GREENIDGE. Yes, sir; I do. I think the publicity given to peonage in Latin America is already beginning to have results. I think that the action of the Government of Bolivia indicates that they feel that the time for reform has come.

Senator KENNEDY. Have you testified before organizations representing the United Nations?

Mr. GREENIDGE. Yes, sir. I made statements last week to the Committee of the Economic and Social Council.

Senator KENNEDY. Do you have indications that they are taking action along the lines that you feel would be advisable?

Mr. GREENIDGE. Yes, sir. In 1950 and 1951 they had a committee investigating this problem of slavery. I was a member of that committee, and following the report of that committee they have worked on a draft convention on slavery which is prepared and a decision has been taken or will be taken this week by the Economic and Social Council on what it would do at the convention and whether they would refer it to a conference of plenipotentiaries or to the General Assembly and before that the United Nations took over the functions of the League of Nations under the Slavery Convention of 1926 which had been made by the League.

Senator KENNEDY. We appreciate your coming before us, Mr. Greenidge. While Senator Humphrey's resolution and we are particularly concerned with forced labor, we, nevertheless, are vitally interested in this related field so we are very grateful to have them. This information is very new to me and we are very glad to have it.

Mr. GREENIDGE. Would you like information, sir, on forced labor in Portuguese Africa, too?

Senator KENNEDY. Perhaps if you have a memorandum to place in the record it would be valuable to the committee.

Mr. GREENIDGE. Yes, sir.

Senator KENNEDY. We will also put into the record the translation of excerpts from an article on the slave traffic published in the January 1956 edition of the French magazine La Nouvelle Revue Francaise d'Outremer, 1956.

(The information referred to follows:)

EXCERPTS TRANSLATED FROM ARTICLE ON NEGRO SLAVE TRAFFIC BY EMMANUEL LAGRAVIERE FROM LA NOUVELLE REVUE FRANCAISE D'OUTREMER, JANUARY 1956

Following is a translation of a report quoted in the article made by a French diplomatic agent in Africa in November 1953:

"* * * Merchants in Jidda or Mecca send emissaries who are naturalized Saudis but for the most part of Senegalese origin to bring back a certain number

of individuals crimped from villages in the Sudan, the upper Volta, or the Niger: Timbuctu in particular is a center frequently visited by these wretches. They represent themselves as missionaries entrusted with the delicate mission of leading their compatriots toward the holy places of Islam in order to accomplish their pilgrimages and be taught the Koran in Arabic. A certain number of Moslem natives let themselves fall into this trap. Men, women, and children are then conducted by their benevolent guides to the coast of the Red Sea at Port Sudan or at Suakin. It appears the trip is made by truck with the help of local accomplices.

"After having crossed the sea in specially chartered 'sambuks,' the Negroes disembark at Lith, a little port 200 kilometers south of Jidda. There they are denounced as clandestine pilgrims, heaved into trucks and transported to Jidda where they are put in prison—their stay lasts only a short while and the next day a Saudi trader has the police hand over his merchandise. Immediately sold, the unfortunates are led to their master's house from which, in principle, they will never again depart. The price of a slave naturally varies with sex and age. A young girl under 15 is worth 2,000 to 4,000 rials ($500 to $1,000); a man under 40 sells for 1,500 rials; an old woman for 400 rials.

"The operation is most often arranged through the intermediary of brokers in the market places.

"All evidence agrees that the slaves are very often well treated. On condition of accepting their lot, renouncing freedom and submitting body and soul to their masters' desires, they are assured of a material existence far superior to that they could lead in their African village. The men often attain posts of confidence, such as steward, chauffeur, or bodyguard. Women who become mothers are treated practically as wives.

"How many inhabitants of French West Africa and French Equatorial Africa are sold as slaves annually? No precise evaluation is possible but it does not seem that the figure is very considerable—perhaps several hundred. Still, Negroes of French Africa continue to furnish the largest contingent of slaves for Arabia, recruitment in Ethiopia, itself a slave country, being much more difficult.

"Demand in Saudi Arabia is quite strong, since slaves constitute an important element in the social organization. The Arab's pride prevents him from doing a certain number of tasks considered servile and degrading.

"Thus, with the complicity of Saudi authorities, the ancient commerce of 'ebony' is perpetuated in our day in spite of international conventions and even though the realm of Ibn Saud may belong to the United Nations. * * *"

Mr. GREENIDGE. Yes, sir; of course, the United Nations has adhered to the slavery convention of 1926 which prohibits forced labor for private enterprise and both Portugal and the Union of South Africa are also parties to that convention, and I very much hope that as the United States is a party to that convention that it would use its influence to influence those other parties to it to abide by and comply by their obligations under it.

Senator KENNEDY. We will place your documents in the record at this point.

("Slavery at the United Nations," "Slavery and Slave Trading in Arabia," and "Forced Labor in Portuguese African Colonies" by Mr. Greenidge are as follows:)

SLAVERY AT THE UNITED NATIONS

(Address by C. W. W. Greenidge, Secretary of the Anti-Slavery Society, at the Annual Meeting of the Society on 15th June, 1954.)

INTRODUCTION

MEMBERS of the Anti-Slavery Society are well aware that Slavery, even in its crudest form, still exists in the world to-day and still holds millions of people in its grip—but lest there be among us some who are asking a question so often addressed to me: "Are there still any slaves in the world?"—permit me to state as briefly as I can (1) what are the forms of slavery, (2) where it exists

and (3) approximately how many people are affected by it, before I go on to say what is being done by the United Nations to combat it.

DEFINITION

Definitions of slavery reposed upon national enactments or legal and philosophic opinion until the League of Nations succeeded in preparing the Slavery Convention of 1926, to which forty-four States adhered. That Convention defined slavery as "a status or condition of a person over whom any or all of the powers attaching to the right of ownership are exercised." That Convention is still in force. We still find in the world to-day four classes of people whose status conforms with that definition.

CHATTEL SLAVERY

There is still the old chattel slavery in several countries in the Arabian peninsula which have not abolished the legal status of slavery. Under that system people who are children of slaves are born slaves, live and die as slaves. They are bought, sold and inherited. While most of the slaves in those countries are born slaves, some are recruited from people who were born free. There is still a small slave trade from Africa into Arabia, and it is not uncommon for pilgrims from overseas to the Holy Places of Islam in Arabia to take non-Moslem servants with them on their pilgrimages and when they reach Mecca they sell them into slavery, thus using them as living travellers' cheques. The League of Nations took cognizance of this practice and found that it did exist and as a result of the League's exposure of it, some of the Colonial Powers, from the territories of which Moslem pilgrims made the pilgrimage, instituted a system of inspection of the travel papers of departing and returning pilgrims and required them to account satisfactorily on their return for the absence of any who went on the pilgrimage and did not return. The Dutch Government, which then administered Indonesia, from which a large number of pilgrims went to Mecca, developed the most efficient system of inspection, but other Colonial Powers, also took action, even if it was less thorough than the Dutch. There is no recent official information on this practice, but it is believed to exist still, as the demand for slaves still exists in most of the countries of Arabia and travellers in those countries tell us that the demand is supplied. There is also a slave trade from other parts of Asia into Arabia. Colonel Gerald de Gaury, who has lived most of his life in Iraq and in Saudi-Arabia and received high honours from King Ibn Saud, tells us in his book, *Arabian Journey*, published in 1950, p. 80, that "slaves are still sold in Saudi-Arabia . . . The chief market is in Mecca and the main route for them is to Mecca from the Yemen, whence they are brought by sailing boats from the opposite coast of Africa." The price, he writes, ranged from £12 to £50, but a traveller last year to Jeddah, the part of Saudi-Arabia, tells us that the price is now about £10. That traveller says that the people sold into slavery are often sold by their parents to pay a debt and sometimes they are people who sell themselves into slavery to pay a debt. Colonel de Gaury tells us that there is also a slave trade from the Mekran coast of Persia and Baloochistan on the eastern shore of the Persian Gulf and that he had it from good authority that several cargoes of boys were brought from the Mekran coast in 1947 and sold into slavery in Oman. He is supported by other recent writers on Arabia who have long lived in that country. One is Raymond O'Shea, an officer of an Air Line who spent several years at Shargah in Oman and wrote his book, *Sand Kings of Arabia*, published in 1947. Throughout that book he mentions the existence of slavery in Oman, and at p. 175 he wrote, "It must not be assumed that slavery has been entirely abolished in Arabia, even in that part administered by the Government of India. It is known to flourish in the dominions of King Ibn Saud and in the Yemen. Negro slaves may still be seen in the houses of the Sheikhs and merchants of the Trucial Oman Coast, whilst a great many are employed in the fishing and pearl diving industries. Once I was talking to a young slave of a pearl merchant of Dubai. I said to him I suppose your father was an ex-slave here? To my surprise he confessed that he had been with his present master only four years and had been born in Zanzibar whither he had been abducted by Arab merchants when four years old, smuggled into the Hadramaut and sold in the slave market at Baraimi for 500 rupees." Elsewhere O'Shea writes, "I have been informed that a regular slave market also exists at the small town of Harfit, as well as at Baraimi. Several official delegations have been dispatched to Baraimi and

Harfit to investigate the slave trade, but the Bedowins, who are the principal slave dealers concealed the slaves and closed the market long before the approach of any foreigner." He then described a visit by himself to Baraimi. He says, "Among the crowd we did see several negroes whose legs bore the marks of iron chains and the healed scars of a lash but they were quickly hurried out of sight at our approach and we were not allowed to question them. When we attempted to enter the door of the fort (where the market was) the crowd's attitude became threatening and I thought they would attack us." At p. 57 he described the case of a Persian who told him that he had been travelling in Arabia in 1939 when he was seized and sold into slavery and was a slave until 1945 when he succeeded in reaching the British authorities who secured his release.

Another writer on Oman who describes slavery is Dr. Paul Harrison, an American medical missionary, who spent 30 years in Muscat, the capital of Oman. In his book, *Doctor in Arabia*, published in 1943 (p. 39), he describes a trip which he made into the Bottina district of Oman, among the date plantations. He says, "That trip was my first introduction to slavery . . . It was a slave economy but the slaves were obviously contented and extremely well fed. Some of them needed treatment for obesity." But at p. 46 he describes another trip which he made to the Pirate Coast on the Persian Gulf and presents a very different picture. He writes, "I had seen a good deal of slavery in the plantations back of Muscat and it is a pleasure to testify to the good treatment that those slaves received and their evident contentment with their lot. But on the Pirate Coast the situation was very different. Thousands of slaves were there and with them dozens and hundreds of pearl diving boats were manned. The dark places of the earth are full of cruelty. While I was in Abu Dhubbi three slaves tried to escape to Bahrein (an Arab country in which slavery was abolished in 1937). Fortune refused to smile on their desperate venture, and they were recaptured. They were beaten so severely that one of them died . . . The Baloochee slaves were the most pathetic, they rebelled bitterly against their bonds. All slaves were miserably treated but the Africans were the most patient. Their souls were manacled along with their bodies but still they could sing."

OFFICIAL INFORMATION

Critics say that this is unofficial information and that they require official confirmation of it. That official confirmation is not lacking. As regards Saudi-Arabia, a member of the United Nations, the Government of Saudi-Arabia has ignored several requests by the United Nations for information on slavery in its territory, a request which had been addressed to all Member States and many non-Member States, but on the 2d of October, 1936, the King of Saudi-Arabia promulgated a Decree entitled "Instructions Concerning Traffic in Slaves", which, *inter alia*, prohibited the importation of slaves into Saudi-Arabia unless it could be proved that the person imported was a slave in the country whence he came, and also prohibited the enslavement of free persons in Saudi-Arabia. It went on to give slaves rights of protection against their masters and required slave-owners to register their slaves within one year from the promulgation of the Decree, failing which any slave not so registered would be entitled to his freedom. It also gave the slave the right to purchase his freedom. The Decree also established the office of Inspector of Slave Affairs. It is inconceivable that a Government would legislate to control slave-owning if there were no slaves and no slave-owners, therefore this law is an admission by implication that slavery existed in Saudi-Arabia in 1936. Moreover, I am informed that this law is still operative in Saudi-Arabia. As regards the Yemen, another member State of the United Nations, Eldon Rutter stated in a lecture which he gave on Slavery to the Royal Asian Society in London that the Imam of the Yemen, the Ruler of that State, had told him that he could not abolish the legal status of slavery by law in the Yemen because public opinion in the country still strongly desired slavery, another admission by the Head of the State that slavery existed in the State which he ruled.

As regards the small States in the Aden Protectorate under the military protection of Great Britain, the British Government informed the United Nations in 1951, that the complete abolition of slavery in the Aden Protectorate is a matter of some difficulty. The majority of such slaves as still exist enjoy a certain measure of security under the relatively humane provisions of the Moslem law and the harsh environment of the country renders them unwilling to change their status.

"In the western half of the Aden Protectorate there is comparatively little slavery, and in the Quaiti and Kathiri States of the Hadranaut the selling of slaves is forbidden and any slave has the right to manumission on application. The importation of slaves from Africa into Arabia appears to have completely stopped. Of persons remaining in a state of slavery in the Protectorate only a very small number can have been born outside Arabia. It is the constant aim of Her Majesty's Government to assist the Rulers to bring about the complete abolition of slavery." The only States in Arabia which have abolished the legal status of slavery are Bahrein in 1937, Kuwait in 1947, and Quatar in 1952.

RELIGIOUS ASPECT

Islam is the religion of the countries of Arabia and the institution of slavery is repugnant to the spirit of Islam. Asian and European writers on this subject agree that this is so. Amur Ali, a Privy Councillor of Great Britain, in his book, *The Spirit of Islam* (1935), p. 262, writes, "The Prophet exhorted his followers repeatedly in the name of God to enfrancise their slaves 'than which there was not an act more acceptable to God'." Eldon Rutter writes in his *Holy Cities of Arabia*, "The Koran rightly practised would soon bring about the complete cessation of slavery in the Islamic State", and Bertram Thomas, formerly Prime Minister of the Sultan of Muscat, write in his book, *The Arabs* (1937), "In the unabatement of slavery Arabia has been false to her Prophet." Most Moslem States have abolished slavery and the weight of enlightened Moslem opinion in modern times condemns slavery. The responsibility rests on the Moslem nations which have abolished slavery to convince their recalcitrant brothers-in-faith that the good name of their religion is always brought into an unfavourable light by the enslavement of their fellow human beings.

ESTIMATE OF SLAVES IN ARABIA

A census of the population of Arabia has never been made, still less a census of the slaves. The population of Arabia has been estimated at from 10 to 15 million. If I accept the lower figure, and owing to the desert nature of the country halve the percentage at which writers on slavery usually estimate slave populations, that is take 5 per cent. instead of 10 per cent., the slave population of Arabia would be 500,000.

AFRICA

The legal status of slavery has been abolished in all countries in Africa except the Spanish Protectorate of Morocco. It was abolished by law in Ethiopia in 1942 and the Government of Ethiopia affirms that slavery has ceased to exist in Ethiopia, but experience in other countries has shown that slavery lingers on clandestinely for many years after it has been abolished by law and supports the statement made by Margery Perham in her book, *The Government of Ethiopia* (1947), p. 236, "Statements that slavery has completely disappeared from Ethiopia should be discounted." What is needed is an impartial investigation in Ethiopia.

In other countries in Africa there are still some vestiges of chattel slavery. In the Gold Coast, although the legal status of slavery has been abolished by law, some of the "royal households still have domestic slaves who function as servants in the palaces of their masters and when their masters die some of them are sacrificed so that their souls may accompany the royalty to the other world to serve him or her there. The number sacrificed may vary from 4 to 40 according to the rank of the royalty". In Africa there is still a little pawning of persons as security for a debt. The creditor is entitled to the services of the pawl without liability to apply the value of those services towards liquidation of the debt and in this way the pawn may be enslaved for life. Pawning of persons, though, is fast disappearing as the economic condition of the country improves.

ACQUISITION OF WIVES BY PAYMENT OF BRIDE-PRICE

In Africa, south of the Sahara, it has been an ancient custom which is still prevalent, for a man to acquire his wife by payment of bride-price to her parents. The woman is usually acquired without her consent, and according to tribal law and custom her consent is not necessary to the validity of the marriage. A woman so acquired becomes the property of her husband, as well

as her children, even if the husband is not the natural father of the children. The man has the right to re-sell the woman to another man, even apart from her children, and on his death in her lifetime, the woman passes as part of his property to his heir and is bound to become the wife of the heir, without her consent, or of any man to whom the heir sells her. Some Colonial Powers in Africa have passed laws to modify this custom. A decree of the French Government of 15th, June, 1929, which applies to French West Africa and French Equatorial Africa, makes the consent of both parties to a marriage an essential to its validity and fixes a minimum age of consent and prohibits the inheritance of widows, and another Decree of 1946 makes marriage contracted in violation of the Decree of 1939 "enslavement". There has been similar legislation in the Belgian Congo, Southern Rhodesia, the Union of South Africa, and as regards widows in British Somaliland.

This practice is slavery within the meaning of the definition of slavery in the Slavery Convention of 1926, because rights of ownership are exercised over the wives so acquired. A French nun, Sister Marie-André du Sacré Coeur, who spent seventeen years of her life in French West Africa, has written on this subject, and she found in the records of Native Courts many instances where women were compelled by the Native Courts to conform with the custom. The custom has its defenders, but it is doomed to disappear under the impact of Western civilization, just as suttee—the burning of widows—has disappeared from India. One can only hazard a guess of the number of women affected by this marriage custom. It may be 60 millions.

SHAM ADOPTION OF CHILDREN

In some countries of the Far East it has been an ancient custom for poor families to sell or give some of their children to better-off families, believing that they will thus improve the lot of the child. The receiving families are willing to take them to exploit their labour or to use them as concubines or even as prostitutes. In China most of the children so disposed of are girls, but boys are also affected by it and are subjected to unmercifully long hours of work in small factories. The practice also exists in Japan and to a less degree in colonies of European nations in the Far East. On the 28th August, 1953, the *Manchester Guardian* published a summary of a Report prepared by the Ministry of Labour of Japan which showed that in the year ending June, 1952, that Ministry had traced close on 1,500 cases of children so disposed of. When these child slaves grow up they usually run away and are not recoverable because slavery is not a legal status in those countries. The British have tackled the problem successfully in Hong Kong and Malaya by requiring registration of children so "adopted", followed by regular inspection by Welfare Officers. Registration began in Hong Kong in 1929 and there were then about 10,000 of these child slaves there. Latest reports show that they are now less than 2,000. There is no recent information on this problem in China, but rumour says that the position has improved as the Chinese peasant has been able to get land more easily than under the old system of landlordism. In the late 1930's a Chinese organization which occupied itself with the welfare of the child slave, estimated the number in China at not less than 3 millions.

DEBT-BONDAGE AND SERFDOM

Then there is an intermediate status between slavery and free labour, which has not always been sufficiently discriminated from slavery. That is serfdom. It has its origin in land holding. The relationship between master and man changed from a personal one to a territorial one. A landowner granted a serf the use of a piece of land on condition that he rendered fixed services. This status was and is hereditary. The serf is bound to the land and goes with it, and on his death his children succeed him. In feudal times the practice was widespread, but it now exists mainly in some Latin-American countries where it is known as peonage. When the Spaniards conquered those territories they took away the land from the aboriginal American-Indians and subjected them to forced labour. The labourer was then called a peon and the only way he could live or get land was to take it from the immigrant Spanish landowner and work for him a specified number of days a week without pay. The shackle was usually rivetted more firmly by inveigling the peon into debt. Theoretically free, the peon was unable to break away from his yoke, and on his death it passed to his children. At one time it extended over most, if not all, of Latin America, but

it has disappeared from all of the Latin-American countries except Ecuador, Bolivia and Peru. In those countries the aggregate number of people living in this state is estimated at 8 millions. Last year Bolivia announced an agrarian reform which, it was claimed, would free 2½ million people from peonage, but I have been unable to get any information about the working of this measure. The problem was successfully tackled in Mexico by Co-operative agriculture under what is known as the ejido system. By that system groups of people are settled on Co-operative farms and assisted by the Government to run them and market their produce. It is to be hoped that this system will be copied in the three countries mentioned.

Closely related to peonage or serfdom is Debt-bondage, that is, the pledging of a person, either the debtor himself or a person under his control, as security for a debt. The practice has its origin in the absence among primitive people of immovable property in individual ownership or of moveable property of much value, which the creditor could seize in default of payment of the debt. All the debtor had to pledge was his labour. In theory at least, debt bondage is a temporary form of slavery, for the assumption is that the slavery ends when the debt is repaid. In practice, it usually results in life-long enslavement, because the value of the pawn's labour is not applied towards liquidation of the debt and he seldom has any other means of repaying it. In some systems debt bondage is hereditary. It is a very widely spread form of slavery and it is impossible to estimate the numbers affected by it. It often accompanies serfdom. This closes the picture of slavery which, leaving out of the reckoning the African wives, shows that some 12 millions of people in the world are still slaves.

HISTORICAL

Few, if any, communities are free from the stigma of slavery at some time or other in their history. It had its origin in the practice of enslaving prisoners-of-war and using them to relieve their conquerors of manual labour. As war, as a source of supply of slaves, became less frequent, slave raiding took its place and still survives, even though to a small extent. The discovery and colonization of the Americas gave slave raiding a tremendous impetus, and for two centuries that appalling traffic in human beings flourished between Africa and the Americas. It was not until the close of the 18th century that the conscience of the world awoke to the iniquity of this traffic. Among the first stirred by it were Granville Sharp, Thomas Clarkson and William Wilberforce. Wilberforce records in his diary in 1787 that "sitting under an old oak tree in Holwood Park with William Pitt, I formed the resolve to work for the abolition of slavery." That decision lighted a torch which still burns and the old oak tree is still alive, and promises to live till the day the last slave is set free.

Wilberforce and his colleagues worked first to secure the abolition of the slave trade in British territories which Wilberforce's influence carried through in 1807. The campaign for the Emancipation of the slaves in the British Colonies did not really begin until 1820. In this Wilberforce was joined by Fowell Buxton, who carried it through to success in 1833 after the death of Wilberforce. At the same time the Abbe Gregoire and others were working in France, and the Beechers, Garrison and Lincoln in the United States of America. France emancipated the slaves in her Colonies in 1848, and the U. S. A. in 1865. To Denmark belongs the honour of having been the first to emancipate the slaves in her West Indian colonies in 1799.

These were national efforts towards emancipation, but as the late Viscount Simon (than whom there has been no more ardent worker for the abolition of slavery), wrote in the preface to Lady Simon's book on *Slavery*, "The modern problem of slavery is not national, but international."

INTERNATIONAL

Slavery first became a problem of international concern at the Congress of Vienna in 1815, when eight European States bound themselves to bring about the universal abolition of the Slave Trade. That was followed by the Brussels Convention on Slavery of 1890, and the most active period in international effort for the abolition of slavery was the twenty-five years between the making of that convention and the outbreak of the First World War. In pursuance of that Convention slave trading, between Africa and Asia, was almost brought to an end and many nations abolished slavery. After the First World War (1914–18) the League of Nations was formed and it occupied itself with slavery. In 1926 the

League prepared a Convention on Slavery to which forty-four States adhered. That Convention is still in force. The League also set up a Standing Advisory Committee of Experts on Slavery, to supervise the application of the Convention and League influence resulted in the abolition of slavery in Afghanistan in 1923, in Iraq in 1924, in Nepal in 1926, in Kelat in 1926, in Trans-Jordania in 1929, in Iran in 1929, and in Bahrein in 1937. The Second World War brought the League's work for the abolition of slavery to a standstill. Following the Second World War the United Nations Organization arose, and as soon as it was created the Anti-Slavery Society set about interesting agencies of the United Nations in the abolition of slavery. A Declaration of Human Rights was prepared by the U. N., Article IV of which states that "No one shall be held in slavery or serviture; slavery and the slave trade shall be prohibited in all its forms."

At the General Assembly of the U. N., held in Paris in October, 1948, the Delegate of Belgium, Professor Fernand de Housse, moved, seconded by the Delegate of France, Professor Rene Cassin, that the Economic and Social Council of the U.N.* should study Slavery, and it was passed by a large majority. In 1949 the E. C. O. S. O. C. decided to appoint an *ad hoc* Committee of Experts on Slavery, and Madame Jane Vialle, a Frenchwoman, Mr. Bruno Lasker, an American, Mr. Poblete Troncoso, a Chilean, and I were appointed as its members. Efforts were made to fill the fifth place on the Committee, but they were unsuccessful. At the second session of the Committee in 1951, Mr. Robert Gavin of the International Labour Office, attended throughout as an observer, and did valuable work, especially in composing differences between members, but I regret to say, was not appointed a member. The *ad hoc* Committee held its first session at Lake Success in February, 1950. Some members of the Committee showed a desire to extend the Committee's enquiries to Forced Labour and other forms of involuntary labour, which are not slavery, but the E. C. O. S. O. C., which was in session at the same time, passed a resolution requesting the *ad hoc* Committee to confine itself to slavery, as the Council contemplated setting up another committee on Forced Labour, which has since been done. With that decision I agree, because Forced Labour is not Slavery. Forced Labour is exaction of involuntary labour by a government, whereas Slavery is exaction of involuntary labour by an individual, springing from that individual's rights of property in the person compelled to work. The *ad hoc* Committee at its first session prepared a Questionnaire on Slavery and similar forms of servitude which was addressed to all Member States and to a number of non-Member States, as well as to a number of non-governmental organizations and individuals with special competence in the field of slavery. Officials of the United Nations say that this request for information resulted in a larger response than any other request disseminated by the United Nations. The *ad hoc* Committee then submitted to the E. C. O. S. O. C. a programme, asking for authorization of two more sessions of the Committee, one to examine the replies to the questionnaire and to address requests for supplementary information, if necessary, and another, final one, to consider the information collected and prepare a Report. In the meanwhile a paper, prepared by Mr. Poblete Troncoso, on Forms of Servitude in Latin-America, was released, and it gave offence to the Government of Peru. When the *ad hoc* Committee's request came before the E. C. O. S. O. C., it was attacked by the Delegate for Peru who succeeded in securing a majority for cutting out one of the sessions asked by the Committee and limiting it to one session of four weeks and four weeks only. The Committee met again in March, 1951, and, hamstrung as it was by that decision, it was further hamstrung by the fact that it met in the unfinished building of the U. N. Headquarters in New York, in which a system of simultaneous translation of statements had not yet been installed. The Committee had to make use of consecutive translation of English into French and vice versa, which further halved the time available. As a result, an incomplete Report was prepared. I stayed in New York and prepared a longer, more complete Report (E/AC.33.B.14), in which I said, among other things, where slavery exists. It has never been published, although it has been quoted by U. N. officials in their documents on slavery and has met with commendation from Delegates at the E. C. O. S. O. C. Delegates at the U. N., as well as officials of the U. N., have not yet realized that you cannot make an omelette without breaking eggs, and that you cannot get people to agree on putting down slavery unless you say where slavery exists, and as long as they debate slavery in a vacuum, there will be a decision to postpone a decision for another year. That has happened. The

*E. C. O. S. O. C.

E. C. O. S. O. C. debated the Report of the *ad hoc* Committee on Slavery in September, 1951, and decided to ask the Secretary-General of the U. N. to collect more information on slavery and report on that information, and on the *ad hoc* Committee's Report. He did so. The Secretary-General's Report was debated in April, 1953, and he was asked to invite States to adhere to a Protocol transferring the functions of the League of Nations under the Slavery Convention of 1926 to the United Nations, and to express their views on the need for a Supplementary Convention on Slavery. Most States supported transfer of powers under the Slavery Convention of 1926 to the U. N., and there was a substantial consensus of opinion in favour of a Supplementary Convention on Slavery. At the session of the E. C. O. S. O. C. in April, 1954, the United Kingdom's Delegation submitted a draft Supplementary Convention which contains most of the recommendations made by the *ad hoc* Committee, and moved that it be circulated to all States for their comments and that a Rapporteur be appointed to report on those comments and on the information available. The preparation of that draft convention is the most constructive step yet taken by the United Nations on Slavery. After some opposition that resolution was passed and the leader of the Norwegian Delegation, Mr. Hans Engen, has been appointed as the Rapporteur. The matter will come up again at the United Nations in April, 1955. It is to be hoped that a final decision will then be made to prepare a Supplementary Convention and that suitable machinery will be set up to supervise the application of the Slavery Conventions. Lord Lugard, the greatest authority on slavery in this century, urged the need for a Standard Committee of Experts to supervise the application of the Slavery Convention, and his advice was ultimately accepted by the League of Nations. It is to be hoped that it will also be followed by the United Nations. The Slavery Convention of 1926 achieved all that could be achieved in the circumstances of its time, but it is not sufficient for the task. It is too short. It does little more than define Slavery. It does not even define Serfdom. It is to be noted that the Brussels Slavery Convention of 1890, was was a long convention, setting out specifically what was to be done, did achieve results. Why not pursue that course again? One of the greatest weaknesses of the Slavery Convention of 1926 was the lack of machinery for supervising the application of the Convention. The League recognized that and tried to remedy it by resolution, but nine years passed before the League could get the Standing Committee of Experts set up, and most States ignored the League's resolutions asking them to submit information on measures taken to abolish slavery. Unless that obligation is written into a convention, that information will not be forthcoming. Another provision which it should contain is one requiring the whole Convention to apply to all territories of an adhering State. If slavery is not permissible in one, it should not be permissible in any. The power of reserving certain territories should be deleted.

When Slavery comes before the United Nations again I hope that delegates will abandon their shyness about stating where slavery exists. Most States have slavery, even if only vestiges of it, in some of their territories. We, British, have vestiges of it in some of our possessions and have frankly said so in communications to the U. N. We should say it again in the hearing of Delegates of other nations who are more sensitive. The United States has it in some of the Southern States. People have been convicted in the U. S. A. of slavery as recently as in 1949. France still has vestiges of it in her possessions. I partook of a meal in 1938 in an Arab household in Fez, in Morocco, served by a woman slave, and her owner spoke openly and unashamedly of her as his slave. More recent travellers in Morocco have told me that there are still slaves in Morocco. Moreover, it is admitted by the French Government in statements to the U. N. The Belgian, Indian and Chinese Governments have made similar admissions. In many other countries there is Forced Labour which is as great an evil and stigma as slavery. The recent Report of the *ad hoc* Committee on Forced Labour of the U. N. shows that while most of those countries are behind the Iron Curtain, several are not so. More candid admission at the U. N. as to where slavery is by all guilty parties might result in breaking down the sensitiveness on the subject and bring Member States to concrete action to abolish it. Slavery also suffers at the U. N. from the fact that it has no value as ammunition in the "cold war" which is bedevilling the work of the U. N. Contrast the generous treatment accorded to the *ad hoc* Committee on Forced Labour with the parsimony shown to the *ad hoc* Committee on Slavery.

At the last session of the E. C. O. S. O. C. the Delegate of the United Kingdom said, and I think said rightly, that in addition to the Report of the *ad hoc* Committee of Experts on Slavery the Secretary-General had prepared no less than

four Reports, all of them valuable documents, but "however useful they might be they do not in fact make the picture any clearer. On the contrary they rather add to the confusion." He added that he did not wish to disparage the Secretary-General and his staff who had prepared those Reports, but the type of Report prepared, had not been suitable and had not pointed the way to a decision. From that it appears that the E. C. O. S. O. C. has found Slavery an involved, technical problem on which they need light. When the League of Nations addressed itself to the task of preparing a convention on Slavery, it was greatly helped by the presence among some of the Delegations present of some experts on Slavery, who gave a lead, which was followed. It may be that that is what the United Nations has lacked.

It is with the deepest regret that I have made these comments on the work of the United Nations on Slavery. I am satisfied that there is a genuine desire at the United Nations to find a solution to this problem. I have, moreover, received every consideration and courtesy both from national representatives at the United Nations as well as from officials of the U. N. and Delegates have been unstinting in paying tribute to the work of the Anti-Slavery Society for the abolition of Slavery, but I feel that I would be wanting in my duty to this Society if I did not say what I believe to be the causes of the six years delay, since slavery became an active issue at the United Nations, in reaching a decision and if I do not indicate how that hesitation to reach a decision might be resolved.

Let us hope that 1955 will bring forth a Supplementary Convention on Slavery, setting out the measures to be taken to bring Slavery to an end and the machinery for supervising the application of the Slavery Conventions.

The battle is not yet won.

THE ANTISLAVERY SOCIETY (UNITED KINGDOM)—SLAVERY AND SLAVE TRADING IN ARABIA

A copy of a statement which Mr. C. W. W. Greenidge, the representative of the Antislavery Society of the United Kingdom, an organization in consultative status with the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations in category B, will ask the Council to hear during its session, beginning on April 17, 1956.

The Antislavery Society notes with pleasure that a draft supplementary convention on the abolition of slavery, the slave trade and practices similar to slavery has been prepared by a committee of the economic and social council and expresses its satisfaction with the draft convention.

Since the draft convention has been published the society's attention has been drawn to the fact that the area of the high seas within which conveyance of slaves would be deemed to be piracy under article 3 (b) of the draft convention does not include the Mekran coast of Baluchistan from which people are seized and carried off to Arabia and sold into slavery.

2. Oman in Arabia is a country in which the legal status of slavery has not been abolished and there is still slavery there. Baluchis are among the slaves there as well as Africans. Dr. Paul Harrison, an American medical missionary who spent 30 years in Oman, says in his book, "Doctor in Arabia," published in 1943, (p. 46), "I had seen a good deal of slavery in the plantations back of Muscat and it is a pleasure to testify to the good treatment that those slaves received and their evident contentment with their lot. But on the pirate coast the situation was very different. Thousands of slaves were there and with them hundreds of pearl diving boats were manned. The dark places of the earth are full of cruelty. While I was in Abu Dhubai three slaves tried to escape to Bahrain (an Arab country in which slavery was abolished by law in 1937). * * * They were recaptured and beaten so severely that one of them died. The Baluchi slaves were the most pathetic, they rebelled bitterly against their bonds. All slaves were miserably treated but the Africans were the most patient." Mr. Raymond O'Shea, an officer of an aviation line, which had a station at Shargan in Oman, at which he was stationed, wrote in his book, "Sand Kings of Arabia," published in 1947 (p. 175), "It must not be assumed that slavery has been abolished in Arabia. * * * It is known to flourish in the dominions of King Ibn Saud and in the Yemen. Negro slaves may still be seen in the houses of the Sheiks and merchants of the Trucial Oman coast, while a great number are employed in the fishing and pearl diving industries. Once I was talking to a young slave of a pearl merchant of Dubai. I said to him, I suppose your father was an ex-slave here? To my surprise he had been born in Zanzibar whence

he had been abducted by Arab merchants when 4 years old, smuggled into the Hadramaut and sold in the slave market at Baraimi for 500 rupees."

Col. Gerald de Gaury, who has lived most of his life in Iraq and in Saudi Arabia and received high honors from King Ibn Saud, says in his book, Arabian Journey, published in 1950, (p. 80), that "slaves are still sold in Saudi Arabia * * * The chief market is in Mecca and the main route for them is to Mecca from the Yemen, to which they are brought by sailing boats from the opposite coast of Africa." He also tells us that there is a slave trade from the Mekran coast of Persia and Baluchistan and that he had it from good authority that several cargoes of boys were brought from the Mekran coast in 1947 and sold into slavery in Oman.

A recent traveler between India and Arabia has informed the Antislavery Society that as late as 1953 people were being carried off from Baluchistan to Arabia and sold into slavery. Oman has an enclave on the coast of Baluchistan called Gwarder, which serves as a base for assembling slaves for export to Arabia.

3. It is suggested that the eastern boundary of the area of the high seas covered by article 3 (b) of the draft convention should be extended from the 62° east longitude to the 66° 40′ east longitude to embrace the coast of Baluchistan.

4. In addition to the above information on slave trading between Arabia and both Africa and Baluchistan in Asia, a report was made to the Assembly of the French Union on November 17, 1955, by M. Emmanuel La Graviere, a member of that Assembly, in which he shows that there is a slave trade between Arabia and Africa. In November 1954, M. La Graviere, stirred by articles in the French press alleging the existence of this slave trade, moved the Assembly of the Franch Union to collect all the information it could on this slave trade and to take all steps possible to terminate it. He was appointed by the Assembly to collect the information. He spent part of 1955 traveling in French Africa collecting information on it and reported to the Assembly on November 17, 1955. His report is Document No. 75, an annex to the summary record of the session of the Assembly of November 17, 1955.

5. It contains three valuable bodies of evidence of this slave trade, namely:

1. The testimony of an African, Awed el Joud, that he was taken to Mecca as a servant and sold into slavery;

2. A letter dated November 7, 1953, from the French Ambassador in Saudi Arabia to his government setting out the existence of a slave trade between Arabia and Africa; and

3. The testimony of a priest in the French Cameroons, that in 1954 he had been occupied with 61 cases of slavery and numbers of others in preceding years.

(1) Awed el Joud was brought to M. La Graviere by a French military officer and stated that he was employed by Mohammed Ali ag Attaher, the chief of the Kel Antessar tribe in the French Sudan and that in 1949 his master told him that he was going to make a pilgrimage to Mecca and to take him with him. His master left for Mecca taking his wife, 3 children and 5 servants, including Awad, of whom 2 were women. The journey covered a year. After arrival in Mecca his master told him that he was going to place him in the service of Prince Abdallah Faycal, son of the Governor of Djeddah. Awad soon realized that he had been sold to the prince and was 1 of his 40 slaves. He said that he was the only one of them of French nationality, the others being Yemenites or Eritreans. He was not ill treated but he saw another slave almost beaten to death for trying to escape. In May 1953 he was taken to the slave market in Djeddah and offered for sale. He asked leave to go outside to smoke and escaped and went to the French Embassy. There he was told that the Ambassador could not intervene, and he returned to his master. At the end of 1953 his master went to France and in his absence, he asked for 3 days leave to make his pilgrimage to Mecca which was granted. He went to Mecca and returned to Djeddah. He then succeeded in boarding a ship bound for the Anglo-Egyptian Sudan and worked his passage from there back to his village in the French Sudan, at which he arrived in April 1954. Awad's testimony gets some support from a letter dated October 13, 1953, from the French Ambassador in Saudi Arabia to the Governor-General of French West Africa. He wrote that he had learned that Mohammed Ali ag Attaher, ex-chief of the Kel Antessar tribe had sold 5 slaves, of whom 2 were women, in Mecca in 1951, but he did not give their names.

(2) The French ambassador in Saudi Arabia informed his government that he had made inquiry in the Senegalese colony at Djeddah and was satisfied with the authenticity of the information. He said that merchants in Djeddah and Mecca send emissaries of Senegalese origin, who are now naturalized as Saudi Arabians into the villages of the French Sudan, the High Volta or the Niger Province and particularly to Timbuctoo. These emissaries pretend to be Muslim missionaries and they entice their compatriots to accompany them on a pilgrimage to Mecca. A number of Africans fall into this trap and are taken to Saudi Arabia. Arrived there they are sold into slavery. He estimated that a few hundred a year are so sold. He gave the names of 10 men engaged in this traffic.

(3) In the French Cameroons, M. La Graviere had the testimony of a priest, who had been there more than 20 years, that in 1954 he had been concerned with 61 cases of slavery. The slaves asked for his help and he reported their cases to the district officer who examined them and granted relief. He had also occupied himself with numerous other cases in preceding years.

The report mentions a small book entitled "Ce que j'ai connu de l'esclavage in Oubangui-Chari," by Father Charles Tisserant, a priest who spent over 30 years in French Equatorial Africa in which he says (p. 62) that there is still slavery in Oubangui-Chari, French Equatorial Africa, but perhaps a little less than when the French first came there. This book was published by the French Antislavery Society in 1955. A copy of it is in the Library of the United Nations.

The report states (p. 39) the conviction of its author that a slave trade does in fact exist between Arabia and Africa and that these practices are pursued with the complicity of the authorities of certain nations which are members of the United Nations and are signatories of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights.

6. The above evidence establishes that there is a slave trade between Arabia and Africa as well as between Arabia and other parts of Asia. The United Nations is vested with the powers of the League of Nations under the Slavery Convention of 1926, which prohibits slave trading.

A law of Saudi Arabia, namely, a decree made by the late Ibn Saud on October 2, 1936, also prohiibts slave trading in Saudi Arabia. Could the United Nations not devise some way of approaching the Government of Saudi Arabia, asking it to enforce its own laws against slave trading in conformity with the obligations it has undertaken under the Charter of the United Nations and to abolish the legal status of slavery.

The preamble of the Charter of the United Nations recites that the populations of member states of the United Nations have determined "to reaffirm faith in fundamental human rights and in the dignity and worth of the human person" and by article 56 of the charter, "member states pledge themselves to take joint and separate action in cooperation with the organization for the achievement of the purposes set out in article 55."

Article 55 (c) states that "the United Nations shall promote universal respect for and observance of human rights and fundamental freedoms for all without distinction as to race, sex, language, or religion." Can it be said that a member state which has not abolished the legal status of slavery and allows slavery and slave trading in its territories is promoting respect and observance of the human rights and fundamental freedoms of persons within its borders?

If the United Nations fails to influence a member state to observe that pledge, it may bring discredit on itself; and weaken respect in the world for its decisions.

MACHINERY TO SUPERVISE THE APPLICATION OF THE SLAVERY CONVENTIONS

I have addressed this committee before on the need for machinery to supervise the application of the Slavery Conventions. May I return to it now. The United Nations is now vested with the powers and functions of the League of Nations under the Slavery Convention of 1926. What I have said on the slave trade with Arabia shows that there is work waiting to be done by the United Nations under that convention, whether a supplementary convention is or is not made. After 8 years barren of result from the making of the Slavery Convention of 1926, the League of Nations found it necessary to set up a Standing Advisory Committee of Experts on Salvery to examine the information on slavery received and prepare the ground for the decisions of the league.

I submit that the same need exists now; that somebody with an expert knowledge of slavery should examine the information received by the United Nations and make recommendations to the Economic and Social Council for action. The

committee, I suggest, would be advisory to the Council and would have no power of action apart from the Council, but it would be composed of experts on slavery who would probably be more impartial than political or national representatives and more courageous in stating unpleasant facts than officials, employed by member states, in reference to some of whom unpleasant statements might have to be made.

I therefore express the hope that the Economic and Social Council may soon see fit to set up such a committee of experts by resolution. There is much more to be said on this point, some of which I have said already, but I will not weary the committee by repeating it. It is on record.

THE ANTISLAVERY SOCIETY (UNITED KINGDOM)—FORCED LABOR IN THE PORTUGUESE AFRICAN COLONIES

A copy of a statement which Mr. C. W. W. Greenidge, the representative of the Antislavery Society of the United Kingdom, an organization in consultative status with the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations in category B, will ask the Council to hear during its session, beginning on April 17, 1956.

Slavery was abolished by law in the Portuguese colonies in 1876, but it has been known for more than 50 years that the Portuguese Government has been exacting forced labor from the African population of the Portuguese colonies in Africa, following the abolition of slavery. This was first revealed by William Cadbury, Joseph Burtt, and H. W. Nevinson, who visited the Portuguese African colonies and the cocoa producing islands of Principe and San Thome 50 years ago and established the existence in them of a system of forced labor amounting to slavery. As a result of their investigations, cocoa manufacturers in the United Kingdom refused to buy and still refuse to buy Portuguese cocoa. This led to investigations into forced labor in other countries.

The general result of these disclosures was that world opinion became convinced that the whole system of labor in dependent territories needed to be reformed, if possible by international agreement. This was the background behind the international conventions prepared by the League of Nations and the International Labor Office.

Among the conventions prepared was the Forced Labor Convention of 1930 and the Recruiting of Indigenous Workers Convention of 1936, neither of which has Portugal ratified and applied to her colonies, although Portugal is a member of the Council of the International Labor Office. In 1949, when challenged with this at a session of the International Labor Office, the Portuguese delegate stated that Portugal was willing to apply the Forced Labor Convention to her colonies but up to the present this has not been done.

2. Legislation on labor in the Portuguese colonies is based on the Native Labor Code of 1928, which superseded all previous legislation. One of the ILO publications of 1929 entitled "Forced Labor Report and Draft Questionnaire" stated (par. 143, p. 118), "There are in the Portuguese colonies two types of labor exacted under compulsion. Type 1 is forced labor for general or local purposes or for private employers imposed solely on natives who fail to perform their obligations to labor and who lead a life of idleness." And in paragraph 271 (p. 206) of the same publication it is stated, "Compulsory labor for private employers may be imposed on natives who do not conform to their moral and legal obligations to labor, the principle of which was laid down in the General Native Labor Regulations."

Another ILO publication entitled "The Recruiting of Labor in the Colonies," report IV, published in 1935, says (p. 99) : "The 1928 code abandoned the principle of the moral and legal obligation of the native to work which had formerly been the underlying principle of Portuguese native labor law and substituted for it that of the moral obligation to procure the means of subsistence by labor and thereby promote the general interests of mankind." This in fact is a distinction without a difference and is so interpreted by the Portuguese administration in Africa.

The Antislavery Society has been informed by an official in a British colony bordering on a Portuguese colony in Africa, in a letter dated January 16, 1952, "That an African in a Portuguese colony must give his services for 1 whole year in every 3 to the Government."

3. The United Nations' Ad Hoc Committee on Forced Labor found in 1953 (v., Document E/2431 of the U. N., par. 291) that—

"(*a*) forced or compulsory labor is prohibited in principle by Portuguese legislation, but there are certain restrictions and legislation in the form of exceptions which permit the exaction of forced or compulsory labor;

"(*b*) the provisions protecting indigenous workers against unfair methods of recruitment do not, however, exclude a certain amount of compulsion and it is possible that in practice pressure is brought to bear upon workers responsible to officials to induce them to conclude contracts of employment offered by recruiting agents;

"(*c*) with regard to the recruitment of indigenous workers in Mozambique for the mines in the Union of South Africa conditions of forced labor might be created by the combined application of pressure at the recruiting stage and of the South African legislation governing breaches of labor contracts; and

"(*d*) that labor of workers in San Thome is of considerable economic importance to the territory and their situation appears to be similar to that of workers under a system of forced labor for economic purposes."

The Committee also commented on the fact that Portugal had not ratified the Forced Labor Convention of 1930 or the Recruitment of Indigenous Workers Convention of 1936 and applied them to her colonies.

In 1954 Mr. Basil Davidson visited Portuguese West Africa (Angola) and wrote a book entitled "The African Awakening," in which he brings up to date the work of Cadbury, Burtt, and Nevinson. Before he left for Angola he consulted the Anti-Slavery Society and was shown all the material collected in the past 50 years, including statements by people still resident in the country. He states in his book (p. 195), "There is much less cruelty than in Nevinson's days, otherwise the system is unchanged, and it is probable that there are now many more slaves in Angola than there were 50 years ago. * * * The files of the Native Affairs Department at Luanda, the capital, shows 379,000 contretatos or forced workers." He says (p. 199) that "the Constitution of Portugal incorporates article 19 of the Labor Code of 1928 that 'all regulations whereby the state may undertake to furnish native laborers for any enterprise working for their own economic development are hereby prohibited.' He comments on this: "These prohibitions are not worth the paper they are written on. They are for outside consumption * * * they in no way reflect what happens" and at p. 202, "Employers who want labor indent for it from the Government. Approved demands are sent to local administrators up and down the country and the Chefe de Posto (a Portuguese official), through the local chiefs and headmen, is then obliged to conscript the number of men required by the indent received. I was able to inspect a number of these indents at the offices of the Government at Luanda and also to secure copies of the contracts under which the forced workers are conscripted." Elsewhere Mr. Davidson places the number of voluntary workers in the labor force of Angola at about 400,000, so the forced workers almost equal in number the voluntary workers, an amazing proportion of idlers to find in a country.

4. Mr. Davidson has quoted in his book from a report made by Senhor Henrique Galvao, Inspector General of the Ministry of the Portuguese Colonies, who toured Angola in 1946 and wrote that report in which he laments that "clandestine emigration is responsible for the extremely grave state of depopulation that one notes in this country (Angola)" and he estimated a permanent loss of population in Guinea, Mozambique and Angola between 1937 and 1946 at no less than a million people. He found little difference between forced and voluntary labor except that the first was generally conscripted by the Government and the second by private employers or their paid agents. In Angola he found that the state openly and deliberately acted as recruiting agent for labor on behalf of settlers who write to the Department of Native Affairs for "a supply of workers." He concludes by saying, "in some ways the situation is worse than simple slavery. Under slavery the native is bought as an animal and his owner prefers him to remain fit. Yet here the native is not bought; he is hired from the state, although he is called a freeman. His employer cares little if he sickens and dies once he is working, because when he dies, his employer will simply ask for another."

5. Late in 1955 a pamphlet entitled "Angola Without Prejudice," by F. C. C. Egerton, was published by the Agency General for the Oversea Territories, Lisbon. It contains an introductory note by Senhor R. Ventura, the Minister for

the Portuguese Oversea Territories and the title page states that its "publication was authorized by a ministerial dispatch of September 2, 1955"; therefore it is an official publication. The purpose of the pamphlet is to challenge Mr. Basil Davidson's statement on Angola in his book mentioned above, but in doing so admissions are made which support the charge that the Government of Angola is exacting forced labor from the African inhabitants of it. This pamphlet denies that the number of contratatos (forced laborers) was 379,000 and states (p. 12) that "the total number engaged under contract in 1953 was 142,674. In 1954 the number dropped to 99,771." It matters little to the principle of the problem what the correct number was and an admission by the Portuguese Government that 140,000 or 100,000 forced laborers were conscripted is sufficient. The pamphlet states that that number was "under contract." How did they come "under contract." The pamphlet states (p. 22): "First it must be made clear that Portuguese law does not recognize the 'right' to be idle which some of its critics seem to regard as so precious. The Governor General (of Angola in a report made in 1953) quotes article 240 of the Carta Organica which declares: "The state does not impose upon the natives of its colonies or allow to be required of them any kind of obligatory or forced labor for private purposes, though it does not relieve them of the duty to try to obtain the means of subsistence by their own labor"; and on page 24 it states, "The Governor General tells us how the authorities decide whether or not a man must be made to work: In accordance with the established regulations every healthy male native must be able to show that he is living on the proceeds of his own work. It is considered that he is not doing so—and that work must therefore be found for him—if he does not appear to be in a position to pay the taxes which are due from him to the state; if it seems that he is unable, by his own efforts, to obtain the means required to support, clothe, and house himself and his family; and if the dwelling in which he lives is not in a hygienic condition.' The next stop, in the case of one who does not fulfill these conditions, may be recruitment."

The pamphlet then describes how recruitment is carried out and says (p. 25), "We are here dealing only with contracts which are made with 'the intervention of the state.'"

It is clear from the above that Africans are coerced by the state into working for people who apply to the state for labor and that is forced labor.

It is admitted that in many countries people who are found wandering about without visible means of subsistence are prosecuted and if adjudged to be "idle and disorderly persons" are imprisoned and subjected to work in a prison, but there is nothing to indicate that Africans in Angola deemed to be idle persons are so determined by any judicial process. It appears to be an executive decision.

A copy of the pamphlet mentioned is enclosed and a copy of a letter addressed by Mr. Basil Davidson to the editor of the Antislavery Reporter for publication is also enclosed. This letter is his reply to the pamphlet Angola Without Prejudice. It is sent because it will not be published until June.

6. In 1955 Mr. Oliver Woods, the colonial correspondent of the London Times, visited Angola and in an article entitled "Industrial Strides in Angola" published by the Times on August 24, 1955, he says, "There is a legal compulsion on every able-bodied man in Angola to work" and in the supplement to the Times of October 25, 1955, there is an article entitled "A Colonial System on the Lines of the Roman Empire," in which the following appears, "It is a fundamental basis of Portuguese colonial law that everyone, whether black or white, is compelled to work. That is a principle which has inevitably led to abuses. An 'indigenous' native may be conscribed for the army or for communal labor on roads and public works. Alternatively, he may work on his shamba, provided he is growing a productive crop, or for hire by contract in European estates or industries. All contracts are arranged through the district administration in theory to protect the native's interests. Direction of labor by the administration to particular estates or conscription of labor for private enterprises are expressly forbidden by law. Abuses and corruption do, however, occur, although the authorities take legal action against officials and employers where complaints are proven. There is no doubt that one effort of the system is to help create the labor shortage which it is designed to prevent." And in another article entitled "Settlements in Angola" published by the Times on September 22, 1955, it is stated that "certain services, such as quarrying and road maintenance are performed by the Public Works Department whose workers, as cynics will observe, are in Angola compulsorily recruited."

7. Mr. John Gunther wrote a book entitled, "Inside Africa", published in 1955 in which he states (p. 574), "The worst thing about Portuguese Africa is forced labor. Not only does this still exist; the Portuguese authorities admit that it exists, say that it is necessary and even a good thing for its victims and condone it. They call it directed labor * * *. That every man should work is, the government holds, an essential element in the civilizing process. But the system has manifest abuses. It is not quite—but almost—a form of slavery. The man becomes a chattel. The system works more or less like this: A planter informs the government that he will need so many men and these are provided for him by the local Chefe de posto or district officer. Native recruiters go into the villages and collect the necessary number of men who are then turned over to the planter. But the planter, to be sure of getting all the recruits he needs, usually has to pay off the Chefe de posto, if this latter happens to be corrupt. The normal 'payoff is 10 times the contract laborer's wages for 6 months * * *. The payoff system is illegal but widespread * * *. The contractor or planter who employs forced labor must, by law, provide food and shelter of a sort for his workers, make medical facilities available and pay them a minimum wage. But this is miserably small * * *. Some unlucky Africans * * * deported to San Thome and Principe, which have pronounced labor shortages. Here they do forced or directed labor on the cocoa fields in circumstances barely distinguishable from slavery."

8. Another recent writer on Africa, Mr. Alexander Campbell, in his book, The Heart of Africa, published in 1955, says (p. 376), "Any adult male African may be compelled by Portuguese law to work for a white master for at least 6 months of every year or else to produce a minimum quantity of prescribed crops on his own land * * *. African labor is the chief export of Portuguese East Africa. Between 60,000 and 80,000 Africans are successfully encouraged each year to go to work in South Africa's gold and coal mines."

9. It is difficult to see how Portugal could deny the truth of this body of official and unofficial evidence that forced labor is exacted in the Portuguese African colonies.

10. Portugal has not ratified the Forced Labor Convention of 1930, but she has ratified the Slavery Convention of 1926, article 5 of which prohibits forced labor for private enterprise.

Senator KENNEDY. We want to thank you very much for testifying. We found it very helpful.

Mr. Michael Devenis, of the Lithuanian-American Council, will you come before us?

Mr. DEVENIS. Mr. Chairman——

Senator KENNEDY. Doctor, we are very glad to have you here.

STATEMENT OF DR. MICHAEL DEVENIS, OF THE LITHUANIAN-AMERICAN COUNCIL

Mr. DEVENIS. I would like to excuse myself. It was a very short time. I have no prepared statement, but I think my appearance is going to be helpful because I was the person who spent 1 year in Russian concentration camp and 1 year in prison although I, myself, was an American citizen.

As you know, Lithuania was invaded by Russian troops in 1940 and I happened to be at that time living in Lithuania with my wife and three minor children and I was arrested just a few weeks after Lithuania was invaded. I was arrested without any reason, without warrant, without any accusation at all—just probably because I was the owner of the farm and employed some hired labor.

As you know, all arrests in Lithuania were made by the lists prepared in Moscow probably 1 year ahead before the invasion of Lithuania and that list was found when the Russians were expelled from Lithuania by the Germans. So, they made that list and no matter

whether a man was guilty or not he was accused, taken, arrested, and held in prison without any trial.

I was arrested on July 22, and remained in prison until March 1941, almost a year, and was held there for about 6 months without knowing any reason for what I was arrested, what my crime was. I had no communication with the outside world and no communication with the family. What was the worst was that I was an American citizen and I had two American-born children. I did not know whether they were arrested or they escaped. But, later on I found out that they escaped with my wife to America, so that gave me more courage to sustain all those cruelties.

The worst thing was that at the beginning they used to tell our trial is going to be a just trial, a people's trial, elected by the people, you are going to have a counsel, you are going to have a representation, and so on. But, after sitting 6 months in jail, one night about 1 o'clock, I was awakened and a man read a sentence that I was condemned to 8 years of the hard labor. I asked where was the trial? And who condemned me? They said trial was in Russia; in fact, I was tried by 3 men—1 probably from the Communist Party, 1 from the secret police, and the other from the local government there.

After the trial I was transported to the prison in Vilrius and there I had to wait until deportations were made ready to concentration camps. I was deported just before the Germans invaded Lithuania on June 16, 1941.

The deportations usually were very cruel, people from the prison were taken in the trucks, just piled like sacks of flour, and then brought to the railroad station and put in the cattle cars. All windows and doors were locked—boarded, nailed from the outside so that no one could even peak outside.

Usually Russians in those cars could put 8 horses or 40 men—I mean the Czarist Russians before Bolsheviks. But the Bolsheviks put about 60 or 70 men. So, the men used to be piled one on the other; there was no room to lay down, always standing up. The worst thing was that it was summertime and warm weather and there was no water. They used to have one bucket of water on the floor, but when the car began to move that water was all splashed out and no one could have it to drink. The food, we hardly had any food, except black bread and sometimes salted fish which increased the thirst even more.

That journey lasted for about 16 days until we reached the distribution camp in Russia. You heard the gentleman mention Vorkuta, previously, that's where I was—not in the city itself but the government or administration of the camps was in Vorkuta. They used to bring all prisoners from Baltic States, from Poland and so on. Here they were distributed for different camps. The prisoners were classified according to their ability to do hard work, medium work, or who were invalids. Those who were able to do hard work were sent to the coal mines and the others were sent to the forests to cut the wood and prepare timber. Since I was a physician, I did not do manual work, but I had to classify the prisoners. Later on I had to find out who was able to work. If they refused to work they would be tried for sabotage. But if the physician gave a certificate that the man was sick and was unable to work, then he could get along all right. They would not do anything to him.

After spending several months in that Vorkuta camp I was transferred to another camp, Naryan Mar—that is Red City. This is where the Pechora flows into the Arctic Ocean, that is the Arctic region. In the winter it was very cold, about 55° below zero Fahrenheit and the prisoners were badly clad and with hardly any footwear for working outside.

The rule was that if the temperature was below 35° no one would go to work. Sometimes upon departure it was 35°, but when the temperature fell to 40° or 50° below zero, they still had to work.

According to their constitution the Russians say there is an 8-hour work day. That probably, to a certain extent, is correct, but not in the prison camps, because the prisoners used to be awakened about 5 o'clock and by the time the roll call was made and breakfast was eaten and then, later on again at the outside of the zone until they were checked and the Red guards came, probably 2 hours passed. Then they had to walk an hour or two until their destination. They probably put 8 hours of actual work in the woods, but at the end of the day it would be 14 or 16 hours.

The food, as I said, was black bread and sometimes a piece of salted fish and once a day very thin soup from millet seed.

Senator KENNEDY. What do you think the casualties were there?

Mr. DEVENIS. Pardon me?

Senator KENNEDY. What were the casualties among the prisoners?

Mr. DEVENIS. They were very high. We had in that camp at first before my coming about 5,000 but later it was 1,500, but every day on the sick list there were about a 100 or 150 men. And taking into consideration that these men were in the prime of life as Polish soldiers who were about 22 or 23, all below 30 years of age, but after living there for about 3 or 6 months their health deteriorated so that you hardly could recognize them.

Senator KENNEDY. What happened to most of them?

Mr. DEVENIS. Well, most of them, if they got seriously ill they would be taken out. I do not know what happened to them—whether they were transferred to some hospitals in the interior of Russia or if they were left to die.

Senator KENNEDY. What happened to those that did not, they stayed for their sentence, how did you get out?

Mr. DEVENIS. My wife escaped to America and then she worked through the State Department since I was an American citizen. When Germany invaded Russia, Russia needed American supplies, and Admiral Stanley at that time went to Russia as Ambassador and the first thing he did, he negotiated my release.

Senator KENNEDY. Doctor, you are representing the Lituanian-American Council?

Mr. DEVENIS. Yes, sir.

Senator KENNEDY. And you are in favor of this resolution, as I understand it?

Mr. DEVENIS. Yes, sir; I am.

Senator KENNEDY. You feel that it will help us spotlight the situation such as you just described?

Mr. DEVENIS. Well, I feel so, because here a gentleman described there is slave labor and forced labor. I would say that in those concentration camps it is just slave labor. They do not have any rights. But entire Russia is probably forced labor, because everybody is

forced to work, they cannot leave their work, and they are confined to the factories.

Senator KENNEDY. Well, doctor, we appreciate very much having your statement here and I think it will be very helpful to the committee in considering the resolution.

Mr. DEVENIS. Thank you.

Senator KENNEDY. The last witness is Dr. Stanislaus Skrzypek, economic analyst and specialist in Polish and East European economics.

Doctor, we are glad to have you here. Who are you representing now?

Mr. SKRZYPEK. I am representing the Polish Association of Former Political Prisoners.

STATEMENT OF DR. STANISLAUS SKRZYPEK, REPRESENTING THE POLISH ASSOCIATION OF FORMER POLITICAL PRISONERS, ECONOMIC ANALYST AND SPECIALIST IN POLISH AND EAST EUROPEAN ECONOMICS

Mr. SKRZYPEK. I was myself a prisoner in Russia. I was in concentration camp. I spent about a year in Lubianka Prison in Moscow and then being released I worked for the Polish Embassy where I investigated the condition of the slave labor camps in Russia. So, I collected extensive material which later I published into book form in London.

Senator KENNEDY. When did you leave the Soviet Union?

Mr. SKRZYPEK. In 1942.

Senator KENNEDY. You went to London then?

Mr. SKRZYPEK. Yes, I left the Soviet Union with the Polish Army to Persia and then I came to London and I stayed in London until 1951.

Senator KENNEDY. You left when they went down through Persia——

Mr. SKRZYPEK. Yes, the——

Senator KENNEDY. General Anders?

Mr. SKRZYPEK. Yes, with General Anders' Army.

Senator KENNEDY. And you live in New York now?

Mr. SKRZYPEK. Yes, I live in New York.

Senator KENNEDY. And you are a Polish citizen?

Mr. SKRZYPEK. Yes.

Senator KENNEDY. We are very glad to have you here, doctor, and we will be glad to hear what you say.

Mr. SKRZYPEK. I have to speak about the forced labor in present-day Poland. As I told you, I left Poland in 1939, so here I am not the so-called a personal witness but as I studied those problems thoroughly for the last 5 years what I will tell now I am telling on the basis of documents I have.

I will prepare the written statement and send it later, but now I will just outline the situation.

(The statement referred to follows:)

FORCED LABOR IN POLAND

(Supplementary statement)

Forced labor in Poland is partly organized on the grounds of the existing common law, partly on the basis of the existing common laws.

People are directed to forced labor camps in accordance with decisions of the Special Commission for Fighting Economic Sabotage and Abuses, or following a verdict of a court of law.

The special commission was formed by a decree of November 16, 1945, as amended on May 14, 1946, and July 20, 1950. The final text of this decree, published in the Law Journal after the modifications introduced by the law of July 20, 1950, is given below. The special commission was abolished on December 23, 1954.

The Code of Penal Procedure, after it was amended by the law passed on July 20, 1950, provides for sentences to forced labor camps to be issued by ordinary courts. This is in accordance with article 14 of this code, the text of which is also enclosed.

Unpublished prison regulations as well as instructions of the Ministry of Internal Security (to which all prisons are subordinate) introduced forced labor for prisoners, not only within the prison walls but also outside.

The law on penal-administrative jurisdiction which takes power on April 1, 1952 (we are quoting some of its articles), provides for administrative punishment up to 3 months of corrective labor. This punishment can be inflicted with reduced wages for work, or without any pay.

Here are some excerpts from Polish statutes of law containing provisions for the forced labor:

Law Journal of the Polish Republic, No. 41, of the day September 19, 1950; decree of November 16, 1945, on the formation and powers of the Special Commission for Fighting Economic Sabotage and Abuses. (Compiled text published in the Law Journal after modifications introduced by the lat of July 20, 1950):

"Article 1. Special Commission for Fighting Economic Sabotage and Abuses, which will be called Special Commission in the following articles of this decree, is formed to consider cases of criminal offences detrimental to the interests of the economic or social life of the state, and in particular embezzlement of social property, corruption, bribery, speculation, and incitation to panic, with the intention to harm the interests of the working masses.

"Article 6. The Special Commission and offices of delegates of the Special Commission, on the proposal of the public prosecutor, pass sentences also in such cases when the activity of the culprit is prompted by his dislike of work, or creates a danger of committing abuses or economic sabotage.

"Article 7. (1) The Special Commission and offices of delegates of the Special Commission have the power to pass the following decisions:

"(*a*) committing the author of the offence to a labor camp, for a period not exceeding 2 years, and imposing a fine up to 5.000.000 zlotys,[1] or any one of these two punishments.

"(2) When the fine has been imposed, and the sentenced person is found insolvable, the Special Commission and offices of delegates of the Special Commission can, at their discretion, change the fine into the punishment of labor camp, for the period not exceeding 2 years, and this independently from the sentence of labor camp which has already been passed on the author of the offence.

"(3) A person infringing on the forbidden residence, under the sentenced passed against him in accordance with point 1 d of this article, can be directed to the labor camp for a period not exceeding 2 years, by the Special Commission or offices of delegates of the Special Commission.

"Article 9. The legal procedure concerning the directing of the author of the offence to a labor camp, takes place without the participation of a councel for defence.

"Article 11. (1) The decisions of the Special Commission or of offices of delegates of the Special Commission are final, and no legal form of appeal exists from them.

---

[1] Currency before the monetary reform of 1950.

"(2) The Special Commission, by its powers of supervision, can change the decision issued by the office of delegate of the Special Commission, and can reserve certain sorts of cases, or decisions of directing the guilty person to the labor camp, for its own exclusive jurisdiction."

Law of December 15, 1951, on penal-administrative jurisdiction (Law Journal No. 66 of 29.12.1951):

This law decrees that in the penal-administrative procedure, sentences are issued either by collective bodies (collegia) appointed by National Councils, or by administrative orders.

The law establishes the punishment of "corrective labor" from 1 day to 3 months, or of a fine from 3 to 3.000 zlotys. The sentenced person may appeal to the collegium at the Praesidium of National Council of a higher degree.

This is the text of some more characteristic articles of the law:

"Article 10. (1) The sentence of corrective labor is being carried out without depriving the convicted person of his liberty; from the wages due to him for the work he is doing as corrective labor, 20 percent are deducted for the state.

"(2) The persons employed in the enterprises of nationalized economy, with the authorities, offices, institutions, and establishments of the state or nationalized, perform their corrective labor in the place of their employment.

"(3) Other persons perform their corrective labor in the place indicated by the Praesidium of the National Council which is executing the sentence. The Praesidium of the National Council, in order to execute the sentence of corrective labor, can direct the punished person, instead of to a paid work, to a work without wages, accepting 1 day of work without wages an an equivalent to 3–5 days of paid work of corrective labor.

"(4) The decree of the Council of Ministers will decide upon the rules and procedure of corrective labor.

"Article 14. If an imposed fine cannot be paid, the chairman of the collegium will change the fine into the punishment by corrective labor, accepting 1 day of corrective labor as equivalent to 10–40 zlotys of fine.

"(2) If the fine is changed into corrective labor, the term of punishment by corrective labor cannot exceed 3 months, and if the fine has been imposed by administrative order; 3 days.

"Article 29. (1) In cases when, considering a small social harmfulness of the offense, the necessity does not arise to impose a heavier punishment than a reprimand, 150 zlotys' fine or 3 days of corrective labor; the chairman of the collegium or his deputy can issue sentences in the above-described limits by order, without a hearing of the case; this can happen exclusively on the grounds of information issuing from state authorities, offices, or state institutions or establishments.

"(2) In village communities and in towns having up to 10,000 inhabitants, such a penal order can only be issued by a collegium."

A special article says on which initiative the penal-administrative procedure before the collegia at the Praesidia of National Councils is put in motion:

"Article 17. The grounds for starting the proceedings are provided by a report of an authority, office, state, or social institution, of an enterprise of nationalized economy, of the injured party or any other person."

Law of July 20, 1950, modifying the provisions of penal procedure (Law Journal No. 38 of 1.9.1950):

This law, modifying the Code of Penal Procedure, in its article 14 provides for the punishment of forced labor camp to be imposed by ordinary courts of justice. The article mentions that the case may be heard in the absence of the accused, and in paragraph 1 says that the accused's presence is not required if the court does not intend to deprive him of liberty for a longer time than 12 months. The paragraph 3 of this article is most characteristic:

"Article 14. (3) In the case when, on the grounds of the results of court proceedings held in the absence of the accused, who has been questioned by way of juridical assistance (pomoc sadowa), the court comes to the conclusion that a punishment higher than mentioned in paragraph 1 should be imposed, or that the accused should be directed to a forced-labor camp or to an institution for incorrigibles; the proceedings of the court are interrupted or adjourned and the court orders that the accused be brought before it."

LEGAL PROVISIONS FOR SEMIFORCED LABOR

There are no free workers in Poland in the Western sense of the word. The conditions of work of so-called free workers are limited in the legal and admin-

istrative sense, for in a certain measure each factory or office is, as if it were, an introductory course to compulsory work camps.

The Warsaw regime had already begun in 1945 systematically to deprive the working class of social rights, first of all by banning strikes (unlawfully) and later by gradually imposing methods of so-called competitive work (stakhanovism), piecework pay, etc. These steps were preliminary to the introduction of a system of slave labor, fully realized only in 1950.

Two laws form the legal basis of this system: the law to prevent the dissolution of workers' cadres and the law on socialist labor discipline.

LAW ON PREVENTING THE DISSOLUTION OF WORKER'S CADRES

The law of March 7, 1950 (Journal of Laws No. 10, pos. 107), to prevent the dissolution of workers' cadres in professions or special occupations especially important to socialized economy, provides that:

"In order to prevent harmful dissolution of qualified cadres, which would be contrary to the principles of planned economy, it is desided as follows: Professionally qualified persons or those in specialized occupations particularly vital to socialized economy, can be obliged to remain for a prescribed time in a specialized work establishment or in a state or autonomous institution in their present positions or in other positions suitable to their qualifications."

And later: "The Council of Ministers, upon a motion made by the Chairman of the State Commission for Planned Economy after consultation with the Central Council of Professional Unions may authorize the suspension, for a period not longer than 2 years, of the right to cancel a work contract or service agreement made by the majority of workers employed in particularly important professions or specialized occupations, without the necessity of issuing individual orders, or it may make this right conditional upon the fulfillment of definite conditions."

Depriving thus the workers of the right to choose their place of work and binding them slavishly to a workshop chosen by the state, the law of March 7 transforms factories and production plants in Poland into compulsory labor camps. The mention of the Central Council of Professional Unions in the law is a mere euphemism since these unions are party organizations, dependent upon the Politbureau for their instructions.

SOCIALIST LABOR DISCIPLINE

The law of April 19, 1950 (Journal of Law No. 20, pos. 168) on safeguarding the socialistic discipline of work begins with the following declaration of program:

"In the People's Poland the working class, conscious of its rights and duties as the manager of the nation, give labor discipline a new socialist meaning.

"An overwhelming majority of laborers and intellectual workers, working conscientiously and with enthusiasm, acknowledge their socialist relationship to work and contribute to the strength of the people's fatherland.

"There are, however, individuals who, by impairing the discipline of work, lower the efficiency of the self-denying labors of their coworkers and act as a brake upon the further, continuous growth of the prosperity and culture of the working masses. One of the most harmful offences against the discipline of work is unjustified absenteeism.

"Considering that the safeguarding of the socialist labor discipline is an indispensable condition for the realization of the 6-year plan, in accordance with the interests and postulates of the working class, it is decided as follows: * * *."

There follows a long list of fines as foreseen for the least infringement of labor discipline, running from admonitions and pay deductions to a reduction of pay of up to 25 percent together with a prison sentence.

Jointly the laws on prevention of fluidity and labor discipline give a large room for applying semiforced labor in Poland.

Military units also can be used for forced labor. The law on general conscription provides for the so-called substitute military service (zastepcza sluzba wojskowa), which means that some recruits, after formal enrollment in the army and a short period of military training, are directed to factories or mines, to work there under the regime strict military discipline. Penal military units are also used for such work; the existence of such units has been confirmed by the law of January 18, 1951, about the responsibility of soldiers for disciplinary offenses.

Law of February 4, 1950, on the general obligation of military service (Law Journal No. 6 of 28.2.1950) :

"Section IV. Substitute military service.

"Article 48. Substitute military service lasts 2 years.

"Article 49. Substitute miltiary service consists of military training and of performing work necessary for the defence of the state and for the realization of national economic plans.

"Article 50. Also the men put on the reserve list without doing the basic military service can be called up for substitute military service, but not later than until the end of this calendar year in which they complete 28 years of age."

Law of January 18, 1951, on the responsibility of a soldier for disciplinary offences and for offences against the soldier's honour and dignity (Law Journal No. 6 of 26.1.1951) :

"Article 6. In the disciplinary proceedings, disciplinary punishments of administrative order can be meted out, as well as the punishments of: detention barracks, service in a penal unit, etc. * * *."

FORCED LABOR CAMPS IN POLAND (LIST OF 22 LABOR CAMPS WITH A BRIEF SYNOPSIS)

1. Forced-labor camp Bielawy near Piechcin.

Source: A forced laborer who served a 6-year sentence in Bielawy.

Date of observation: until June 1953.

Brief synopsis: The Bielawy camp is a subcamp of the Potolice forced-labor camp and holds about 1,000 inmates serving sentences between 3 and 15 years. In most cases the inmates of this camp already served 3 years in the Potolice camp. The inmates work in the limestone pits nearby. Forty percent of the inmates are political convicts. Besides the regular camp guards, a militia company has to guard the inmates. The food is bad. Parcels may only seldom be received. The health conditions of the workers are poor. Their work is dangerous and many of them are injured during the work. There is regular political schooling. The inmates are allowed to set up a band and a theater group.

2. Forced-labor camp near Chorzow.

Source: Polish emigree who came to London.

Date of observation: 1953.

Brief synopsis: At the coal mine Wyzwolenie, a distance of about 5 kilometers from Chorzow in the direction of Bytom, is a forced-labor camp. In this camp Poles carry out their forced-labor sentences of from 3 months to 2 years.

3. Forced-labor camp Hrubieszow.

Source: Poland in the Year 1951, published by the NCFE.

Brief synopsis: Situated 2 kilometers from the shores of the River Bug, on the Zamosc-Wlodzimierz Wolynski railroad; established in 1947. Among the prisoners are many former members of the Home Army (AK) of General Anders' Corps and repatriates from the West. Prisoners are housed in 20 barracks and do construction work on the airfield, railroads, industrial projects, etc.

4. Forced-labor camp near Gubin.

Source: Informationsbüro West, Bulletin 144 of July 16, 1952.

Synopsis: Forced-labor camp near Gubin with a capacity of 3,000 recently opened for political prisoners. At present it has 400 inmates.

5. Forced-labor camp Jawiszowice.

Source: A carpenter, 44 years old. He spent 26 months in the Jawiszowice camp.

Date of observation: April 1953.

Brief synopsis: Appalling sanitary conditions in the forced-labor camp at Jawiszowice, formerly a branch of the Auschwitz (Oswiecim) concentration camp, as well as the heavy work in the Jawiszowice coal mines, strain the prisoners' strength to the limit of endurance. The majority of prisoners were sentenced for criminal offences, but there are also former military men and party functionaries. Spies and informers in the camp are mostly recruited from among this latter group.

6. Forced-labor camp Jaworzno.

Source: A 23-year-old man who spent several months in 1951 at the Jaworzno camp.

Date of observation: January–April 1951.

Brief synopsis: In 1950 a huge camp for about 3,000 inmates was established in Jaworzno under the name of "Central Labor Camp." At that time only very primitive wooden huts were erected to serve as accommodation for the prisoners.

Source: Poland in the Year 1951, published by NCFE.

Brief synopsis: Situated on the Chrzanow-Katowice railroad; 1 square kilometer in area; originally 20 buildings with a capacity of 5,000 men, recently increased to 15,000. The prisoners work in two coal mines, Bierut and Kosciuszko.

7. Forced-labor camp in Jelcza.

Source: A 43-year-old refugee who worked in the Jelcza forced-labor camp until December 1952.

Brief synopsis: The forced-labor camp in Jelcza appears to be a comparatively recent institution, commenced, according to source, in the late fall of 1951. When he was sent there, in April 1952, there were about 1,500 prisoners, but by fall already 4,000, and the camp was planned for altogether 6,000 prisoners. The camp is on the site of a former Krupp factory. Some workshops have been rebuilt, in which heavy trucks were repaired. Two more workshops were in the process of being built when source left.

8. Forced-labor camp at the coal mine Kleofas near Katowice.

Source: Refugee who escaped from Poland in January 1953.

Date of observation: 1952 till summer.

Brief synopsis: At the Kleofas coal mine near Katowice about 2,000 people are employed. Out of this number about 800 are free workers, 700 are prisoners from the forced-labor camp situated at Zalesie (suburb of Katowice), and the rest is recruited from among special army detachments. Because the coal mine is lagging behind with the production plan, Sunday work is obligatory. Three consecutive Sundays are paid on the usual weekday basis, the fourth is offered gratis "to the Plan." The workers prefer the night shift because of higher pay and because those who work at night are not obliged to attend political meetings, which take place twice or three times a week. Out of the prisoners' earnings 50 percent is deducted for maintenance expenses in the camp, 25 percent is being paid in canteen vouchers, and 25 percent is put aside to the prisoner's savings account.

9. Forced-labor camp in Knurow mines near Rybnik.

Source: Refugee, 21 years old.

Date of observation: Until September 1951.

Brief synopsis: Forced-labor camp Knurow, situated near Rybnik (17 kilometers). Inmates number in this camp 1,200. The prisoners used for work in coal mines Piotr and Pawel.

10. Forced-labor camp in coal mine Dymitrow near Bytom.

Source: Forced laborer, 46 years old.

Date of observation: June 1953.

Brief synopsis: The camp Kopalnia Dymitrow is a forced-labor camp near Bytom. It belongs to the administration of the Bytom jail. The camp holds at present about 1,125 inmates. The camp is situated in the rear of the pits and hermetically separated from its surroundings. The living conditions of the inmates are extremely bad. They have to work in three shifts in the mines and often they are not allowed to leave their working place until they fulfilled their norm. After work the inmates are locked up in their barracks; they receive for their work 1,200 zlotys per month from which 50 percent are retained for lodging, food, and their guards; 25 percent for the canteen; and the last 25 percent for a so-called iron account. The medical care is poor and many workers suffer from tuberculosis. Political training was regularly held, but about one-half year ago it was given up.

11. Forced-labor camp Leszno-Gronowo.

Source: Poland in the Year 1951, published by NCFE.

Brief synopsis: On the Leszno-Ostrow Wielkopolski railroad; situated 4 kilometers from Leszno; 600 by 600 meters in area; surrounded by double barbed wire with watchtowers at 50-meter intervals; reportedly unsantiary conditions; many prisoners former members of the Home Army (AK) and other underground organizations; approximately half work on collective state farm Gronowek; number of prisoners recently said to be over 3,000.

12. Forced-labor camp Mielecin near Wloclawek.

Source: Polish refugee who spent 8 months in Mielecin labor camp.

Date of observation: until February 1952.

Brief synopsis: There are at present about 1,000 prisoners, including about 100 women at the Mielecin labor camp. The camp is situated 1½ kilometers from the village Mielecin, not far from Wloclawek. On three sides it is surrounded with a forest; on its northern side it is connected with an open road leading to the main highway to Wloclawek.

13. Forced-labor camp in Modlin.

Source: Refugee 28.

Date of observation: Until December 1948.

Brief synopsis: The labor camp in Modlin, near Warsaw, is in the vicinity of the old fortress. The camp consisted of 4 wooden barracks housing 50 persons each. Thus the capacity of the camp was 200 men. Each group of 50 persons was housed in 1 common room. There was 1 toilet and 1 washroom in each barrack. The camp was surrounded with a barbed-wire fence, 3 meters high and 3 meters broad. There was also one watchtower in the middle of the fence. There was a heavy machinegun and a reflector in the watchtower.

14. Forced-labor camp near Opole.

Source: Informationsburo West. Bulletin 144, July 16, 1952.

Brief synopsis: A large new forced-labor camp is being constructed by nearly 3,000 forced laborers near Opole in Polish Silesia, according to recent refugees from that area. It is to accommodate about 10,000 prisoners.

15. Forced labor camp Rokitnice near Katowice.

Source: 21-year-old refugee.

Date of observation: Worked in this camp until May 1951.

Brief synopsis: About 1,000 inmates who work in coal mines Stas and Kosciuszko.

16. Forced-labor camp Siemianowice.

Source: A 42-year-old refugee.

Date of observation: March 1953.

Brief synopsis. In Siemianowice there are two forced-labor camps. The first is situated at the coal mine of Siemianowice (prewar name Richter coal mine). The second camp is next to the foundry, Laura.

17. Forced-labor camp Sosnica.

Source: A young refugee from Poland who crossed the border on March 23, 1953.

Date of observation: Until September 1952.

Brief synopsis: A forced-labor camp named Sosnica is attached to the coal mine bearing the same name, situated in the eastern suburb of the town Gliwice. In his time, the camp held nearly 700 inmates, most of them with short terms of sentences, some sent to the camp to terminate their long terms. Apart from that, the mine employed around 2,500 free miners and workers and about 700 soldiers of labor units quartered at Gliwice.

18. Forced labor camps in Warsaw.

Source: Combined report from two sources both interned in Warsaw forced-labor camp No. 1 who obtained this information from other prisoners from the three camps mentioned when meeting them during work.

Date of observation: April 1953.

Brief synopsis:

Camp No. 1 in Warsaw was liquidated in 1951; it had been situated on Wolowska Street and the name was transferred to the newly opened camp at Sluzewiec.

Camp No. 2 is a very small one and is situated on Podchorazy Street.

Camp No. 3 is situated in the building which formerly housed the Tobacco Monopoly on Anielewicz Street. The 4-floor building of the Monopoly is partly occupied by the prisoners, whom the source estimates to number 3,000. On the other side of the Monopoly is the infamous prison, the so-called Gesiowka, and separated by a high barbed wire.

Camp No. 4 is situated in the former Opel factory at Gornoslaska Street 2. In the basement, on the first floor and the following floor of the former factory, in 3 large rooms, are housed about 800 prisoners.

COP: Centralny Oboz Pracy (main forced-labor camp), which has 3–4 blocks, is the administration for all other forced-labor camps in Warsaw as well as a temporary camp for new prisoners.

19. Forced-labor camp Wesola II.

Source: A German, 21, from the district of Sztum. He was arrested when attempting to cross the border near Stettin.

Date of observation: 1952.

Brief synopsis: This labor camp is situated very near the coal mine Wesola II, not far from the village of Wesola, in the Pszczyna district, in Upper Silesia. The whole camp area, 350 meters by 100 meters, is filled with wooden barracks and surrounded by 3 thicknesses of barbed wire. Above the entrance there is a sign "O. P. W. Wesola II." (Source thinks that these initials stand for the words "Osrodek Pracy Wieziennej"—prison work center.) About 35–40 men in dark green uniforms guard about 830–850 prisoners.

20. Forced-labor camp Wroclaw.

Source: A 42-year-old German convict, who served 6-year sentence in the forced-labor camp Wroclaw-Kletschau.

Date of observation: June 1953.

21. Forced labor camp Wylkow (Wilkow).

Source: A forced laborer, 43 years old.

Date of observation: June 1953.

Brief synopsis: The Wilkow forced-labor camp is for males only and holds about 1,000 men, who are serving sentences between 6 months and 6 years. About half consist of soldiers, including officers and NCO's, who are kept separate and undergo severe treatment. Accommodations are in barrack rooms hold'ng up to 50 persons. Conditions generally better than in other camps. Inmates have to work in iron-ore mine about 250 yards away; this work confined to day shifts. The mine is almost worked out and in bad condition, leading to many accidents including high percentage of fatals.

22. Forced labor camp in Zlotow.

Source: Two sailors who jumped off the Polish ship *Stalowa Wola* in Sweden.

Date of observation: February 1952.

Brief synopsis: The labor camp in Zlotow, in Pomorze, is reserved almost exclusively for seamen and sailors serving short sentences (3 to 6 months) for small political or disciplinary offenses. The number of inmates is about 3,000.

EXCERPT FROM THE POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC YEARBOOK FOR 1948, WARSAW, 1948

We read, among other things, on page 417 et seq.:

"Since the decree provides for compulsory labor in a camp, and the camp is essentially a closed-up place isolated from the rest of the community, in practice interment in a labor camp is equivalent to imprisonment * * *.

"Work as the main element of a penalty gives the labor camp the character of a penal and educational medium corresponding to the needs of our times in which we cannot tolerate parasites either in the nature of persons aversive to work, racketeers, black-market dealers * * *.

"The Special Board first established a labor camp at Jaworzno and thereafter another at Mielecin. The camp regulations correspond in general to prison regulations, that is, the barracks of the camps, the kitchens, washrooms, and sick bays conform to the requirements of hygiene. A doctor is attached to each camp. In case of serious illness or the need for a surgical operation the patient is sent to a hospital. In order that discipline and order may be maintained in the camp as well as at places where the work is being carired out, the camp commandant has the authority to impose disciplinary punishment as provided for in prison regulations. Other punishment is not to be imposed. Good behavior in the camp and the performance of work allocated is one of the main bases for the prisoner's release from the camp prior to the full expiration of the sentence. The prescribed working day amounts to about 10 hours, but its actual length depends upon the physical strength of the inmate. The work in the labor camp consists of performing labor in local plants, building barracks, felling trees, excavation, or performing orderly duties in the camp, etc. Women work in the kitchens, washrooms, plants, and the camp garden. * * *

"Labor camps organized on those lines are important means of reform and correspond completely to the needs of rebuilding the state, namely, by protecting the community, isolating from it wrongdoers and forcing them to do honest and systematic work * * *."

The particular statistical figures from the activities of the Special Board for 1946–47 are given and they read as follows:

	1946	1947	Total	Percentage
The Special Board received denunciations—				
From Government and local government agencies	11,360	30,147	41,507	45.1
From private persons	5,246	6,511	11,757	12.8
From public institutions	1,777	18,676	20,453	22.1
Acting upon the initiative of the agencies of the Special Board		18,440	18,440	20.0
Total	18,383	73,774	92,157	100.0

We further read:

"On appraising the activities of the Special Board the first thing to be noted is the drive with which it carried out its purpose to fight crime. While in the first year the Commission dealt with 18,383 cases, in the second year, this figure rose to 73,774, that is, within the period of its 2 years' of activity, 92,157 cases were dealt with. * * *

"During the first period the agencies of the Board concentrated their activities upon the detection of all types of offences which were detrimental to the economic interest of the state. The Special Board issued a proclamation to the people asking for collaboration in the detection of offences; it also established, for that purpose, close contact with labor unions, labor boards, political parties, and social organizations. In the respective agencies Complaint Offices were established which filed all complaints of the population as reported on alleged abuses; investigations and proceedings were conducted in every case which gave rise to suspicion that abuses had taken place. By enlisting the working masses in these activities a very important power was vested in them, namely, the power to regulate trade by price control. The People's Poland undertook a planned campaign to fight speculation, a campaign based upon social organizations, labor unions, and political parties. The conduct of this campaign was entrusted to the Special Board, which brought about a closer collaboration between the government as the executive factor and the people in general. In that indeed lies the significance and power of the Special Board."

Mr. SKRZYPEK. So, I would say that the Polish Communist Party imitates all the Soviet patterns in many aspects of life, legal institutions and so on, so it brought also the institution of forced labor which before the war was unknown in Poland.

Everything is dressed in a legal form. There is nothing outside the law. So, the special laws were published or the existing laws amended in such a way that the forced labor is legal.

First of all, there was a Special Commission for Fighting Economic Abuses and Sabotage formed in 1945 already, and then it was amended in 1946, and finally in 1950. This commission had a right to send to the forced labor camp for 2 years without any investigation, just by free judgment of the members of 3 people. It was closely related to the famous Soviet Troyka, with the difference that the Troyka had the right to send for 8 years without any investigation and in Poland, well, they still were more lenient, only for 2 years. This is one form of how to recruit the people to the concentration camps.

Second is the penal court procedure. To the prewar procedure a special amendment was added, article 14, on July 20, 1950, which provides that the regular courts could impose 1 year forced labor sentence without calling the guilty man to the court if the punishment is not more than a year. If more, well, they have to bring him to the court.

The third law is penal administrative jurisdiction of April 1, 1952. This law provides that for petty offenses a man could be sent to the forced labor, but not in the camp. He has to work at the place he usually works but without payment for 3 months.

We have a lot of material coming mostly from refugees who testify the condition in those labor camps. There is a checked list, about 36 of them. The labor camps are concentrated largely where there is a shortage of labor and also on the state farms, and building of roads and railroad tracks or things like that.

Some camps are permanent and some are migratory, depending on where the work is necessary.

The conditions are exactly the same as I saw them myself being in the Soviet concentration camp. Perhaps the abuses are not so violent like in Soviet Russia.

I will submit the list of those camps we have checked, but, of course, this is not a complete list. There is sort of black-out in the official publication, but I do not think that if something is not published in the official Communist paper it means that it does not exist. All those reports taken together from 3 or 4 independent sources speaking about the same camp should be accepted as a real fact, because those people do not know each other and they tell the same story. According to those estimates it is about 150,000 inmates in those concentration camps.

I would say that this is not all because this is sort of a free labor which is very similar to the forced labor. There are various semi-compulsory laws for workers. Such is the substitute military service (Jastepcza Sbenzba Wojskawa), where sons of the richer people or shopkeepers are sent. It is taken as a military service but soldiers are sent to work in mines. They receive payment, but out of it, 80 percent is taken and they receive only, well, barely about 80 zloty which has actually a buying power of one or two dollars in the United States.

Another form of semi-force labor is a decree on preventing the dissolution of the working cadres of 1950. This law provides that in order to prevent harmful dissolution of qualified workers cadres professional qualified persons in specialized occupation, particularly vital to socialized economy can be obliged to remain for a prescribed time at their place of work.

So, actually, they have no right to change the jobs.

Another law is about the discipline of labor which also provided compulsory work in case of those coming late to do work or loafing, or things like that.

Finally there is a forced recruitment of labor. The former boss secretary of the Communist Party Bolestan Bierut spoke on the Seventh Plenum Central Committee of the party in 1952 and stated that those people who expect to get free people to come to work, will be disappointed. He advocated to recruit them by force. Quota were assigned to the particular parts of the country and the local authorities have to send so many people to work to socialist conventions and enterprises. So, I would say that there is a trend indicating that the discrepancy between free labor as we understand it in the West and the forced labor is getting smaller.

This condition exists almost until now, but after Radkiewicz' downfall, the Special Commission for Fighting Economic Abuses was dissolved.

Now, there is a tendency to reorganize these labor camps into smaller units and to place them near the places where there is a shortage of labor. Considerations are made to better the conditions in conservation camps but they should be treated with caution because the practice does not always follow the declaration.

The only official source which admitted and even described the political condition in those labor camps is a Political and Economic Yearbook printed under the authority of the Council of Ministers, in

1948, which describes the conditions. Since 1948 nothing was published on that subject.

I would say that I made a short outline of the situation. I shall submit more detailed material in a special written statement.

Senator KENNEDY. Fine. We would like to have those, doctor.

You have read the Committee Report on Forced Labor of the International Labor Organization. Have you seen it?

Mr. SKRZYPEK. Yes; I think there is a lot of material presented there. I think that it gives a fair outline.

Senator KENNEDY. You do not know whether the report on Poland was of much use, did you see it?

Mr. SKRZYPEK. Yes.

Senator KENNEDY. This is the sixth item on the agenda, this is an ILO document, too. I did not know whether you had had a chance to study the report on Poland.

Mr. SKRZYPEK. I did not study this document thoroughly, but I saw it.

Senator KENNEDY. I did not know whether the information they had been able to get together on Poland was of particular significance, whether they have been able to dig up this material that you have been talking about and expand it.

Mr. SKRZYPEK. Well, I would say that a legal basis, and the question of the semiforced labor is not treated thoroughly.

Senator KENNEDY. Semiforced labor?

Mr. SKRZYPEK. Yes, sir.

Senator KENNEDY. When I was in Poland somebody was talking to me this last fall about they felt that work was a privilege for political prisoners and that the worst punishment was not to permit them to work.

Mr. SKRZYPEK. Well, exactly so, generally speaking especially now, when due to a limited supply of labor—the demand for labor force is great. They would like to use everybody in this prison population to work. There is a general theory which is accepted in the Soviet Union also, that it is useless to feed and house the prisoners where they do not work. So they put them to work as soon as possible and demand that the prisoners should consider this is a privilege.

Senator KENNEDY. Well, I want to thank you, Doctor, as I said. Having Mr. Zissu come and report on some of the situations in Rumania and Dr. Devenis of Lithuania and you on Poland and, in other words, reminding us of the situation which exists in those countries, is a great service not only to your country but to the United States and, of course, Dr. Dallin reported on the situation in the Soviet Union itself, and Dr. Greenidge reporting on a related field, the field of slavery. I think the hearing this afternoon was very helpful to the committee and we are grateful.

If you have additional material on forced labor in Poland which I am particularly interested in, I hope you will send it to us because I would like to have it put in the record.

Mr. SKRZYPEK. All right, I will do it.

(See contents for material referred to.)

Senator KENNEDY. Thank you.

The committee stands adjourned.

(Whereupon, at 3:45 p. m., the subcommittee was adjourned to reconvene at 10 a. m., Friday, April 27, 1956.)

TO ABOLISH FORCED LABOR THROUGH ILO

FRIDAY, APRIL 27, 1956

UNITED STATES SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON LABOR AND PUBLIC WELFARE,
SUBCOMMITTEE ON LABOR,
Washington, D. C.

The subcommittee met, pursuant to adjournment, at 10:05 a. m., in room P–73, United States Capitol, Senator Paul H. Douglas (chairman) presiding.

Present: Senators Douglas and Smith.

Also present: Stewart G. McClure, staff director; John S. Forsythe, general counsel; Michael J. Bernstein, minority staff director; and Mary DiDio, professional staff member.

Senator DOUGLAS. The subcommittee will come to order.

I have correspondence from the Secretary of Labor saying his schedule does not permit him to testify and that Assistant Secretary Wilkins is out of town. Also another letter, a previous letter dated April 4 which I will make a part of the record, in which he says in the final paragraph that he wholeheartedly supports action relating to the abolition of forced labor. He says he prefers to leave to the Secretary of State any comments on the form of the proceedings of the International Labor Organization and the appropriateness of Senate Joint Resolution 117.

(The letter referred to above follows:)

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, April 4, 1956.

Hon. LISTER HILL,
Chairman, Committee on Labor and Public Welfare,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR HILL: This is in further reply to your recent request for my views on Senate Joint Resolution 117, to provide for United States cooperation with other nations through the International Labor Organization to abolish forced labor.

This joint resolution declares, among other things, that forced labor for political or economic purposes is abhorrent to all civilized nations and repugnant to the underlying foundations of the Government of the United States, that such labor exists in some nations, and that the International Labor Organization is considering the adoption of an international instrument designed to abolish such forced labor wherever it may exist. The resolution would require the Government of the United States to exercise leadership in the International Labor Organization to develop and adopt an international convention which will effectively outlaw forced labor for political and economic purposes.

In 1951, an Ad Hoc Committee on Forced Labor was appointed under the joint auspices of the United Nations and the International Labor Organization. This committee inquired into the existence of systems of political forced labor as well as systems of forced labor constituting an important element in the economic life of a country. In its report in 1953, the committee said it had found that such

systems of forced labor were established in some countries and that they did not appear to be completely banned by the present conventions of the International Labor Organization. Consequently, the governing body of the International Labor Office placed the question of forced labor on the agenda of the June 1956 session of the International Labor Conference. At this session, the Conference will consider developing an international instrument dealing with systems of forced labor as a means of political coercion or punishment and as a regular method of mobilizing labor for economic development.

The United States Government's delegates to the International Labor Organization, as well as delegates representing this Nation's employers and workers, have taken the lead in exposing forced labor for political and economic purposes, and I wholeheartedly support action leading to the abolition of forced labor. However, I prefer to leave to the Secretary of State any comments on the form of any instrument which this Government might support in the proceedings of the International Labor Organization and on the appropriateness of Senate Joint Resolution 117.

The Bureau of the Budget advises that it has no objection to the submission of this report.

Sincerely yours,

JAMES P. MITCHELL,
Secretary of Labor.

The first witness this morning will be Mr. Francis O. Wilcox, Assistant Secretary of State.

Mr. Wilcox.

STATEMENT OF FRANCIS O. WILCOX, ASSISTANT SECRETARY FOR INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATION AFFAIRS, DEPARTMENT OF STATE

Mr. WILCOX. I was pleased to be able to accept the invitation of the subcommittee to be present this morning to assist in the examination of Senate Joint Resolution 117. There is little that I can add to the views of the Department of State expressed in its letter of April 11, 1956, to Senator Hill. I shall, however, be glad to attempt to answer any questions that you, Mr. Chairman, or members of the subcommittee may have.

The Department of State is in complete agreement with the purpose of the Senate Joint Resolution 117 for the United States to exercise leadership in an effort to assist in the abolition of forced labor. The United States has taken leadership, both in the United Nations and in the International Labor Organization, in promoting action to expose and eliminate the practice of forced labor. Our Government was instrumental in the establishment of the joint U. N.–ILO Ad Hoc Committee on Forced Labor, whose report in 1953 drew particular attention to the existence of forced labor in Communist countries as a means of political coercion and for economic purposes. The United States also gave support to the recent action by the International Labor Organization in establishing a Committee on Forced Labor to analyze the material received by the ILO dealing with this subject.

So, Mr. Chairman, there is no question about the attitude of our Government toward this particular problem.

Senate Joint Resolution 117, however, raises certain problems for us by proposing that the United States should exercise leadership in the International Labor Organization in the development and adoption of an international convention to outlaw forced labor.

In testimony before a subcommittee of the Senate Judiciary Committee in 1953 and again in 1955, Secretary Dulles said: "I do not be-

lieve that treaties should, or lawfully can, be used as a device to circumvent the constitutional procedures established in relation to what are essentially matters of domestic concern."

And I would interpolate there, Mr. Chairman, to say that we don't know, of course, the form that a convention might take—the precise form. But one would assume that it would deal with matters which are primarily of domestic concern.

In the present case it is difficult to conceive of any convention on forced labor which might be adopted by the International Labor Organization that would not deal with matters which are primarily of domestic concern.

It is our view that while there are no explicit limitations in the Constitution upon the treatymaking power, there are implicit limitations. This is an opinion which has been long held and has been expressed very clearly by Secretaries of State Root and Hughes. They indicated that the treaty power is to be used only in relation to matters which are the traditional subject of treatymaking. That means the making of treaties for the protection of United States national interests and the interests of our people in trade, travel, property abroad, and so forth. In other words, the treatymaking power is a power to be used in the interests of the United States and its citizens.

On the other hand—and this I think is the burden of my argument, Mr. Chairman—we do not believe that the treatymaking power is designed to be used to protect citizens of other countries against their government. It is not the proper subject of a treaty for the United States, for example, to try to protect Russian citizens against labor abuses by the Russian Government any more than it is appropriate through the treaty power to give other governments a treaty right to try to protect United States citizens from what may be considered labor abuses within the United States.

It seems clear that the proposed forced labor convention will concern itself with national rather and international matters. A number of analogies could be cited. For example, in the related field of slavery, questions relating to the international traffic in slavery are appropriate for international control. We do not believe, however, that the control of slavery within countries is a matter which can or should be regulated by treaties. Problems of slavery within the countries should be dealt with by the countries themselves. We believe that the same principle applies for forced labor.

I might add at this point, Mr. Chairman, that some people raise the analogy of the 1926 Slavery Convention concluded under the auspices of the League of Nations. But that treaty dealt pretty largely with the international implications of the slave trade as between nations and was not confined to slavery within a country.

Moreover, we do not believe that a convention outlawing forced labor constitutes an effective guaranty of its abolition. Good faith and sincerity of purpose will determine the extent to which countries ratifying such a convention will take steps to implement it. In this connection it is interesting to observe that the U. S. S. R., in a note to the International Labor Organization, has urged the adoption of "as broad and radical an instrument as possible." This illustrates the danger that such a convention may conceivably become an empty gesture, and public opinion be misled into thinking that forced labor has been eliminated.

The Department of State believes that an effective method of combating forced labor is through publicizing such practices and mobilizing public opinion to demand their elimination. This mobilization of public opinion for the condemnation of the evils of forced labor—and we all agree as to the evils of forced labor—may well do more toward the elimination of this practice than a convention. As the committee is aware, the International Labor Conference adopts recommendations as well as conventions.

We consider that a recommendation by the ILO would serve the purpose of publicizing forced labor practices and concentrating the pressures of public opinion on the need for eliminating them. An ILO convention is adopted with a view to its becoming a part of international law. A recommendation, on the other hand, has no binding legal obligation but involves a strong moral obligation to take action.

In concluding, Mr. Chairman, I wish to be clearly understood that the position of the Department of State with respect to this matter bears no relationship to the Department's attitude toward the International Labor Organization and the great significance of its work.

The Department fully supports the International Labor Organization as one of the more important of the United Nations specialized agencies. I know there are some critics of the International Labor Organization, and it may have some faults, as all human institutions do. This does not alter my firm belief that the International Labor Organization can, and does, play a significant part in our efforts to keep the free world free. The presence of the U. S. S. R. in the organization makes our leadership the more important. I believe that United States support of the International Labor Organization is directly in our national interest.

As I have indicated, Mr. Chairman, I shall be very glad to attempt to answer any questions you or members of the committee may have.

Senator DOUGLAS. Mr. Wilcox, are you familiar with the report VI, paragraph 2, the paragraph on forced labor, International Labor Conference, published in Geneva, Switzerland this year, 1956, a copy of which I hold in my hand.

Mr. WILCOX. Yes, sir; I am generally familiar with it.

Senator DOUGLAS. In the introduction on page 1, a list is given stating that questionnaires were communicated to governments of the member states which were invited to send their replies to reach the office by October 6, 1955.

At the time of drafting the present report—that date is somewhat uncertain—replies were received from governments of the following 44 member states—and the 44 member states were listed. The Government of the United States was not included in this list. Do you know whether the Government has yet replied to that questionnaire?

Mr. WILCOX. No, sir; I don not think we have replied to that questionnaire.

Senator DOUGLAS. Is that failure to reply an oversight, or is it a result of deliberate policy?

Mr. WILCOX. We were discussing within the administration the kind of reply which should be given to the ILO. And we did not arrive at a conclusion on this problem in ample time to submit our report.

Senator DOUGLAS. The report was due on the 6th of October 1955. It is April 27 now. And no reply has been made to this date?

Mr. WILCOX. That is correct, sir.

Senator DOUGLAS. Some 6½ months after this period?

Well, does this mean that reply to the questionnaire would not necessarily bind you to agree to a convention; but this questionnaire dealt primarily with factual matters and conditions within the United States? Isn't that true—the questionnaire as I go over it?

Mr. WILCOX. Yes, but I think the answer to the question which you raised was involved in the questionnaire. And, as I say, there were some problems which had not been thrashed out in the Government, and we were not quite ready to submit a reply to it.

Senator DOUGLAS. The first question was: Do you consider it desirable that the International Labor Conference should adopt a new international instrument dealing with forced labor practices which were excluded from the scope of forced labor convention in 1930 by terms of article 2.

You thought we should not reply to that?

Senator SMITH. I don't see where the questions are.

Senator DOUGLAS. Page 8 of this report.

Mr. WILCOX. Mr. Chairman, I think there was no question in our minds about that particular matter.

Senator DOUGLAS. Well, could you reply to that question, even though you did not reply to the others?

Mr. WILCOX. Presumably we could have. But we were not in a position to answer the entire questionnaire. Therefore, we did not want to submit replies to part of it.

This matter, I should say, was not primarily within my jurisdiction.

Senator DOUGLAS. I understand that you are speaking for the State Department, are you not, this morning?

Mr. WILCOX. Yes, sir. The Department of Labor, I think, was preparing the reply to this.

Senator DOUGLAS. The Department of Labor says they will allow the State Department to make the reply.

Now you say it is no concern of yours; that somebody else had it. I am trying to fix responsibility and find out in which shell the pea is.

Mr. WILCOX. Mr. Chairman, I did not say that it was of no concern to me. I mean to say that it was the primary responsibility of the Department of Labor. And I had not, myself, given considerable personal attention to this problem.

Senator DOUGLAS. It was the decision of the Department of Labor, then, not to reply to the questionnaire?

Did the Department of Labor make the decision?

Mr. WILCOX. No, sir. I think it was a joint decision between the Department of State and the Department of Labor.

Senator DOUGLAS. Now, I notice that you say that a recommendation might be satisfactory. Is that the position of the Department of State?

Mr. WILCOX. Yes, sir.

Senator DOUGLAS. That it should be a recommendation?

Mr. WILCOX. Yes, sir.

Senator DOUGLAS. Now, Assistant Secretary Hill uses the term "declaration." Do you understand any difference to exist between "declaration" and "recommendation"?

Mr. WILCOX. No, sir. I think it was the view of the Department that a recommendation, coupled with a ringing declaration, might serve the purposes just as satisfactorily. The normal procedure in the ILO, as you know, is to adopt either a convention or a recommendation.

Senator DOUGLAS. Then, what did Mr. Hill mean by "a declaration would be sufficient"?

Mr. WILCOX. Well, I think that what he had in mind, or what the Department had in mind when that letter was formulated, was the possibility of drafting a kind of instrument comparable to the Declaration of Human Rights.

Senator DOUGLAS. In other words, from which the nations would say that they are opposed to forced labor?

Mr. WILCOX. That is correct, sir. It would involve moral commitments and would set standards.

Senator DOUGLAS. Would you turn to page 10 of this report on forced labor, 1956.

The second question was: Do you consider such an instrument should take the form of a convention or recommendation?

Now, you say you think it should take the form of a recommendation. Why couldn't you have replied to that question?

Mr. WILCOX. Well, sir, I think we might have, except as I say, we were discussing the matter within the Government and had not arrived at a decision as to what our attitude should be on that particular problem.

Senator DOUGLAS. Do you realize that failure to reply can be and probably has been used against the United States on the alleged ground that we are not interested in that?

Mr. WILCOX. I think it might be. But I think that would be a rather unrealistic approach to take, because of the interest we had shown in forced labor in the years past, both in the General Assembly of the United Nations and in the ILO, and in the Economic and Social Council.

Senator DOUGLAS. Are you acquainted with the Constitution of the International Labor Organization?

Mr. WILCOX. Generally. I am not an expert on that.

Senator DOUGLAS. Do you have a copy there?

Mr. WILCOX. Yes, sir.

Senator DOUGLAS. Would you turn to page 12.

In your reply and in the statements of the Secretary, you treat the negotiation of the conventions as equivalent to a treaty.

Now, is there anything which gives a legal or even a moral obligation from the United States to conclude a treaty on this matter? Is not a convention very different from a treaty? Is not the only obligation that the convention shall be at least submitted, and as seen in A, B, C, and D, to be submitted to the legislature, and then a report made as to what action has been taken upon it, but no obligation upon the Government to ratify it? Isn't that true?

Mr. WILCOX. I think it is true, Mr. Chairman. It should be pointed out, however, that we might be accused of bad faith if we would continue to vote for international labor conventions and then not submit them for ratification or for action.

Senator DOUGLAS. But the point I make is: Submit them, yes; but does this mean that it is a treaty?

Mr. WILCOX. Yes, sir, I think it can be said that the contents of an international labor organization convention, in that they create legal obligations as between states, have the same stature and dignity as an international treaty.

Senator DOUGLAS. I think it is contrary—I am not an expert on constitutional law, and you probably are—but I think it is contrary to all understanding that I have of constitutional law and the obligations under the International Labor Organization.

I would invite you to look also at section 7, article 19, on page 14 of the ILO constitution, which makes the provision for so-called federal states.

Mr. WILCOX. Yes, sir.

Senator DOUGLAS. But where the federal government does not have the constitutional power to pass legislation, and these are matters left for individual states, that the only obligation upon the federal government is to submit it to the legislatures and governments of the individual states which compose the federal state. Or in the language of the constitution "constituent states." So that if the State Department were to conclude that this was not a matter for national legislation, they could merely refer it to the individual State governments? Isn't that true?

Mr. WILCOX. That is true, sir.

Senator DOUGLAS. Why is it, therefore, that there is any obligation? And this is true of a convention as well as a recommendation. Why would there be any treaty obligation upon the Department of State to submit this to the Senate for ratification as a treaty?

Mr. WILCOX. Well, if it were decided that it was a matter of national concern, there certainly would be a commitment to submit it to the Congress.

Senator DOUGLAS. Well, is it your contention that this is a matter of national concern or is it your contention that this is a matter of State concern?

Mr. WILCOX. That is a subject on which I am not qualified to speak.

Under the 13th amendment of the Constitution of the United States it might be argued that this is a matter of Federal concern. I think, however, that that is really not the question that is before us.

Mr. CHAIRMAN. I think the question that is before us is whether it is a proper subject of treaty negotiation.

Senator DOUGLAS. It is not a treaty negotiation. The convention of the ILO imposes no treaty obligation.

Mr. WILCOX. Mr. Chairman, I think, if I may beg to differ with you on that point, that it can be argued that an ILO convention is comparable to a treaty. There is one test, one acid test, which I always apply under the Constitution, whether it is called a treaty, a convention, or a protocol, or whatever. It calls for a two-thirds vote of the Senate, is submitted for Senate approval, and the President ratifies it. Then under our Constitution, I think it would have to be called a treaty. And I think that is the treatment which we normally accord ILO conventions.

Senator DOUGLAS. Is it your contention, therefore, that conventions of the ILO should not be submitted to Congress because they would be in the nature of a treaty?

77294—56——12

Mr. WILCOX. No, sir. If that is what action is required, if it calls for congressional action or action by the 48 States——

Senator DOUGLAS. I would like to call your attention to the fact that under date of May 23, 1955, the Secretary of State submitted four conventions—Convention No. 99 concerning minimum-wage-fixing machinery in agriculture; Convention No. 100 concerning equal remuneration for male and female workers for work of equal value; Convention No. 101 concerning holidays with pay in agriculture; Convention No. 103 concerning maternity protection. And Mr. Dulles stated under provisions of article 19 that the Constitution of the International Labor Organization states that a federal state determines whether a particular convention or recommendation adopted by the International Labor Conference is appropriate under the constitutional system of that state for federal action, or whether it is suitable in whole or in part for action by the constituent states, provinces, or cantons. It will be observed that the interested departments and agencies consider that article 19, paragraph 7 (b), which I have read of that constitution is applicable to all the present conventions and recommendations, and any instruments are to be referred to the appropriate Federal and State authorities for consideration for ratification of any of the four conventions is not regarded as appropriate.

Apparently the State Department thought it proper to approve not only the signing of these four separate conventions, but actually submitted them either to the Congress or to the States, even though it did not urge ratification.

Now, why it is that you do that for minimum-wage-fixing machinery in agriculture, do it for the equal remuneration for men and women workers for work of equal value, do it for holidays with pay in agriculture, and do it for maternity protection, but will not do it for forced labor?

Now, very frankly, I think this is pettifogging. Those are harsh words. But that is the only judgment I can draw.

Mr. WILCOX. These are clearly within the power of the States to deal with. I am not sure that the forced labor question is solely within the power of the 48 States.

Senator DOUGLAS. But this message was addressed to the Congress of the United States. It was not addressed to the various State legislatures. On page 1 you will find "To the Congress of the United States."

If you will look at page 1, you will not find it addressed to the Legislature of Arkansas or Arizona or to the secretaries of state of those States; but you find it addressed to the Congress of the United States.

Senator SMITH. What page?

Senator DOUGLAS. 84th Congress, 1st session, House of Representatives; Document No. 172.

Incidentally, it was submitted to the Congress and not to the Senate. It is not regarded as a treaty, but it was sent for congressional action.

Mr .WILCOX. Normally in a case of that kind we would refer them to the Congress and to the 48 States. But I should be glad to look into that question for you. I am afraid I cannot give you a thorough answer at this stage, because I am not entirely familiar with the facts concerning those conventions.

Senator DOUGLAS. Well, it seems to me highly contradictory for you to approve these conventions, and submit them to the Con-

gress and, not submit them to the Senate, clearly making it known that the convention need not be ratified by the Senate and hence is not a treaty. I think you fellows down there have got yourself involved not only in just hopeless confusion, but hopeless contradiction.

Mr. WILCOX. Mr. Chairman, I would like to say this—and this is not to excuse the contradiction which you accuse me of this morning—but it is a partial explanation: Ever since the ILO constitution was amended in 1946 in Philadelphia, there has been a great deal of confusion in the ILO itself and in our Government as to the precise meaning of the federal-state clause and of the obligations of the United States and other governments under the ILO constitution with respect to these conventions.

Senator DOUGLAS. Is it your position that the Department of State was confused on May 23 of last year but is not confused now?

Mr. WILCOX. I would hesitate to take a position on that question until I get the facts. I am not sure.

Senator DOUGLAS. Has the present administration supported any conventions of the ILO?

Mr. WILCOX. Well, I do not think very many have been approved in the last 2 or 3 years, Mr. Chairman.

There has only been one since the present administration took office. There has only been one ILO convention approved. There has been a tendency on the part of the ILO, may I say, to reduce the number of conventions that they have been working on, and to take action through other appropriate channels.

I think there has been a feeling that perhaps the convention concept has been overdone. There have been a great many of these conventions concluded, some 104, I think; but it is generally recognized that a good many states rather lightly enter into their obligation in connection with them and yet do not do anything about them.

Senator DOUGLAS. I would like to point out that the Secretary of State in this letter which he addressed to the Congress states—and this is on page 3:

> It is of course entirely within the discretion of the competent authorities of each country to determine whether any legislation is to be enacted or other action taken.

That indicates that in May of last year you did not think that the approval of the convention carried with it any obligation to see that it was ratified. It cannot be any more clearly stated than that.

Mr. WILCOX. I think as a general principle it is not wise to go to international labor conferences and to vote for and to speak for conventions unless it is the intention of the government to see that those conventions are carried out in practice.

It seems to me to be somewhat misleading and somewhat hypocritical to strongly support and speak for treaties or agreements which we intend to do nothing about. And that to me is somewhat the situation that we face at the present time.

Senator DOUGLAS. Have you received any representations from any foreign governments concerning whether there should be a convention on forced labor?

Mr. WILCOX. Yes, sir, we have.

We have circularized or sent messages to the field to inquire of foreign governments whether they would approve the idea of a convention or of a recommendation. The replies have not been too satisfactory from our point of view.

Senator DOUGLAS. What do you mean by that? It is not satisfactory from your point of view? You mean the other countries have not approved a convention?

Mr. WILCOX. The great majority of the replies indicated that the countries had already submitted the answer to the questionnaire to the ILO in favor of a convention. In the circumstances, it is understandable that there would be some reluctance on the part of these countries to withdraw from that position and support a declaration or a recommendation.

Senator DOUGLAS. Isn't it rather peculiar that the United States Government will not reply to questionnaires submitted by the International Labor Office dealing with whether it wishes a convention or recommendation but will on its own account circularize messages and inquiries concerning it? Is that really international cooperation?

Mr. WILCOX. Mr. Chairman, I think it was the natural thing for us to do, because we had the feeling that it would be better to do this in terms of a declaration or a recommendation.

Senator DOUGLAS. Could you fill out the questionnaire instead of paying no attention to it? Or why couldn't you have filled out the questionnaire and said that you favored a recommendation and not a convention?

Mr. WILCOX. If I may complete the sentence I began: We wanted to find out what these other countries were willing to do. Now, so far as the ILO questionnaire is concerned, as I have said, we were discussing the matter within the Government at the time, and were not prepared to submit a reply to the questionnaire.

Senator DOUGLAS. Are you aware of the position that this is likely to place the United States in before the world—the United States refusing to reply to the questionnaire? And if the Government persists in the attitude taken by the Department of State, can you imagine the propaganda that this will arouse against the United States?

Mr. WILCOX. Yes, Mr. Chairman. But I may say in the history of the International Labor Organization this is by no means the first time a state, and a great state, has not submitted a reply to a questionnaire.

Even in this case, I think some 44 out of—well, something over half—have submitted replies to the questionnaire. So, we are not in isolated company by any means.

Senator DOUGLAS. The sinners are many.

As of March 1 the following governments have not replied: Albania, Argentina, Bolivia, Brazil, Byelorussia, Ecuador, Etheiopia, France, Greece, Guatemala, Haiti, Indonesia, Jordan, Liberia, Libya, Luxembourg, Ukrainian S. S. R., United States, Venezuela, Viet Nam.

I would say that France is the only other major power which has not replied. And I should hate to have the United States placed in the same classification as the Ukraine, Byelorussia, Jordan, and so on.

Mr. WILCOX. I should say, Mr. Chairman, it would be unfortunate if we would get in the habit of not replying to their questionnaires. But I think perhaps an occasional delinquency might be forgiven.

Senator DOUGLAS. Senator Smith, have you any questions?

Senator SMITH. Yes; I have a few questions.

Doctor Wilcox, if you will take the resolution we are discussing, I want to ask you 1 or 2 questions about it. I notice that the State Department makes no objection at all to the "whereeases" in here.

Mr. WILCOX. No, Senator, the State Department and the administration are clearly on record as opposed to forced labor, and thoroughly in support of the work of the International Labor Organization.

Senator SMITH. There is no language in the "whereases" that gives you any concern then?

Mr. WILCOX. I should think not.

Senator SMITH. I am going to go to the resolution in a minute. I want to clear that first. It seems to me as we read that we are all in accord.

Mr. WILCOX. Yes, sir.

Senator SMITH. Now, calling your attention to the resolution itself——

Senator DOUGLAS. Which resolution?

Senator SMITH. The one we are discussing.

Senator DOUGLAS. We have three resolutions before us.

Senator SMITH. 117. That is all I read about.

Senator DOUGLAS. We have three.

One a concurring resolution; one a joint resolution; and one a plain Senate resolution.

Senator SMITH. I thought they were all identical.

Well, Doctor Wilcox, on page 2 of Senate Joint Resolution 117, which I am told is identical language as all the others, the resolution reads as follows:

> Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Government of the United States exercise leadership in the International Labor Organization to develop and adopt an international convention which will effectively outlaw forced labor for political and economic purposes.

Now, if I understand the discussion to date of what we should best do to take care of this forced labor problem, what concerns the United States are the words "international convention" which we believe are almost synonymous with the words "international treaty."

Senator DOUGLAS. It is not the same as international treaty.

Senator SMITH. I want to get that clear.

Is that the position of the United States Government that a convention and treaty are in the same general classification? That it calls for agreement between nations on some subject?

Mr. WILCOX. Yes, sir.

Senator SMITH. Then, technically, it would require that it be referred to the Foreign Relations Committee, to be studied there and then ordered up or down to the Senate for a two-third ratification required by the Constitution of the United States; is that correct?

Mr. WILCOX. Yes. With the exception that the chairman has pointed out: that there is a proviso in the ILO Constitution to the effect that in certain cases States may decide that an instrument before them should be taken care of in a particular way; submitted to the States for appropriate action. But, generally speaking, I quite agree that if a country approves a convention and accepts the com-

mitments in that convention, it is comparable to being bound by the obligations in an international treaty.

Senator SMITH. I suppose in lieu of the words "international convention" if we had a recommendation, would the State Department feel that that was a proper way to deal with this?

You mentioned earlier I think that you thought it ought to be a recommendation.

Mr. WILCOX. Yes, sir.

Senator SMITH. Which would, of course, have a certain moral effect on the whole picture. But a recommendation is distinguished from a convention or a treaty, which is binding on the states to do something about it.

Mr. WILCOX. Yes, sir; that has been our position.

I think, Senator Smith, that if you changed the words "international convention" to read "appropriate international instrument"—I think that would be all right. But the subsequent language would still be a little objectionable, because to say that a convention or instrument will effectively outlaw forced labor is open to question.

Senator SMITH. Look at that a minute. I want to get this first step that we would prefer in the way of a recommendation.

High up in the "whereas" clauses I find the words "Whereas the International Labor Organization is now considering the adoption of an international instrument." At that point the Labor Organization is not at the moment considering a convention; some sort of an instrument, a convention, or a recommendation, or something else. We know they are going to consider this; and the whole purpose here is to clarify our thinking on this.

What should they do there? Should they say "Sorry, we cannot go along with the convention. That implies treaty obligations and will have to go back to our Senate for consideration and two-thirds vote of the Senate"?

Or are we going to submit a recommendation? But we all agree forced labor is a bad thing, and something should be done about it.

Mr. WILCOX. Yes, sir.

Senator SMITH. That ought to be before the ILO meeting when it comes. And our delegation should know the position we take on it. I think that is the substance of our discussion here, what you said this morning, as distinguished from Mr. Humphrey's position all through this language.

All right. Let me pass on then from the word "recommendation" which I think is definitely different from convention. They are two different things entirely. One is a treaty; the other is not.

I do not think a recommendation could in any way be looked upon as calling for a treaty. That may be open to question; but it does not seem to me it would be. But where it says "will effectively outlaw forced labor" that means you are committing yourself to go into Russia and help to outlaw forced labor in Russia.

Can we conceive of the United States being called upon to do that, or any other country?

I think you are on the right trail when you suggest that this is primarily a domestic question. And as much as we despise it—we despise forced labor in Communist China—would this mean that we should go into Communist China and prevent forced labor in China?

Personally I wish we could. Especially with our boys there. That is why my Committee of One Million is so much disturbed over this, and why I am disturbed over this also. I want to do everything I can. But should we enter into a binding treaty with other countries to say that we will, by treaty, agree to effectively outlaw forced labor?

That is what troubles me in the approach to this particular resolution. My thinking is in line with yours. Whether I am in line with the State Department's thinking, I want to find out.

Mr. WILCOX. Senator Smith, I think that is quite in line with the point I was attempting to make in the original statement that I read.

Senator SMITH. That is the way I interpreted your language.

Mr. WILCOX. Yes.

Senator SMITH. Well, then, would this meet with the State Department's position? In lieu of the words "international convention" you put the word "recommendations" in there, and in lieu of "which will effectively outlaw" you put "recommendation aimed to outlaw forced labor for political and economic purposes."

Mr. WILCOX. I would be a little disturbed about the term "outlaw," Senator Smith. I do not know whether you could——

Senator SMITH. I am just thinking of some alternate words here that we might offer an amendment to to this particular resolution that would be in line with what seems to me to be the sound approach of the State Department.

And I reserve my final judgment on this, because I am not sure. I certainly think we want to get into this.

I certainly think we do not want to be in a position of voting against it. I am very hesitant to approve any abstention. I do not like abstentions. I think abstentions just stop the issue. I do not believe in them. I hate to see the United States abstain in a vital matter like this, unless it is perfectly clear that we are abstaining only on procedure, but we recommend the other approach.

That is what I would like to see. I want to see us vote yes for something, doing away with forced labor. I am troubled by the position that we tell our people to abstain. I am frank to say that. I think the chairman will agree with me on that.

Mr. WILCOX. I don't have any language, Senator Smith, right at the moment that I would recommend. But I am sure that language could be very easily worked out which would substitute the recommendation or appropriate instrument and then set this up as a goal; something like the declaration of human rights, without attempting to establish any legal or binding commitments. It would be in the form of a recommendation which would establish a goal for the States to work toward.

This is a situation that is somewhat comparable to that which we found in connection with human rights. The declaration of human rights which was approved by the General Assembly by an overwhelming vote, I think, was a great step forward, and has served as a great guidepost for all the nations of the world.

But when you started to put those principles in specific terms in a convention, we encountered a great deal of difficulty, difficulty between the Soviet Union and ourselves as to what religious liberty meant and as to what rights with respect to private property and so on ought to

be incorporated in binding treaty obligations. And, there is a considerable difference between setting down legal contractual terms in an instrument of this kind, given the kind of commitments that are involved, and on the other hand setting up some great goal toward which the nation of the world might work.

And that latter concept is that the administration has in mind in connection with forced labor.

Senator SMITH. If you deal with forced labor as a convention implying a binding treaty obligation, it is hard to argue against anything else that may shock the moral conscience of the world. Why shouldn't we just reform the entire world by a few treaties? That is what bothers me.

Mr. WILCOX. Yes.

Senator SMITH. I think we kind of overstep the area in which we can operate in these things.

Mr. WILCOX. I think this committee, for example, with its concern about education, would agree that we ought not to get into the job of reforming American educational institutions through the treaty powers. I think it would be an abuse of the treaty power.

Senator SMITH. There are lots of other areas I can think of. We come down to a definition of what is forced or slave labor.

Is it forced labor that you have people in prisons for offenses and you require them to work? Is that forced labor?

I mean I am just thinking of things like that that bother me. You get into the definition that you are going to try to set up a legal obligation which a convention implies. I want to distinguish between a treaty obligation under which I feel the United States had the responsibility to move ahead and try and force the issue right in Russia or in Red China. God knows we wish we could. But I see the reasons for our constitutional limitations and our constitutional process.

And I raise the question whether if you have this extreme language in your convention, whether you can do less than bring it before the Senate as a treaty and require two-thirds vote. And I think it is doubtful whether you get anything passed like that.

Then you put the United States in a very difficult position, where we appear to have turned down something by our constitutional process; and we do not intend to do that.

Mr. WILCOX. As you know, Senator Smith, I have long been interested in treatymaking and the treaty process in my work with the Foreign Relations Committee. We encountered problems in this area very often. And I had the feeling, for example, that while I am very much in favor of course of encouraging and promoting human rights in the world that are comparable to our own, we might be doing harm to the cause we seek to serve if we try to incorporate in treaties and conventions the details about human rights, because, in trying to push the treaty power too far, we invite opposition to it and we perhaps won't be able to do as much through the treaty power as we should be able to do, in view of the opposition that is engendered.

Senator SMITH. Well, I have served, as you know, Dr. Wilcox, with the U. N. Of course, you have been there constantly. You know the U. N. procedures. And you know the way we draw the

resolutions up there—statement of principles many times that we adhere to. But we cannot pass anything in the Assembly that is binding on the United States without it coming back if it has to be binding in the form of a treaty of some sort.

When I was there, we adhered to a good many that seemed to be sound. But to say that we are ducking our responsibility here by not being willing to approve of a convention is very disturbing to me. I think we are off on the wrong trail. I told Senator Humphrey the other day that I thought he was starting with an attack on the State Department as the big issue here, and I thought that was wrong.

The question is, How best can we do something effectively to stop slave labor in the world?

We have suffered from it, too. And it, of course, happened to our boys in both Russia and in China. Boys of our allies, too. Everybody knows why we all deplore slave labor.

Mr. WILCOX. I think, Senator Smith, if we present our case with honesty and sincerity and conviction in the International Labor Organization, we will not lose friends thereby. I think they will respect that honesty.

Senator SMITH. I agree with you. I think if we say we are glad to go along with a recommendation that they would all go along with us. I don't think they have thought through this thing. And the fact that we haven't answered this yet is to our credit.

We are not trying to duck anything. I don't agree with the chairman at all that you delayed or stalled. I do not agree with that at all. I must take issue right here in the record. We have done what we should have done. We have been studying this. We have been trying to find from our allies and all these countries what the wisest approach is, not just jumping in and saying "Yes" or "No," that it should be a convention or a recommendation when you haven't thought through the implications of those two words.

Now, maybe even a recommendation on it is right. I don't know. But it seems to me if we indicate that we want to use every possible legal endeavor that we can to stop slave labor that would be sufficient.

But we do not feel that the word "convention" and the implication of a treaty are the correct approach to this legal problem. I want to get that into the record. That is the way my thinking is at the moment. But as I say, I want to hear more testimony. And I think every member of the committee should have clearly before him exactly the implications of what we are discussing now will be. Otherwise, the committee, in my judgment, will not be able to form a sound judgment as to the merits of this resolution.

Mr. WILCOX. I think you have expressed much more effectively than I the position I have tried to present.

Senator SMITH. I want to say for the record that Dr. Wilcox has been the adviser of our Foreign Relations Committee for years now, as long as I have been in the Senate. And he has made a special study of the United Nations which implies a special study of international get-togethers, whether it is the League of Nations or the United Nations, or what have you. He has just written a book on possible modifications of the U. N. Charter.

He has pointed out the difficulties of every suggestion made. There is no better authority anywhere that I know of than Dr. Wilcox on

these affairs. I want to say that because I feel it very strongly. And I look to you for guidance. I am prepared when you come to a conclusion to examine very carefully whether you are on sound ground or not.

I think you have given us a fine statement here. And I think every member of our committee and every Member of the Senate, before we vote on this, if it comes to the Senate, must know what those words mean and what the implications are.

Mr. WILCOX. I appreciate that very much, Senator Smith.

Senator SMITH. On the assumption that the convention will constitute a binding treaty on the part of the United States; and if it is so binding, will the United States not seem guilty of bad faith unless it, too, signs a binding treaty?

Suppose the others do; wouldn't we be in a tough spot if it gets into a binding treaty form?

Senator DOUGLAS. May I reply to that?

Senator SMITH. Certainly.

Senator DOUGLAS. The other countries will be bound by the constitution of the International Labor Organization. And the constitution of the International Labor Organization does not require ratification by any country. And since it does not require ratification by any country, it does not require ratification by us, or by Great Britain or any other country.

Mr. WILCOX. I think that is correct, Senator Douglas. No state is obligated legally to ratify a convention which it has voted for in the conference of the International Labor Organization.

We had the feeling, however, that with our position in the world it would be somewhat misleading to go out in front and urge the operation of the convention unless we were in our own minds satisfied that a convention should be adopted and that we could go ahead and implement the terms of the convention in the United States.

Senator DOUGLAS. As a matter of fact, some years ago I read a comparative study in one of the bulletins of the International Labor Organization on the degree to which the conventions have been ratified by the various countries. While some time back, my impression was that the vast majority of the conventions have not been ratified.

Mr. WILCOX. That is one of the concerns that the International Labor Organization has and one which interests us in the Department. We feel that the convention procedure may have been used too much. States have been to willing to vote for conventions and then not take the steps that are necessary to implement them.

Senator DOUGLAS. At least we wouldn't be worse than the other states.

Mr. WILCOX. No, sir.

Senator DOUGLAS. Because they have followed this practice generally of approving the convention but not ratifying them.

Did you have any other questions, Senator Smith?

Senator SMITH. No, I don't think so. I think I have tried to make clear what the issue is. And I think it is a very vital and important issue. I think we have got to consider it very carefully not only by the subcommittee but by the whole committee.

I want the whole committee to hear some of the witnesses, because I want to make it perfectly clear that nobody feels more strongly than

I do about slave labor. I am a member of the Committee of One Million, of which the distinguished chairman is a comember with me, whose aim is to prevent the admission of Red China to the United Nations. One of the chief reasons is because of their slave labor and what they have done to our boys and the boys of other countries.

There is no question about my strong feeling on this. And there is no question about the great importance I attach to the very thing we are discussing now and how best to deal with it.

And I hope we can send a terribly strong representation to this next ILO meeting representing our feeling as to the way this should be handled. And I think if we stand firmly and can get others to stand firmly with us on making this a recommendation and not a convention, we will win that battle right there. I am convinced of it in spite of all these statements to the contrary.

Let's go ahead and have an international agreement that will effectively outlaw forced labor. But how can you possibly do it? Even Senator Humphrey admitted that the word "effectively" was a little bit strong here. He wanted to take it out.

I have shown we cannot go too fast in thinking of the wording of these things. They are terribly important. And I commend the State Department for taking time to think this through and confer with the representatives of other countries before they go headlong into something that we don't know what the end of it is.

And I object to the charges that the State Department has been lax in this or that we have ducked our responsibility. I think we will answer those questions in time. And I think when we answer them, that the answer will be much more effective than if they just drew hasty answers that we should immediately join in anything suggested.

Mr. WILCOX. Senator Smith, I honestly do not feel that the State Department has been lax in this. I think we have been giving the matter a great deal of attention and study. And it is my hope that we can still encourage the right kind of action, the appropriate action at the next conference of the Organization.

I reiterate what I said in my statement that certainly the Department, and I personally as head of the Bureau under which some of this work comes, feel very strongly that the challenge in the International Labor Organization which the Soviet Union will undoubtedly put forth must be met, and that our role in the International Labor Organization ought to be reemphasized and underlined. We should do everything we can to take the kind of leadership that redounds to the credit of this country and of the free world.

Senator SMITH. I agree with you fully. And I want to reiterate what you have said about the ILO.

I have been there to see it. And I think it is a very important body. I have no reservations on that at all. The method of procedure is going to be terribly important.

Senator DOUGLAS. I certainly am not an authority on international law. But I must protest the tortured and twisted interpretation which the witness has given to the term "convention," making it identical with a treaty, when I hold here in my hand a message by the Department of State about conventions of the ILO submitted not to the Senate as would be the case if it were a treaty, but submitted to the Congress.

The particular bulletin that I have is a bulletin of the House of Representatives which was referred to the House Committee on Foreign Affairs. And, therefore, since the House has nothing to do with the ratification of treaties, this clearly indicates that the Department of State, as late as last May 23, 1955, did not regard the convention as a treaty, but merely as an instrument which could be implemented at the will of the legislatures and the Congress.

What Mr. Wilcox has been saying is the same as saying the man mounted his horse and rode off in all directions.

On last May 23, the Department said conventions are not treaties; they are merely matters for Congress to argue. Now it is trying to maintain the identity of the convention with the treaty.

I would like to ask what is wrong with submitting a convention on forced labor to the Senate for ratification? Suppose it is a treaty? What is wrong with it? We don't have anything to fear about forced labor. There is no forced labor in this country. Why should you be afraid of submitting it as a treaty, even assuming that it is a treaty?

Mr. WILCOX. I don't think the United States has anything to fear in connection with forced labor. But I reiterate the point that I made, that we feel the treaty process ought to be confined to those problems which are traditionally the kind of matters which are subject to negotiations and contracts between states, and that it ought not to go into the areas which are normally reserved to the states or which are not normally the subject of treatymaking.

Senator DOUGLAS. Mr. Wilcox, I want to point out to you that section 7 of article 19 specifically provides that in the case of federal states, where residual powers are left in the hands of the states, the duty of the government is fulfilled by submitting the measure to the legislatures of the various states.

If you do not think that forced labor is a matter for Federal concern, why not sign the convention and submit it to the states and let them take such action as they wish?

Mr. WILCOX. Well, if it were a matter for Federal concern—and I say that I have not in my own mind come to any conclusion, because I do not know what the contents of the convention would be—but there are some who argue that under the 13th amendment of the Constitution that this matter would be a subject of Federal concern.

In that event, we would have to treat the instrument as a convention. If it were approved by the Senate and ratified by the President, it would be a treaty. And we get back to the argument that I made at the beginning, that it is not a proper subject for treaty negotiation.

Senator DOUGLAS. Well, then, is it the position of the Department of State that in the future they will oppose all conventions of the ILO?

Mr. WILCOX. No, sir.

Senator DOUGLAS. Because this requires action by the Congress?

Mr. WILCOX. No, sir; there are a good many conventions which the ILO has adopted which would seem to be suitable for treaty action. For instance, we have entered into a number of maritime conventions which have to do with maritime problems and those would seem to be quite suitable for effective ILO action. But there are a number of other matters.

Senator DOUGLAS. You still persist in treating the convention as equivalent to a treaty?

Mr. WILCOX. In its legal effects, Mr. Chairman; yes.

Senator DOUGLAS. How do you account for the fact that article 7, or section 7, of article 19, specifically says that in a federal state it may be referred to the legislatures or to the Congress. Now, treaties are not referred to the legislatures.

Mr. WILCOX. Yes, sir. But what I was attempting to say——

Senator DOUGLAS. And, indeed, they are referred not to the Senate, but to the Congress, as Secretary Dulles has done in taking the House of Representatives into partnership, which is not the case with treaties.

Mr. WILCOX. What I was attempting to do, Mr. Chairman, was to answer your question on the assumption that if the United States were to enter into a convention and to approve it in the form in which we have approved a number of them, ratification by the President following approval by the Senate, that convention has the same type of legal commitment and obligation which would be contained in a treaty entered into by the United States.

Senator DOUGLAS. I think, with all due respect to you, the obligation would be only that given under the constitution of the ILO, which, again, more or less prescribes that it be submitted to the legislatures, the legislature of the national government, or to the legislatures of the state governments. There is no further obligation than that which is imposed by the constitution of the ILO itself.

Mr. WILCOX. I think the record would make that clear, Mr. Chairman. As I say, though, there has been a very considerable amount of confusion in the ILO and in the government and among students who have attempted——

Senator DOUGLAS. We always have that confusion in some states which are unitary states and others which are federal states about this proceeding at the very origin of the ILO. I can remember back to the origin of the ILO; and I can remember discussions which went on in Paris on this very point. America made it perfectly clear to Paris that a federal state does not guarantee ratification by a national legislature in any labor matters which were under the jurisdiction of the states.

It was made clear by Mr. Gompers, one of our representatives; Mr. Albert Thomas, who was the first Director General of the ILO, granting that fact. When I visited the ILO and worked there unofficially in the 1920's, that was accepted. I was never an official member of the staff of the ILO. But I worked in the library there, and spent some time trying to understand it.

You are taking a position which is contrary to history, contrary to logic, and contrary to the law. I think that, very frankly.

I cannot believe these are the real reasons. Are you afraid of the Bricker group in the Senate? Is that the real point? That you are afraid that this is going to arouse all the opposition to treaties?

Mr. WILCOX. That is not my primary concern, Mr. Chairman.

Senator DOUGLAS. Is it the concern of the State Department?

Mr. WILCOX. Insofar as the Bricker amendment expresses the sentiment of a good many people who are concerned lest the treaty power be pushed too far and lest damage be done to the whole cause of our cooperation with other nations, I suppose the answer would be "yes." But I cannot quite share your view—and if I am wrong, I hope you

will correct me—but as I understand your view, the International Labor Organization should then be competent to conclude conventions on any problems in the field of education or health or labor or any problem which might normally be considered the domestic jurisdiction of states.

Is that a correct interpretation of your position on this matter?

Senator DOUGLAS. No; I don't think so. I am merely saying that a convention is not a treaty; that there is no obligation upon the member government to have it ratified; that it can be submitted, not to the Senate, but to the Congress; Congress can accept it or reject it as it wishes; or it can be submitted to the legislation of the several States which may check it.

There is no binding obligation, since there is no binding legal obligation. As explicitly stated, there is no binding moral obligation. What I am fearful of is that we have already exposed ourselves to criticism. But we are holding up an attack on forced labor, a movement to suppress forced labor. We have nothing to fear; we have no forced labor in this country.

Russia, its European satellites, Red China, and I think some of the Arabian countries do have forced labor. We received that testimony on Wednesday on that subject.

Now, why not put our best foot forward in clearing up what I can only regard as legal pettifogging to prevent action.

Now, somebody inquired into the possibility of rallying other states in favor of a recommendation rather than a convention. Forty-seven countries have put themselves on record in favor of a convention. Twenty-one governments, as I have said, had not replied as of the 1st of March. Three governments have said that they are in favor of a recommendation. Those governments are Syria, Turkey, and Hungary. Now, I expect Hungary might change its mind by the time this issue comes up; with all due respect to the Government of Syria and Turkey, which I hold in high esteem, they might change their minds. It would be somewhat ludicrous for us to stand out alone on this, and when it is passed to refuse to go along.

Now, you did not hestiate to submit conventions to the Congress saying that you think they should not be approved. Secretary Dulles' letter of last May made that very point. I think that that is putting this country in the worst possible light. I am sure you do not want to do that. I want to give you credit for good intentions. I want to give Mr. Dulles credit for good intentions. I think Mr. Dulles is just as patriotic a man as Dean Acheson. Both of them are very able Secretaries of State.

Now, I am distressed. There is probably nothing we can do in the Senate. You down in the State Department pay no attention to Congress and go your way. So, there is probably nothing we can do. But if, by chance, you persist in this same attitude, then you must see what a price we are going to pay all over the world.

That is all I have to say.

Mr. WILCOX. May I reply very briefly to your comments?

Senator DOUGLAS. Certainly.

Mr. WILCOX. I have two thoughts. First, with respect to the last comment you made: You may be sure that so far as I am concerned, the attitude of the Congress would, of course, be given considerable weight, because my background is such that I think I do——

Senator DOUGLAS. But you are not the State Department. You are merely the mouthpiece, so to speak.

Mr. WILCOX. I think I do have something of an appreciation of the proper role of Congress in the conduct of foreign policy. And I have always contended that Congress ought to have a greater and more responsible role.

The second thing I would say is this: That generally speaking—with the exceptions I have noted—I agree with your analysis of article 19 of the International Labor Organization Constitution. I do not believe, however, that that gives us any justification for moving out in front and urging the conclusion of conventions which we cannot honestly support as being the proper subject for treaty negotiations or for conventions.

Senator DOUGLAS. I agree with Senator Smith that we should not abstain. We have a real issue.

Senator Humphrey is here now. He just came in. Senator Humphrey, we have been putting Secretary Wilcox over the coals here. He has had a rather rough time. I don't wish to add to his difficulties.

Senator SMITH. I hope I haven't given him a rough time.

Senator DOUGLAS. Oh, no. You are the counsel for the defense.

Well, when Senator Humphrey testified on Wednesday, I promised him a chance to confront you face to face. And while he has not heard your testimony, he is now reading it. And I think he has probably read it by now. I know you gentlemen are personal friends. So this is a case where you may have intellectual differences and still retain warm personal friendship. With your permission I am going to ask Senator Humphrey to come up and sit beside you here.

Senator HUMPHREY. Mr. Chairman, may I have the opportunity now of conversing with my friend, Secretary Wilcox, while I talk to the committee on this matter? Is that the idea?

Senator DOUGLAS. Well, I thought you wanted to be present?

Senator HUMPHREY. Yes. I do. I wonder if the Secretary was through with his presentation?

Senator DOUGLAS. Yes; I think so; yes. I am through with my questioning.

Senator SMITH. I am through at the moment. Unless Senator Humphrey has some questions with which I might want to take issue. I might say I will have to leave presently, because the Foreign Relations Committee has requested me to go in there.

Senator HUMPHREY. I shall be very brief, Senator.

As I gather it, the burden of the testimony of Secretary Wilcox is, first, that this is hardly an appropriate use of the treaty power under the constitutional provision relating to treaties. I gather that the second point emphasized is that the convention outlawing forced labor may not constitute an effective guaranty of its abolition. "Good faith and sincerity of purpose will determine the extent to which countries ratifying such convention will take steps to implement it."

Now, let me just comment just very briefly in reference to the treaty power.

I think it is fair to say that the State Department has not always considered conventions a treaty matter. I have some questions which I developed since my last testimony. First, has the Department's posi-

tion changed regarding the legal effect of ILO conventions since May 26, 1955, when President Eisenhower transmitted to Congress four conventions, pursuant to the ILO constitution and said, and I quote:

> In accordance with the foregoing provisions ratification of the conventions by the United States is not deemed appropriate. I submit the conventions to Congress for such consideration as it may wish to give.

What I am asking here in terms of a theoretical question is whether the Department and the President have taken cognizance of the fact that—under the ILO constitution and under precedent on the part of our Executive—it is possible to submit conventions only for due notice to the Congress once they have been entered into by the appropriate executive officers. For as I cited here the other day, Mr. Chairman, a special provision was made in the ILO constitution to take care of federal-state systems as contrasted to what you might call the unitary system, as in the United Kingdom.

Now, another point I would like to emphasize—and I state it as a question:

Is the Department aware that in Public Law 483, the 80th Congress, the President was authorized to accept the 1946 instrument of amendment to the ILO constitution; that this law contains the following statement which was approved June 30, 1948:

> Whereas extensive revision of the constitution has been undertaken to enable the organization to meet changed conditions, to strengthen the application of conventions and recommendations with careful provision to meet the constitutional rules and practices of federal states.

It would appear that Congress was of the opinion that the provisions of the ILO constitution met the constitutional rules and practices of the United States Constitution. I think that is the only conclusion that one can draw from the discussion around Public Law 483 and the report relating to it.

Senator DOUGLAS. I have a copy of Public Law 483 here. I am going to ask that it be made a part of the record concluding the testimony of Mr. Wilcox.

(See contents for the document referred to.)

Senator HUMPHREY. I would like to just quote from the resolution of the American Bar Association concerning ILO procedure. The ILO procedure concerning the consideration by countries with a federal form of government, such as ours, of conventions which deal to any extent with matters under the jurisdiction of the States, has received the specific development of the American Bar Association. In February 1952, the house of delegates adopted the following resolution:

> *Resolved*, That the American Bar Association is of the opinion that the participation of the United States in international measures for the promotion of human rights and fundamental freedoms should be provided for within a framework similar to that of the International Labor Organization.

In other words, the ILO took care of a very difficult problem in its constitution that relates to American constitutional law. What the bar association was suggesting is that if we are going to enter into any other agreements relating to human rights or social welfare, these other international arrangements might well be designed along the same lines as ILO, and, therefore, would obviate any difficulty with out constitutional system.

Senator DOUGLAS. Senator, is it not true that the American Bar Association is the strongest supporter of the so-called Bricker amendment? And that in fact, the committees of the American Bar Association have probably been responsible for the original draft of the Bricker amendment and the successive——

Senator HUMPHREY. That is correct.

Senator DOUGLAS. So, if there is any group in this country more anxious to prevent treaties from having the effect of international law, it would be treaties and international agreements, executive agreements, and so on, of the American Bar Association?

Senator HUMPHREY. That is my view of it, Mr. Chairman.

Senator DOUGLAS. So what you want to do is similar to the procedure of the ILO?

Senator HUMPHREY. As the American Bar Association points out, if there are matters that relate directly to the constitutional powers of the 48 States, you would have the option of referral for separate State consideration of Federal treaty or other Federal action.

The third point I would like to note is also a question: Is the State Department aware that the legal opinion of the Solicitor of the Labor Department as well as of the American Bar Association, is contrary to the State Department's position? Both the Solicitor and the American Bar Association consider that the United States is entitled to treat ILO conventions on federal-state matters as if they were recommendations not to be considered, therefore, for ratification as treaties.

Fourth, the letter from the Assistant Secretary of State, Mr. Hill, Congressional-Liaison Secretary, says that the State Department has a more dramatic way of marshaling public and world opinion against forced labor.

My question is, What more dramatic way? All the argument, for example, of the Department to the effect that a convention would not be binding or enforceable goes out of the window, when the State Department says that what we ought to do is marshal public opinion, be more dramatic, because if this is just a matter of dramatics, or if this merely is a matter of deciding how to crystalize public opinion, may I say that one of the great attributes of the ILO is the fact that it has been able to crystalize public opinion. I want to say that the record of the ILO, Mr. Chairman, in terms of improved standards of living, social welfare, and labor-management relations, is an outstanding one. The full impact of its usefulness has been in marshaling public opinion in the respective countries. It has a tremendous record.

I did a little study on the ILO, when I was a member of the Committee on Government Operations, and for a period of time, the Subcommittee Chairman on International Organizations.

I became very interested in the ILO. Then, this last year at the 10th Commemorative Conference of the United Nations in San Francisco, it was my privilege to speak to all the representatives of labor in a large gathering at the Hotel Fairmont in San Francisco on this very subject.

I guess we all recognize that when you have to prepare an address, you have to become a little bit more conversant with the subject matter than you would ordinarily.

Senator DOUGLAS. In other cases you take a speech written for you by someone else.

Senator HUMPHREY. Finally, is it not true that the United States has supported a host of ILO conventions in instances where we knew we could not formally ratify them and that they would have to be considered as recommendations only? As I understand it, we have only ratified seven conventions. The ILO has adopted at least a hundred and four. Does the State Department agree with all other observers that the ILO convention will now be adopted, with or without United States participation? If so, does the State Department not recognize that we are handing the Soviet Union an excellent opportunity to lead at the next Geneva ILO conference, if we refuse to lead ourselves on this convention question?

I have a feeling, for what reason I am not sure, but I have a feeling that there are agencies of our Government—and in this instance the State Department—which are all too hesitant really to come to grips with this Soviet crowd whenever we have a change to do something about it, except in the United Nations.

May I say that in the U. N. our delegation has, from time to time, exposed the hypocrisy of Soviet argument. I think it is to the credit of Ambassador Lodge that he has been able and willing to do this. I would like to see us meet this challenge head on right in these international agencies.

We should quit dragging our feet on these matters, recognizing, of course, that the Soviet, from time to time, may agree on many things that they have no intention of implementing. But when we get that opportunity of agreement, we should move in and seize the leadership. May I say most kindly that the President was at Geneva; he met with the top Soviet leaders. They apparently came out with some kind of agreements. At least they continued to talk. We were led to believe there was a Geneva spirit. It was accepted bilaterally, multilaterally. Well, now, if the President of the United States, who is supposed to be the chief spokesman in American foreign affairs—if he is of the mind that you can have some agreements with the Soviet Union, then you must be willing to accept the fact that he must believe that they will be carried out.

Senator DOUGLAS. I don't think they are going to keep their agreements.

Senator HUMPHREY. I know. But the assumption must be that we are doing something more than just visiting. Even if we are only visiting, then it is an opportunity for us at least to make our position clear.

I want to say that I have been rather pleased of late that we have been making our position a little more clear upon disarmament.

For a long period of time we did not do that—for the last year or so.

I do not think I need to bear down any more on my case. I want to say that I think that the burden of proof rests on the State Department, Mr. Chairman, to prove that a convention is undesirable or unworkable or illegal. The point as to whether or not the Soviet Union will keep its agreement, as to whether or not you can enforce it, is a fringe issue in this sense: There have been many conventions of a federal-state variety which we have agreed to and on which this issue has never been raised.

I, for the life of me, cannot see why we have gotten ourselves in this embarrassing predicament on forced labor. May I say I hope no one is to assume that there is any forced labor in the United States.

Here is a chance to go the whole way, to say that we are opposed to it. We struck a blow against it with Abraham Lincoln. We are against it internationally. We are against it domestically. By taking a firm position, we may be strengthening our position amongst working people all over the world.

To the working people of the free countries, the ILO is their agency. It is the one agency in which labor unions feel that they have a special interest. I think it is about time that we recognized that we need closer contacts with working people throughout the free countries. Here is the one world agency where employers and representatives of labor have an opportunity to work together.

Senator SMITH. Will the Senator yield to a question there?

Senator HUMPHREY. Yes.

Senator SMITH. As I understand the Senator's interpretation, a convention is exactly the same thing as a recommendation. So why does the Senator object to getting away from this controversial word "convention" and just putting "recommendation" in there?

Senator HUMPHREY. We do not do that, Senator Smith, partly because in the parlance of the ILO, the word "convention" is the word that is used. It represents a particular type of instrument.

Senator SMITH. I thought they used the word "instrument." I have not read it all.

Senator HUMPHREY. They use both words, "convention" and "recommendation", and they mean different things.

Senator SMITH. In your "whereas" clause, it uses the word "instrument." Why don't you put in "recommendation" and let's get rid of this discussion. I don't see why we have to have a discussion on semantics, whether we should use the word "instrument" or "convention." Because we look upon any recommendation that the ILO makes as a recommendation, no matter what form they are in. We never look upon it as binding.

Senator HUMPHREY. The ILO on the forced-labor issue has proceeded now to a point where the word "convention" is the accepted term for the document or the international instrument that is to be ultimately signed and adopted by the participating members. I would say that to the extent it is a matter of semantics, why don't we come along and do what we have done before?

We have accepted "convention" before. Why stand out here like a sore thumb from all the other nations of the world saying, "Well, we disagree on this one word; we want to do the same thing you do, but we would rather call it a recommendation; you want to call it convention"? I think there are forty-some that have agreed to it.

Senator DOUGLAS. There are 47 that have voted in favor of conventions.

Senator HUMPHREY. In this instance, we will have a difficult time recapturing the leadership anyway, because the train has passed us by. We are trying to catch up now.

Senator SMITH. You do not think then that to use the word "convention" it wouldn't have to come back to be ratified by a two-third vote of the Senate?

Senator HUMPHREY. I do not think it would have to come back; no, sir.

Senator SMITH. And decide whether we would report it favorably?

Senator HUMPHREY. No; I do not.

Senator SMITH. I think that would be insisted on if it comes in that form. I am one of those who does not believe you should go through the back door and get things passed that are international agreements without going through the procedure of the two-thirds vote.

Senator DOUGLAS. I yield to the prestige of the President and the eminent Secretary of State who submitted these conventions not as treaties but as matters of legislation; submitted not only to the Senate but to the House of Representatives.

Senator HUMPHREY. May I suggest that this language may be helpful, this interpretation——

Senator SMITH. May I ask what you are reading from?

Senator HUMPHREY. I am reading from a memorandum on the ILO convention issue which I have relating to the President's action on conventions. I quote from the President here in just a moment:

> In the May 26, 1955, message of President Eisenhower to the Congress, transmitting 4 conventions and 8 recommendations to the Congress pursuant to our obligations under the ILO constitution, the President had this to say about the 4 conventions—

now I digress to point out that we can have either conventions or recommendations. The number of conventions adopted by ILO conferences are 104; the number of recommendations adopted by ILO conference are 100.

Going back to these four conventions, I quote the President now from his message of May 26, 1955:

> It is the opinion of those departments and agencies that the conventions and recommendations cited above fall within the purview of article 19, paragraph 7 (b) of the constitution of the International Labor Organization, which provides in the case of a federal state that conventions and recommendations which the federal government regards as appropriate under its constitutional system in whole or in part for action by the constituent states, provinces, or cantons rather than for federal action, shall be referred to the appropriate federal and state authorities for their consideration.
>
> It is in accordance with the foregoing provisions that the ratification of the conventions by the United States is not deemed appropriate, and that I submit the conventions and recommendations to the Congress for such considerations as it may wish to give.

Now, in other words, the State Department has used the convention pattern of nonratification on other occasions. As late as 1955 it has done so.

Senator DOUGLAS. Less than a year ago.

Senator SMITH. I can't comment on that.

Senator HUMPHREY. Again may I say, speaking for myself only personally, and not in any way trying to make this a part of the testimony relating to this convention, I simply cannot imagine that the Congress of the United States would turn down an opportunity to put itself squarely on record against forced labor, because forced labor is not only competitively an evil in the economic sense, but it is inhuman. It is a vicious crime against humanity. I would hope that we would want to put ourselves on record clearly against it.

But if we do run into constitutional problems, and if it is so deemed by the President and his advisers, then under the provisions

of the ILO constitution, we can have them submitted for whatever action the Congress may wish to take, either as a matter of due notice to the Congress or as recommendations or for ratification.

Senator SMITH. Senator, before you came in, I raised the point that if this issue was made crystal clear, it seems to me that when this ILO group meets next time, the issue between the recommendation and the convention could be clarified, and we should state our position in favor of a recommendation, which is just as much supporting the principle of opposition to forced labor as a convention.

Senator HUMPHREY. There is a difference, Senator Smith.

Senator SMITH. I think if we use the word "recommendation" we will not get balled up with this "convention" work. A treaty has to be ratified by a two-thirds vote of the Senate. In other words, what we are suggesting is the back-door method of trying to get things done that you could not get done by a regular treaty procedure.

That is what we have had so much controversy on the last few years.

Senator HUMPHREY. One of the reasons you have the alternative between the convention method and the recommendation method is because you have different kinds of nation states in terms of governmental structure. For example, the United Kingdom, with a system of parliamentary government, prefers to have the ratification of the convention. Our system of government, Federal State, or a Federal system of government, may very well prefer to have it only as a convention not subject to ratification. This is why the United Kingdom, for example, is not in favor of a procedure in ILO on this matter that is limited to a recommendation. They want to go further, and you cannot have a series of proposals. You have got to have something around which all nation states can unite procedurally. The purpose, therefore, of the amendment to the ILO Constitution regarding Federal State constitutions was to permit a convention on the one hand to be ratified, let us say, by a state such as Britain through its regular parliamentary processes, a unitary state, while on the other hand a federal state such as the United States could act by the signature of the President or our Secretary of State, and by placing it before the Congress for whatever purposes we may wish to undertake, or by submitting it to the Senate for ratification, or by submitting it to the several States.

In other words, you have all of those alternatives. I agree with you that we ought to be willing to submit this kind of a proposal right to the Congress. But I want to say right now that if anybody wants to argue the issue of forced labor on the basis of the Bricker amendment principle, I am ready to join it. I am ready to join that argument.

Senator SMITH. I am not discussing it at all.

Senator HUMPHREY. I know you are not.

Senator SMITH. I am discussing what I consider to be sound procedure. And I do not like the back-door way of getting executive agreements with other nations without dealing with them as treaties.

I think they should be. I think our committee should insist that they come to us as treaties and be reported out by a two-thirds vote of the Senate.

There you get in the jam of whether we are prepared to commit ourselves, to go in Russia and stop slave labor in Russia and to go into China and stop slave labor in China.

Senator DOUGLAS. May I make a comment on the statement of my colleague?

This is not an executive agreement. An executive agreement is one signed by heads of States or representatives of heads of States, which is binding upon the country itself.

Now, any such convention would neither be a treaty nor an executive agreement, and would carry with it simply the obligation to submit either to the Congress or to the State legislatures or both.

If I may say so in all charity, the Senator from New Jersey is completely confused on this subject, to say this is an executive agreement. It is not in any sense an executive agreement.

Senator SMITH. I said analogous to an executive agreement.

Senator DOUGLAS. It is a different sort of animal entirely.

Senator SMITH. Yes. But I am not sure we want to adopt a different sort of animal.

Senator DOUGLAS. I simply want to keep the record clear that the conventions under the ILO are neither treaties nor executive agreements.

Senator HUMPHREY. May I ask the State Department representative: Does the State Department want to submit this as a treaty?

Mr. WILCOX. I think, Mr. Chairman, it would depend on the nature of the agreement or the convention. The State Department, so far as it knows of the probable content of the convention, if it is agreed to by the ILO, would feel that it is not the type of subject, as I explained in some detail before the distinguished Senator came in——

Senator HUMPHREY. Yes. I have your statement.

Mr. WILCOX. Which is appropriate for convention or treaty action.

Senator HUMPHREY. I would agree with you that it may not be appropriate for treaty action in light of some of our constitutional problems here. But when you say treaty and convention, are you not assuming that treaties and conventions are analogous or similar or identical?

Mr. WILCOX. Yes.

Senator HUMPHREY. But they are not.

Mr. WILCOX. I think a convention which has been approved by the ILO Conference and which has been approved by the Senate for ratification and ratified by the President is identical to a treaty which has been negotiated outside of the ILO Conference.

Senator HUMPHREY. Yes. But that is true if it is ratified. But now how do you justify the President's statement of May 26, 1955, on an ILO convention?

Senator DOUGLAS (to Mr. Wilcox). Your statement begs the question. But it assumes that a convention must be submitted for ratification by the Senate. Where there is no provision whatsoever in the constitution of the ILO to that effect, to submit it to the legislature of the unitary government, the congress of the unitary government, or the legislature or congress of a federal government.

Senator HUMPHREY. May I ask: Do you have in the record article 19, paragraph 7 of the ILO constitution?

Senator DOUGLAS. Yes.

Senator HUMPHREY. It relates expressly and explicitly to what you do in a situation like this.

Furthermore, our Government feels that this kind of convention that the ILO is about to adopt would undermine our constitutional

practices or violate our constitutional principles, then we ought not merely to abstain; we ought to oppose it. This abstinence business—this kind of benevolent impartiality——

Senator SMITH. I said a minute ago before you came in that I was opposed to an abstention. I do not believe in it at all. I think we should take a position. And I feel very strongly on that.

I think we should argue in the ILO discussions; we should tell our delegates to take the position that we look upon them as recommendations and not conventions, because conventions of this type should be ratified by a two-thirds vote of the Senate.

Senator DOUGLAS. If we make that contention, we will be laughed out of court by any person who knows the constitution of the International Labor Office.

Senator SMITH. It is worth considering.

Senator HUMPHREY. Mr. Chairman, I want to conclude on this: that conventions that are strictly federal are subject to ratification. But conventions that relate to federal-state matters such as provided for in this special provision in the ILO constitution can be submitted under the provisions of federal-state——

Senator DOUGLAS. I think a ratification is not by the Senate alone; it is really approval by the Legislature, including both Houses and therefore not treaties.

Senator HUMPHREY. As I have noted here before, the ILO constitution provides that conventions dealing with federal-state matters shall be regarded as recommendations by the United States and not considered for ratification. This special provision was to accommodate member countries with federal constitutions to avoid the very problem that the advocates of the Bricker amendment worry about.

The ILO conventions dealing with subjects within the authority of states or other political subdivisions rather than the federal government can always be referred, as the chairman says, to states for consideration as recommendations. The ominous fears that an ILO forced-labor convention could supplant our domestic legislation and circumvent our constitutional processes are thus unfounded.

And for a number of reasons that is true. The administration's acquiescence to the pressure from the champions of such arguments is inconsistent in my mind and most unfortunate. I think that is what it is. I like to lay my cards on the table. I think this is an effort to acquiesce in the pressures of some who feel that we ought not to have these international organizations.

Furthermore, I think the record of endorsement of this procedure by such reputable and relatively conservative groups as the American Bar Association as are deeply concerned about the forced-labor matter—I mentioned here in my testimony, I think, the Catholic Association for International Peace, and some of the great trade unions—they are asking for action. This is one of the important things that the labor movement in this country and the great religious groups in our country are asking for action upon.

I am glad that we have a chance in a democracy to discuss this out in the open, because I think we are going to come around to it. I am convinced in my own mind that the State Department is going

to come around to joining this effort; and maybe this free discussion here will help us a little bit.

Senator SMITH. I think it is a matter of words. We can make a recommendation or declaration without getting into the form of an international agreement that is binding and implies we ought to go into Russia and stop this slave labor and things like that.

I think we would have no trouble in getting an agreement on that. That is the action we need. We need a big blast on this thing. We are all opposed to slave labor.

Senator HUMPHREY. Senator, may I say that I recognize that we are not going to be able to march into Russia as such and stop this slave labor. But when the ILO and the United Nations, which represent the best vehicles we have for organizing international public opinion, go on record, as branding forced labor for what it is, namely, a crime against humanity, they you do have mobilized public opinion.

You are on the offensive. You can continue to point to these areas of slave labor, and it is not just in the Soviet Union. I have heard, for example, that slave traffic is taking place in some areas of the Middle East.

Senator SMITH. There is no issue on that. I agree with that. I agree with everything the ILO says here in their finding. It is just a question of which is the right way to present it.

Senator HUMPHREY. Isn't this the issue: That in June of 1956 the ILO is going to adopt this convention. They have got enough members to adopt it already pledged. They are going to meet and——

Senator SMITH. No; not necessarily. If our delegates bring up what this issue, what it means to the United States, if that is brought up, I do not think they will just brush the United States aside.

Senator HUMPHREY. What are our delegates going to be able to say?

Senator SMITH. We have to work that out.

Senator HUMPHREY. I have had a chance to look over the testimony.

Senator SMITH. We have been trying to canvass this thing. We do not want to jump off the ledge on a convention which implies international commitments.

Senator HUMPHREY. Does it really make any difference to our country whether it is a convention or a recommendation?

Senator SMITH. In my judgment, it makes all the difference in the world. I think it is vital to the whole thing.

Senator HUMPHREY. Well, I would appreciate a good brief on that, Senator.

Senator DOUGLAS. There is one statement that you made, Senator, that particularly interested me. You made the statement that the Solicitor of the Department of Labor had given an opinion in which he held that the convention would not be a treaty.

Senator HUMPHREY. Yes.

Senator DOUGLAS. Do you know that that is so?

Senator HUMPHREY. Well, I would suggest that you ask the Solicitor from the Department to come over. I have this information from the representatives of organized labor who have been involved in this.

Senator DOUGLAS. We have asked the Department of Labor to come over. And they stated—or the Secretary stated he was busy and could not come, and that the other man, Mr. Wilkins, was out of town. And they would allow the State Department to answer for them.

Senator HUMPHREY. I want to submit that I am not satisfied with that reply from the Department of Labor. I want to say that when a Department of Labor Solicitor tells a group in this country that he believes that this convention system is desirable, that it is within the constitutional procedures of the United States, in the light of the ILO convention, then I think it is the duty of that particular agent of Government to come before this committee and give you his evaluation of this situation, and not to exhibit this closed-shop attitude. Just because one department happens to have a little more influence in this area than the other, the other is closed off. I went through this in a committee the other day, Senator, on the Passport Office, where I know, from personal conversation, of the differences of opinion in the Department of State over the Passport Office. The mouths are sealed: lips are closed when you get up before a committee. How can we legislate this way?

Senator SMITH. Senator, I made the statement that I understand the Secretary of Labor said he could not personally come because of commitments, but that Mr. Wilkins, who had entire charge of this matter and understood it, was away for a while and would not be back for a week or two.

There is no hesitation upon the Labor Department to appear. And I hope they will.

Senator HUMPHREY. They can always write a letter. We have a letter from Mr. Hill.

Senator DOUGLAS. That is true.

Senator SMITH. We have had a pretty extended debate over this. I want to hear what the Department has to say in this debate.

Senator DOUGLAS. The Secretary of Labor said:

> However, I prefer to leave to the Secretary of State any comments on the form of any instrument which this Government will support in the proceedings of the International Labor Organization * * *.

So, unless the Department of Labor changes its mind, if we were to get Mr. Wilkins up here on the question of a convention or recommendation, he would have to refer the matter to the Department of State, which has declared itself as to the convention.

Now, Mr. Wilcox, I do not wish to abuse the confidence of communications between members of the executive department. But would you be willing to state for the record whether you know whether or not the Solicitor of the Department of State has read the legal opinion as to the constitutionality of——

Senator HUMPHREY. The Department of Labor, Senator.

Senator DOUGLAS. Yes; the Department of Labor has rendered an opinion as to the constitutionality of conventions of the ILO on this matter.

Mr. WILCOX. I am not aware of such an opinion, Mr. Chairman. It may exist. But I do not know about it.

Senator DOUGLAS. Have you heard of it?

Mr. WILCOX. No, sir; not until Senator Humphrey referred to it this morning.

Senator DOUGLAS. I wonder if we couldn't ask the Department of Labor whether such a document has been rendered.

Senator HUMPHREY. I would just like to read from a memorandum that I have here. My legal counsel tells me that I am not at the moment

at liberty to disclose where I got it. But I would just like to bring it to your attention for the record. Then you can ask whether or not this was ever written by the Labor Department.

Senator DOUGLAS. Just a minute. We want to be very careful on this.

Are you alleging that this was written by the Department of Labor?

Senator HUMPHREY. I am not only alleging; I am saying it was.

Senator DOUGLAS. All right.

Senator HUMPHREY. I will read the whole paragraph here.

You will recall that Mr. Phleger has expressed disagreement with the prevailing interpretation of the ILO constitution.

I digress to point out that I believe Mr. Phleger is the counsel of the State Department; is that correct?

Mr. WILCOX. Legal adviser; yes.

Senator HUMPHREY (reading):

Has expressed disagreement with the prevailing interpretation of the ILO constitution. That in the case of conventions on Federal-State matters, the United States Government would treat them like recommendations rather than as conventions and would not seek their ratification. My memorandum of December 6 noted that this opinion is contrary to the interpretation of the Solicitor and of the American Bar Association. You may also wish to note two other important exceptions to the State Department's position in this matter—

Senator DOUGLAS. Who is the purported signer of this memorandum.

Senator HUMPHREY. This memorandum is from within the Labor Department.

Senator DOUGLAS. To whom?

Senator HUMPHREY. Well, I will just offer this as my general views of what the Department has said without causing any trouble for anyone.

Senator DOUGLAS I am told that there is a representative of the Department of Labor here—Mr. McDermott.

Would you stand and be identified?

Mr. MCDERMOTT. My name is Albert McDermott, Senator. And I have no knowledge whatsoever of this particular document.

Senator DOUGLAS. Would you convey to the Secretary of Labor the desire of the chairman that if consistent with Government practice that opinions by the Solicitor on this question be submitted to the committee?

Mr. MCDERMOTT. I shall convey your remarks.

Senator SMITH. Would it be proper, Senator Humphrey, to put that whole material in the record?

Senator HUMPHREY. I have already read from it in the record.

Senator SMITH. I mean the whole letter, and everything.

Senator HUMPHREY. I don't have it as a letter. But I would be glad to submit this to the committee for your executive records and files. It is a memorandum dated December 6, 1955. I have another similar one, December 9, 1955, on the ILO convention issue.

Senator SMITH. Who are they by?

Senator HUMPHREY. They were written in the Department of Labor. May I say that I shall be happy to return again to the fray if somebody from the Department of Labor comes over here, because I am getting a little tired of this business of secrets. I do not know how in the name of commonsense people around here can have easy access to memorandums from the Department of Labor which take

a contrary position to the Department of State, and then have testimony to the effect that there is no such thing going on. I say there is. And I am prepared to fight it out.

Senator DOUGLAS. You mean that there is such a memorandum?

Senator HUMPHREY. I say there is such a memorandum. It is about time these departments admit that there is such a memorandum and that there are all such conflicting views.

Mr. MCDERMOTT. I would just like the record to read, if it has not already done so, that the Secretary could not make the hearing this morning; that he thought Mr. Wilkins was the proper man to appear; and he is willing to have Mr. Wilkins come up as soon as he returns to the city on May 11.

Senator DOUGLAS. May 11, which is 2 weeks from now. When does the delegation go to Geneva?

Mr. WILCOX. I am told, Mr. Chairman, that the conference begins on June 7.

Senator DOUGLAS. When do the delegates have to be instructed and briefed as to the policies?

Mr. WILCOX. There would be briefing prior to the departure of the delegation, Senator, presumably sometime during the latter part of May and early June.

Senator DOUGLAS. So that still further reduces the amount of time.

Is Mr. Wilkins in his absence from the city on very pressing matters?

Mr. MCDERMOTT. I have no knowledge of how pressing his duties are. But he is out of the city.

Senator DOUGLAS. And will not be back until May 11?

Mr. MCDERMOTT. That is his present schedule.

Senator SMITH. Mr. Chairman, I would like to note for the record that this resolution was introduced on January 12. So, we have had a long time to get after this. We are a little bit late for this pressure now.

Senator DOUGLAS. I may say that letters were addressed to the Department of State on January 16 of this year. And reply was not dictated until April 11, indicating that the delay so far as the Department of State is concerned occurred within the Department of State and not within this committee. If there has been any dragging of feet, it seems to have been on the part of the executive departments and not on the part of this committee.

I have here in my hand an acknowledgment signed by Mr. Stewart Rothman, Solicitor of the Department of Labor, under date of January 18 reading as follows:

> The Secretary has asked me to acknowledge your letter of January 16, 1956, requesting report on Senate Joint Resolution 117 to provide for the United States cooperation with other nations of the International Labor Organization to abolish forced labor. Examination and consideration of the provisions of this bill has been completed, and the Secretary will advise you of his views on the proposed legislation.

That letter was not sent until April 4. The letter from the Department of State was not sent until April 11. We set the hearings as soon as the replies from the departments were received.

I am anxious to have these letters made a part of the record. It is clear that the delays which have occurred to date have not been the

fault of the committee, but have been the delays of the executive departments.

Senator HUMPHREY. Mr. Chairman, I find myself in the embarrassing position of presenting material without being able to disclose its identity.

Senator DOUGLAS. I think that has been done before.

Senator HUMPHREY. I do not intend to have it done in my name. If I may, I should like to present these two memorandums to the committee in executive session so as not to cause any embarrassment to the officer in the Government who submitted them.

I want to say further that this demonstrates the difference of opinion between departments in our Government on this matter. Now, I am not trying to chastise anybody for this difference of opinion. It is a legitimate concern, and surely in the final analysis the State Department has the responsibility for our relationships with these international bodies.

The interest of the Labor Department is primarily because of the effect the ILO, which has a close attachment to our own Department of Labor. But I identify for the purposes of the record simply the memorandums of December 6, 1955, and December 9, 1955, on the ILO convention issue.

As I present these to the chairman and to his colleagues, he will note that what the junior Senator from Minnesota has said with reference to their origin is accurate.

Senator DOUGLAS. I think that is more orderly. It should not be made a part of the record, because I disapprove of this practice sometimes followed of having confidential memorandums put in the record.

Mr. Wilcox, did you want to say anything further?

Mr. WILCOX. No, Mr. Chairman; except to say that I appreciate the courtesy that the committee has shown me and my associates during this testimony.

Senator DOUGLAS. You have had a very rough morning. And we thank you very much.

(Public Law 843, 80th Cong., previously referred to follows:)

[PUBLIC LAW 843—80TH CONGRESS]

[CHAPTER 756—2D SESSION]

[S. J. Res. 117]

JOINT RESOLUTION Providing for acceptance by the United States of America of the Constitution of the International Labor Organization Instrument of Amendment, and further authorizing an appropriation for payment of the United States share of the expenses of membership and for expenses of participation by the United States.

Whereas the Senate and House of Representatives by Public Resolution Numbered 43 of the Seventy-third Congress authorized the President to accept membership for the Government of the United States of America in the International Labor Organization and the President, pursuant thereto, accepted such membership on August 20, 1934; and

Whereas such membership in the International Labor Organization has proved of benefit to the people of the United States; and

Whereas the International Labor Organization provides a unique international forum in which representatives of employers and workers join together with those of governments in formulating conventions and recommendations which serve as international minimum standards for labor and social legislation and administration within member countries; and

Whereas extensive revision of the constitution has been undertaken to enable the Organization to meet changed conditions, to strengthen the application of

conventions and recommendations, with careful provision to meet the constitutional rules and practices of Federal States; and to operate as a specialized agency in relationship with the United Nations; and

Wheres the Constitution of the International Labor Organization Instrument of Amendment of 1946 was adopted unanimously on October 9, 1946, with the entire delegation of the United States to the Twenty-ninth Session of the International Labor Conference supporting this Instrument of Amendment: Therefore be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the President is hereby authorized to accept for the Government of the United States of America the Constitution of the International Labor Organization Instrument of Amendment adopted by the Twenty-ninth Session of the International Labor Conference on October 9, 1946.

SEC. 2. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated annually to the Department of State—

(a) such sums, not to exceed $1,091,739 per annum, as may be necessary for the payment by the United States of its share of the expenses of the Organization, as apportioned by the International Labour Conference in accordance with article 13 (c) of the constitution of the Organization; and

(b) such additional sums, not to exceed $95,000 per annum, as may be necessary to pay the expenses incident to participation by the United States in the activities of the Organization, including—

(1) salaries of the representative or representatives and alternates and appropriate staff, including personal services in the District of Columbia and elsewhere, without regard to the civil-service laws and the Classification Act of 1923, as amended; services as authorized by section 15 of Public Law 600, Seventy-ninth Congress; under such rules and regulations as the Secretary of State may prescribe, allowances for living quarters, including heat, fuel, and light and cost-of-living allowances to persons temporarily stationed abroad; printing and binding without regard to section 11 of the Act of March 1, 1919 (44 U. S. C. 111), and section 3709 of the Revised Statutes, as amended; and

(2) such other expenses as the Secretary of State deems necessary to participation by the United States in the activities of the Organization: *Provided*, That the provisions of section 6 of the Act of July 30, 1946, Public Law 565, Seventy-ninth Congress, and regulations thereunder, applicable to expenses incurred pursuant to that Act shall be applicable to any expenses incurred pursuant to this paragraph (b) (2).

SEC. 3. No person shall serve as representative, delegate, or alternate from the United States until such person has been investigated as to loyalty and security by the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

Approved June 30, 1948.

Senator SMITH. Mr. Chairman, I regret that I must leave at this time to attend another meeting, and will not be present to hear Mr. Delaney.

Senator DOUGLAS. This interrogation of the Assistant Secretary of State took longer than I anticipated. We are very much behind schedule. But we will ask Mr. George Delaney, International Representative of the AFL–CIO, International Labor delegate, to come forward and give his testimony.

STATEMENT OF GEORGE P. DELANEY, INTERNATIONAL REPRESENTATIVE OF THE AMERICAN FEDERATION OF LABOR AND CONGRESS OF INDUSTRIAL ORGANIZATIONS

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Chairman, I would like to comment that I think it is quite appropriate that we are holding this hearing under this very beautiful painting of President Lincoln signing the Emancipation Proclamation.

Mr. Chairman, I have a prepared statement, and in addition, I have made some notes from the position taken by the State Department contained in the letter submitted to this committee; and I should like to make comments after I have finished my statement, if that is permitted?

I am grateful for this opportunity to present to you the views of the AFL–CIO on Senate Joint Resolution 117.

I might say, Mr. Chairman, that Mr. Harry Pollak, who is here with me at the stand is a colleague and associate of mine in this work.

I have been the workers' delegate to the International Labor Conference for the last 8 years. In addition, I have been an elected member of the governing body of that organiaztion during that period. I have attended every one of these annual conferences. I have attended, each and every one of its governing body sessions over that period of time.

The American Labor movement's interest in this legislation stems from its desire to protect and advance the freedom of labor both at home and abroad. As early as February 1947 the American Federation of Labor requested the United Nations to undertake, in conjunction with the ILO, an investigation of forced labor wherever it may exist in the world. For 2 years, members of the United Nations stalled and evaded facing up to this issue. The American Federation of Labor, however, continued to persist in this request and finally in February of 1949 the United Nations Economic and Social Council voted to request the ILO to conduct such an investigation. Russia and her Polish and White Russian satellites voted in opposition. Subsequently, the ILO, jointly with the Secretary-General of the United Nations, established an Ad Hoc U. N. ILO Committee to investigate and study the nature and extent of the problem raised by the existence in the world of systems of forced or corrective labor, for political coercion or for achieving the economic ends of the state.

This U. N. ILO Ad Hoc Committee, in its report issued in 1953 found that there did exist a systematic program of forced labor in Russia, Czechoslovakia, Albania, Hungary, and Poland—in fact, in all of the Soviet controlled countries.

In its conclusions the committee suggested, and I quote:

> The Committee has come to the conclusion that, however attractive the idea of using such methods with a view to promoting the economic progress of a country may seem to be, the result is a system of forced labor which not only subjects a section of the population to conditions of serious hardship and indignity, but which must gradually lower the status and dignity of even the free workers in such countries. The Committee suggests that, wherever necessary, international action be taken, either by framing new conventions or by amending existing conventions, so that they may be applicable to the position regarding forced labor conditions found to exist among the workers of fully self-governing countries.
>
> The committee undertook its work as a fact-finding body; its enquiry has revealed the existence of facts relating to systems of forced labor of so grave a nature that they seriously threaten fundamental human rights and jeopardize the freedom and status of workers in contravention of the obligations and provisions of the Charter of the United Nations.

Senator DOUGLAS. That is found on page 127 of the report?

Mr. DELANEY. I intended later to submit those, at least for your use and information. But I see you are well supplied.

> The Committee feels, therefore, that these systems of forced labor, in any of their forms, should be abolished, to ensure universal respect for, and observance of, human rights and fundamental freedoms.

A second major factual document was issued last year. On December 15, 1955, the Secretary-General of the United Nations and the Director-General of the ILO made public a report to the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations which revealed for the first time new information on the startling developments in the use of forced labor in Red China. The report brought to the attention of the world that Communist China is holding 25 million slave laborers in over 2,000 camps. In addition, the report confirmed the previous U. N. ILO Ad Hoc Committee's report of 1953 of forced labor in the Soviet Union, Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, and Rumania.

Senator DOUGLAS. Let the record show that I have this report. And it has been duly noted.

Mr. DELANEY. As a result of effective American leadership, the ILO early this year established an Independent Committee to analyze material received by the ILO since the publication of the report of the joint U. N. ILO Ad Hoc Committee in 1953 and instructed the new committee to submit its conclusions to the governing body for their use and information.

This third major study was issued just a few weeks ago. This latest committee reached the unanimous conclusion that definite systems of forced labor still exist in the world, and the information before the committee led it to a firm conviction that the existing ILO convention of 1930 concerning forced labor is inadequate to deal with the new forms of forced labor which have been found to exist in a number of self-governing countries.

I might add, Mr. Chairman, that it must be understood by the members of this committee that we are dealing with a problem in which we already have an existing convention under the ILO procedure, adopted to take care of the use of forced labor among non-self-governing territories. It seems to me to be rather absurd to believe that we would now with the existence of forced labor spreading throughout the metropolitan territories take any less vigorous action in dealing with this matter as it affects people in metropolitan territories than we did in 1930 dealing with the abuse of forced labor in non-self-governing territories.

It proposed that the International Labor Conference undertake the adoption of a new international instrument which would (1) prohibit forced labor as a means of political coercion or education, as a method of mobilizing labor for economic development, or as a means of labor discipline; and (2) impose restrictions on certain forms or work or service excluded from the scope of the forced-labor convention of 1930.

During the period from 1947 to the present, the United States Government has properly assumed the leadership in promoting international action designed to eliminate the use of forced labor, and in calling to the attention of world opinion the vicious systems employed by Russia and her satellite nations to deprive millions of humans of their freedoms.

Now the ILO is prepared to give the nations of the world a full opportunity to abolish forced labor from the face of the earth.

The issue is simply this: Is the United States, as the leading citadel of democracy, to continue to lead the campaign to redeem the freedom of the millions of oppressed individuals now enslaved? Is this pro-

gram of international action to eliminate forced labor to have the benefit, not only of our support, but of our moral leadership?

Or is this Nation now to withhold and deny its support to this effort of the ILO to advance the concepts of human liberty and individual freedom—concepts of which America was the original living symbol?

From the attitude shown so far by the present administration, the latter would seem to be the case.

The United States has remained silent while an overwhelming majority of the member states of the ILO, in reply to a questionnaire submitted to them by the ILO, have formally expressed their support for a convention to abolish forced labor. Included among these nations is the U. S. S. R.

The failure of the United States Government vigorously to support the adoption of a convention on forced labor would place this Nation in a position that would be ludicrous if its consequences were not so grave. There is no doubt but that the prestige of the United States in international affairs will be severely damaged. The majority of participants in the ILO Conference next June will support the adoption of a convention.

Mention has been made of the attempt of the Department of State to solicit support for a declaration from among other nations. Secretary Wilcox indicated—and I am rather gratified to hear it, that the support they had hoped for had not been forthcoming. I think that I can reasonably state that the overwhelming majority—in fact, all of the workers of the conference—except those who are controlled by governments—will certainly support the adoption of a convention. And I think I can say, with possibly the exception of the United States employer, that that will be true of the participants from the employer side of the International Labor Organization.

The employer and worker representatives of the free nations of the world will consider anything less than vigorous leadership by the United States as an incomprehensible abandonment of its principles.

The Soviet Union, which is now trying to promote the popular front and to pose as the friend of democracy and the leader in the advancement of workers' interests and aspirations, will be delighted to see her chief adversary appear to back away from—of all things—the abolition of forced labor.

It will give Russia a propaganda advantage from which the United States is unlikely to recover. The worker and employer representatives from the free world will be amazed to see the United States Government, which had led the fight up to this time, apparently willing to withdraw at the critical point as action is about to be taken.

The United States has, since 1947, been responsible for calling to the attention of the world the practice and extent of forced labor in Russia.

Are we now suddenly to permit the country which is responsible for the initiation of the uncivilized method of inhuman treatment of individuals to succeed, in a classic act of fakery, to rid itself of this stigma and to present itself, unchallenged, as the leading advocate of the adoption of a convention to abolish forced labor, while America shrinks weakly away, behind a cloud of meaningless and unconvincing technicalities?

There are no constitutional or legal barriers which could possibly prevent the United States from supporting this adoption of a conven-

tion. The United States should assume the leadership in the development and promotion of worldwide standards designed to secure the abolition of slave labor in any and all forms.

These legal facts should be clear. First, support for the adoption of a convention carries with it no legal compulsion to ratify. Nonetheless, it is my personal view that it would be entirely appropriate under our constitutional system for the United States to ratify such a convention.

However, if it is found after the terms of the convention have been formulated, that such a convention involved matters of State rather than Federal jurisdiction, the ILO Constitution itself (art. 19, par. 7) provides that it need not be considered for ratification. President Eisenhower himself so interpreted this article of the ILO Constitution when, on May 26, 1955, he sent a number of ILO conventions to the Congress with the following statement in his message:

> It is in accordance with the foregoing provison [referring to art. 19 of the ILO Constitution] that ratification of the conventions by the United States is not deemed appropriate—

Those conventions were referred to both House of the Congress—

> for such consideration as it may wish to give.

From the legal standpoint, therefore, what is there to prevent the United States from acting consistently with its principles, and joining in the establishment of effective international standards to prohibit this vicious system? We are not bound by the convention unless and until (1) the Senate, after considering its provisions, decides by a two-thirds majority (on a rollcall vote) to give its consent to ratification and (2) the President ratifies. If the convention is not appropriate for ratification by the United States, the Senate need not even consider giving its consent, and it will be treated as a recommendation only.

Why did the United States Government fail to reply to the ILO questionnaire? Our constitution prohibits slavery and forced labor. We have Federal legislation prohibiting the importation of goods manufactured by forced labor. The Honorable James P. Mitchell, Secretary of Labor, has given some indication that he would support the adoption of a convention. In fact, he held out great hopes to the millions of enslaved individuals when on Monday, June 16, 1955, in an address before the 38th International Labor Conference of the ILO held in Geneva, he stated:

> I am sure that you are attending this conference, who come from many nations and worship God in many languages and in many ways, condemn human bondage as I do.
>
> No people who believe in a Supreme Being can justify the evil practice of forced labor—no matter what form it takes.
>
> No man with dignity can read the report of the U. N. ILO Committee on Forced Labor, composed of representatives of India, Norway, and Peru, and not shudder with disgust. No man who believes in any sort of God in heaven can read of the tragic breaking up of homes, the separation of husbands and wives, the wrenching of children from their mothers, the brutality, the slaughter of countless human beings; no man can read these facts and lie still within himself, unmoved, inactive.
>
> You know the facts, I am sure. You doubtless have read the pitiful testimony of those fortunate enough to escape from the forced labor camps of the Communist dictatorships. You have read of the starvation diets, the camps and cells

77294—56——14

surrounded with electrified wire, guarded by watch towers and patrolled by dogs. Victims who were unable to fulfill their work quotas because of their starvation diet met with severe punishment.

Those who struck were starved and shot, and many who were not shot died of malnutrition, exhaustion, and cold. The testimony taken by this impartial commission is replete with horrifying instances such as this.

I continue to quote because I want you to get the spirit and point that Secretary Mitchell made:

These facts which I have set forth prove that forced labor does exist in some parts of the world today and constitutes an atrocious crime against the human race. It is imperative that vigorous and effective action be taken by this great international body to stamp out forever this evil practice.

It is particularly appropriate that action against forced labor be taken by the International Labor Organization, which is so firmly committed to the ideals of social justice and human betterment. The ILO should take advantage of every power, every resource and every facility at its command to assure that effective action is taken against this form of bondage * * * I can assure you that the United States of America, which for almost 100 years has had a constitutional provision outlawing slavery, would vigorously support such an action program.

Senator DOUGLAS. You used the phrase "would vigorously support such an action."

Mr. DELANEY. That is the very language used. And that ends the quote, Mr. Chairman, of Secretary Mitchell in addressing the Conference of the ILO in 1955.

The State Department, however, has taken the position that the United States should not support—

vigorous and effective action by the International Labor Organization to stamp out forever this evil practice.

At least that is my interpretation of the State Department's position, which leads me to believe that it is anything less than vigorous and effective.

The State Department's position seems to be predicated more on a concern for the administration's political relations with certain spokesmen for the isolationist viewpoint in this country than upon America's relations with the forces of freedom and democracy in the world at large, or an intelligent, constructive analysis of the issue, and the interests of the United States in defeating communists and other totalitarian influences and practices in the world.

It is time the administration realized that the appeasement of isolationism and reaction at home cannot be reconciled with the requirements of leadership and responsibility abroad.

Mr. Chairman, I was not aware of the letter, the State Department's letter to Senator Hill, which was submitted and made part of the record of this committee. And naturally I have a few comments to make on that particular letter, because, it seems to me that the position as put forth by Secretary Wilcox this morning, follows more or less generally the same line as pursued in the letter to Senator Hill on behalf of the State Department.

The letter from the State Department refers specifically to the 1953 testimony of Secretary Dulles before the Subcommittee of the Senate Judiciary Committee on the Bricker amendment and I quote again as follows:

I do not believe that treaties should or lawfully can be used as a device to circumvent the constitutional procedures established in relation to what are essentially matters of domestic concern.

The letter goes on then and agrees that the United States Government can not support the adoption of a ILO convention on forced labor because it would be dealing with a matter of domestic concern and would circumvent constitutional procedures.

I believe that this argument is invalid for the folowing specific reasons: First, the Congress of the United States concluded that the ILO constitution now in effect has careful provision to meet the constitutional rules and practices of Federal-States.

This is contained in Public Law 843 of the 80th Congress in its 1st session.

That law authorized the President to accept the revised ILO constitution on behalf of the United States and was passed after hearings were held on the context of the ILO constitution.

Senator DOUGLAS. That was passed by the 80th Congress?

Mr. DELANEY. And I might add, that the Congress which expressed this view in 1948 was a Republican Congress.

Senator DOUGLAS. I was going to make that clear for the record in case you did not do so.

Mr. DELANEY. On what ground does a Republican Secretary of State maintain that a ILO Convention on forced labor would circumvent constitutional procedure?

The fact is that his testimony referred to was not on a ILO Convention on forced labor but dealt primarily with the proposed UN covenant on human rights. Unlike the ILO, the United Nations Constitution does not provide—

the careful provision to meet the constitutional rules and practices of Federal States—

which the Congress, I might add, noted with respect to the ILO. The ILO has a provision in its constitution which authorizes Federal States to treat a convention as if it were a recommendation. That is, not consider it for ratification when the Federal Government determines that under its constitutional system it is inappropriate for ratification because it involves State rather than Federal jurisdiction in whole or in part.

Of all the U. N. agencies, the ILO is the only organization that specifically relieves a Federal-state like the United States from the requirement of even considering the possibility of ratifying an international convention when it would involve such inappropriate use of its treaty making power.

Now, forced labor is not, as maintained in the State Department's letter, a matter of domestic concern outside the scope of the traditional use of the treaty making power of the United States. The interest of this country in the use of forced labor overseas is reflected in Federal legislation shown which authorizes the Secretary of the Treasury to prohibit the importation of goods made by forced labor. The United States is a party to a convention on slavery, a subject similar, I think to forced labor. The letter from the Department of State notes that the effectiveness of international action depends upon the sincerity of purpose of the various countries.

It notes the obvious insincerity of Russia and concludes that a convention is impractical for effective international action.

I would merely note, Mr. Chairman, that it is most unrealistic to expect the form of the international action to change the sincerity

of purpose of any particular government. Does the State Department imagine that the Russians are going to be any more sincere if the ILO develops and adopts a recommendation or a declaration rather than a convention on forced labor?

The important points ignored in the State Department's letter are first, that many countries, including, I hope the United States Government, are sincerely motivated in this problem.

Second, that an intensive and effective program to publicize and expose forced labor has been in operation by the United Nations and the ILO for 9 years. And might I add, Mr. Chairman, that in spite of all these efforts, we continue to find the existence and the spread of forced labor throughout the world.

Third, that more exhortation will no longer be effective in further publicizing and exposing forced labor.

Fourth, that Russia and insincerity will be each more effectively exposed by the development and adoption of a realistic convention if the United States does not support the convention idea. Of course, it will have little influence in seeing to it that the terms of that convention can be embarrassing to the Russians or included in effect in the convention itself.

Let me add that unless the United States Government's position is a positive and forthright one in support of the adoption of a convention, that I find it unrealistic to believe that in the discussion which will formulate the terms of this convention, that the United States delegation will have any influence in the final decision of the formulations of the terms of that convention.

The State Department says in its communication that a declaration is preferable to a convention because it would publicize and expose forced labor and pledge governments to prohibit the use of it.

This is reasoning, believe me, Mr. Senator, straight out of Alice in Wonderland. The convention is the form to achieve that objective.

Conventions are open to ratification by countries wishing to undertake such a international commitment. And as far as I can determine, that is the reason the State Department opposes the convention form.

A declaration is not subject to ratification. There is no commitment of any kind involved in a declaration. It is even less effective than a recommendation itself.

Mr. Chairman, that concludes my remarks, both my statement, and the remarks in connection with the letter from the State Department.

Because Senator Smith has evidenced a great deal of interest in the difference between a recommendation and a convention, I would, for the record, like to make a brief statement from a few notes that I have here in respect to that question with the hope that at a latter stage, Senator Smith might have the opportunity of reviewing it.

Senator DOUGLAS. We will be very glad to have those.

Mr. DELANEY. These are, of course, personal opinions. But a convention, in my opinion, is a much stronger action than a recommendation. A convention becomes solemn and binding upon governments after they have ratified it. Their honor, their integrity and world prestige are at stake in their obligations to faithfully observe the terms once that they have ratified it.

A country ratifying a convention pledges that its laws meet the conditions laid down in that convention.

A recommendation contains no such requirements.

A recommendation is only just what the name implies. It is not subject to binding ratification. It must be submitted to the competent legislative bodies for consideration only, plus occasional reports on the domestic law and practice.

Any member government, if it has ratified the convention, has the right to file a complaint with the ILO, against any other government member state that had ratified the convention and is not effectively observing the terms of the convention.

Now, let me see in this connection, if I can clearly paint the picture for you. If we are able to enact or to adopt a convention in Geneva in 1957—of such a structure that Russia would feel it necessary to ratify—under the convention form we would then have an opportunity to require the Government of Russia to make periodical reports, once a year, in fact, as to the extent of their implementation of such a convention.

If any member state which also has ratified felt that Russia, in this instance, was not complying with the terms of the convention and subsequent ratification, they would have the right under the regulations and procedures and constitutional provisions of the ILO to initiate an inquiry as to why they were not, and to ascertain the facts, report those facts back to the governing body, and the governing body could then make such recommendations to the Conference as it so desired, and the Conference in turn could then refer the matter to the World Court.

Now, I know of no better system of creating world opinion or public opinion, if you will, than the system already provided for under the constitutional provisions of the ILO.

Senator DOUGLAS. This cannot be done in the case of a recommendation.

Mr. DELANEY. This cannot be done in the case of a recommendation, no.

Let me add further that by the very fact that we have an opportunity in the event Russia ratifies and does not comply, to refer to the World Court as a final or at least one of the final steps in the procedure to deal with conventions, considerably strengthens our hand. At this point, I think it should be noted that when Russia made application in its letter of transmittal to the Director General of the ILO for membership, it laid down a condition that it would not be subject to any conditions of the World Court. The Director General refused to accept this condition which forced the U. S. S. R. to accept compliance with the ILO's constitution in full, which provides us with the opportunity of referring to the World Court abuses of ratification of conventions.

Senator DOUGLAS. In view of the fact that Russia is now a member of the ILO, it means that they have abandoned that position?

Mr. DELANEY. At least they have abandoned it with the hope that nothing will ever be referred to it reflecting upon their participation in the ILO.

Now, I think I have indicated that there is no right of complaint. You had asked this question in connection with a recommendation. When a complaint is made regarding the violation of a ratified convention, a Commission of Inquiry may be set up to determine the

facts. The government complained of must give full information to this Commission. The Commission's report and recommendations must then be published. If the recommendations of that Commission are not accepted by the government, the matter will be referred to the Court of International Justice, whose decision shall be final.

I mention those points so I won't go over them. Russia is a member of the U. N. and has an automatic right to International Labor Organization membership upon acceptance of the obligations of the ILO constitution. I reemphasize that again because I want to clearly have it understood that I, as the worker delegate, was equally opposed to Russia's participating in the ILO, but I had no right to vote on that particular question. But at the same time, since they are members, I have no reason to believe that the best action would be to run away from them and leave the ILO to their particular whims and propaganda use.

I would like to emphasize that there is an extreme difference between a convention and a recommendation. Now, Mr. Wilcox mentioned this morning in his testimony that there is confusion, between his department and the ILO in respect to the obligations of a member state under the Federal State structure of government. Now, it may be true that there is confusion in the State Department in respect to that matter. But let me say emphatically that there is no confusion on the part of the ILO in respect to that issue. The ILO, I think quite properly knows the relationship of the member state's obligations, and requires no more than the obligations under the constitution which our Congress has ratified.

I would like also for the record to indicate that at the last governing body session which was held only 6 or 7 weeks ago—6 weeks ago, I think—one government, a major government which you read off of the list this morning indicating the governments which had not yet answered the questionnaires—the Government of France, while it had not actually answered the questionnaire at that period or at that time had indicated in a statement by its government representative at the governing body session that they would support the adoption of a convention. And I might, if it is permitted, comment that in my 8 years of association in the International Labor Organization, it is the first occasion in which I ever heard of the United States Government sending out diplomatic cables to member states soliciting support for their position on matters of a technical character or matters of this particular type in my life. And I think it is rather to be regretted.

Senator Douglas. The results were not encouraging; that is, not encouraging to the State Department.

Mr. Delaney. No. In fact, I think it was even a matter for discussion between Secretary Dulles and Mr. Eden when he was here in Washington visiting. And I regret that this action has to be taken at that level when the Government of the United Kingdom has consistently rallied to the support of American leadership in the United Nations on this very same issue.

I think it is rather unfortunate that we should lead people up the hill and get to the crest of the hill and then ask them to turn around and go down.

Senator Douglas. Thank you very much, Mr. Delaney. The testimony this morning has taken up much more time than I had anticiated.

I know that witnesses have come here in some cases from a distance; and I feel an obligation to hear them if it is at all possible. From 2 o'clock on, I have a very busy schedule of engagements. I propose that we recess until quarter past one and then take as many witnesses as we can.

And I hope that if there are many witnesses who come from out of town we can give them preference so that there will be less inconvenience to them, if possible.

We will recess and reconvene at quarter past one.

(Whereupon, at 12:45 p. m., the subcommittee recessed to reconvene at 1:15 p. m.)

AFTERNOON SESSION

(The subcommittee reconvened at 1:15 p. m., Senator Paul H. Douglas presiding.)

Senator DOUGLAS. The subcommittee will come to order.

The next witness will be Dr. Joseph Sulkowski, associate professor at the School of Social Science, Catholic University, Washington, D. C.

I would like to read a statement of Dr. Sulkowski's experience.

He is associate professor at the School of Social Science, Catholic University of America in Washington, D. C. He is author of the following studies on the International Labor Organization: The Competence of the International Labor Organization under the United Nations System, American Journal of International Law, Washington 1951, pages 286–313. The Problem of Universal Membership in the International Labor Organization, Oesterr. Zeitschrift fuer Oeffentliches Recht, Vienna 1952, pages 70–100. Les Conferences Regionales de l'Organization Internationale du Travail, Revue Generale de Droit International Public, Paris 1953.

We are glad to have you, Dr. Sulkowski.

Dr. SULKOWSKI. Thank you.

STATEMENT OF DR. JOSEPH SULKOWSKI, ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR, SCHOOL OF SOCIAL SCIENCE, CATHOLIC UNIVERSITY OF AMERICA IN WASHINGTON, D. C.

Dr. SULKOWSKI. Mr. Chairman, I am in favor of the Senate joint resolution, introduced by Senator Humphrey of Minnesota, that the United States should take the lead in developing and adopting an international convention which would effectively outlaw forced labor for political and economic purposes.

I support this joint resolution for the following reasons:

It is with strong support of the United States and against the opposition of the Communist states that in 1951 the United Nations Economic and Social Council decided to undertake an investigation as to the existence of forced labor throughout the world. An ad hoc committee of inquiry was appointed for that purpose jointly by the United Nations and the International Labor Organization (ILO). After an exhaustive study, this ad hoc committee submitted in June 1953 a well-documented report which disclosed the existence of forced labor in various countries, and in particular the existence of legalized forced practices in Communist states, employed as a means of political coercion for holding or expressing political views, as well as for eco-

nomic purposes, and in particular for large-scale public works, for the development of previously uncultivated regions. Thereupon the United Nations General Assembly passed in 1953 a resolution supported by the United States, but opposed by the Communist states, which condemned forced labor as "a serious threat to fundamental human rights," and requested both the Economic and Social Council and the ILO to continue their efforts with the view of abolishing forced labor. In 1955 a supplementary report on conditions in countries not covered by the first report of 1953 was made public; it disclosed, among others, that forced labor was used for political and economic purposes also in Red China. The matter of forced labor and of adopting a convention which would deal with matters not already covered by the Geneva Convention of 1926 on suppression of slave trade and slavery is under discussion at the session of the United Nations Economic and Social Council, which is presently being held. It has also been placed on the agenda of the International Labor Conference of the ILO convening next June, which is to consider what kind of international instrument, convention, or recommendation is to be used to outlaw forced-labor practices.

In accordance with its procedure, the ILO has sent out questionnaires to the governments of the member countries to find out what kind of international instrument they favor and which provisions should be included in it. More than 40 countries replied, and most of them have declared themselves in favor of a convention which, when ratified, would create international obligations. Among the nations which replied to the questionnaire is Soviet Russia. Furthermore, in an obvious attempt to divert attention from forced labor practiced by her, Soviet Russia declared to favor the conclusion of a convention which would outlaw all forms of forced labor. In contrast, the United States did not reply to the questionnaire.

The lack of reply cannot but evoke the impression that the United States is not interested in promoting international protection of basic human rights, and this the more so as it did not ratify the Genocide Convention of 1948, and also declared in advance that it will not ratify the conventions on human rights under negotiation, designed to implement the United Nations Declaration on Human Rights of 1948. The impression thus created abroad does grave injustice to the United States real attitude toward human rights. The United States has always been a champion of basic human rights at home and abroad and continues to be a bulwark of freedom. This being so, why should the United States not cooperate with other nations in implementing the protection of human rights on an international scale?

The answer to this perplexing question is to be found in the following considerations, which are partly of a general and partly of a more specific nature:

To start with the general considerations, the United States is decidedly opposed to a supranational government and most reluctant to accept any further restrictions of its sovereignty with regard to matters which it regards to be within its domestic jurisdiction. Actually, however, none of the conventions which I have referred to, and in particular the proposed convention on slave labor practices, could possibly be interpreted as leading to the establishment of a supranational government. Neither is there a question of a further restriction of national sovereignty. The real issue with which we

actually are confronted is the implementation of general pledges already made by the United States. The United States is a party to a number of international instruments dealing with matters of international concern which were previously regarded as being exclusively within the domestic jurisdiction. In 1934 it joined the ILO, then an autonomous part of the League of Nations system and now one of the specialized agencies of the United Nations, the constitution of which sets forth as its goal the improvement of labor standards. It sponsored and is a leading member of the United Nations, the charter of which gives as one of the purposes of this Organization the promotion and encouragement of the respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms, and which pledges the members to cooperate for the achievement of this goal. Most of the international organizations of which the United States is amember attempt to further their specific goals, as defined in their basic instruments, by drafting of conventions. Since, as a general rule, the present international organizations have no mandatory powers, that is, the power to take decisions which would be directly binding upon their members, this left to their discretion to ratify or not the conventions or otherwise to implement their recommendation or resolutions. The United States policy has thus far been not to undertake formal international obligations which would restrict its complete freedom of action and which would possibly subject its actions to a scrutiny by an international body. The wisdom of such a policy is, however, questionable. Any long-run improvement of the present unsatisfactory international relations depends on strengthening the rule of international law on matters already within its scope and, indeed, extending that scope. It is the responsibility of a nation in a leadership position to take the lead in that direction and, at least, not to refuse to cooperate with other nations in matters deemed by a substantial majority to be of paramount importance, except if there are most serious objections to such course of action.

Turning from the general to more specific considerations, I would say that the present United States policy seems to be largely determined by domestic policy considerations. The United States is a Federal state. Under its Constitution the Federal Government has only those powers which have been delegated to it. One of these powers is the conduct of foreign affairs. There is a long-standing controversy as to the extent of the treatymaking power of the President, and more specifically whether it extends to matters which are primarily within the jurisdiction of States. This controversy came recently to the fore with the introduction of the so-called Bricker amendment which proposed a constitutional amendment to make clear that the President's treatymaking power does not extend to such matters. I personally believe that the President has been empowered by the Constitution to conclude, with the advice and consent of the Senate, treaties with regard to matters of international concern, and that this his power should not be restricted. Furthermore, human rights are a matter of Federal concern. This is particularly true of slave labor, the outlawing of which is under discussion. The 13th amendment to the Constitution expressly stipulates that—

> Neither slavery nor involuntary servitude, except as a punishment for crime whereof the party shall have been duly convicted, shall exist within the United States or any place subject to their jurisdiction—

and that—

Congress shall have the power to enforce this article by appropriate legislation.

May I add in this connection that in the past the United States did not hesitate to adhere, on February 1929, to the Geneva Convention of 1926, adopted under the auspices of the League of Nations for the purpose of suppressing slave trade and slavery, and that on January 25 of this year the United States ratified the protocol to the Geneva Convention of 1926 providing for transfer of certain powers, previously held by the League of Nations, to the United Nations.

The official attitude toward the problem of international protection of human rights is at variance with the principles to which I have referred.

Apparently in an effort not to estrange those members of Congress who are in favor of the Bricker amendment, Secretary of State Dulles, testifying on April 6, 1952, before the Senate Judiciary Committee declared that he was opposed to the Bricker amendment as infringing on the treatymaking power of the President. At the same time, however, he assured the committee that the administration does not intend to use the treatymaking power to become a party to treaties dealing with human rights. Here is what he said among other things:

The present administration intends to encourage the promotion everywhere of human rights and individual freedoms, but to favor methods of persuasion, education, and example rather than formal undertaking. We do not ourselves look upon a treaty as the means which we would now select as the proper and most effective way to spread throughout the world the goals of human liberty * * * We * * * do not intend to become a party to any such covenant or present it as a treaty for the consideration of the Senate.

In line with this statement the United Nations Commission on Human Rights was informed, in April 1953, that the United States would not become a party to the conventions under negotiation, designed to implement the United Nations Declaration of Human Rights of 1948 by imposition of binding international obligations. It follows logically from this statement that the administration has no intention in particular to become a party to the proposed convention outlawing slave labor practices for political and economic purposes, and that's why the questionnaire sent out by the ILO probably remained unanswered. It seems to me, however, that domestic policy considerations should not be permitted to becloud international issues of transcending importance, and to discredit the United States in the eyes of the rest of the world.

Equally discouraging is the United States attitude toward the activities of the ILO which is of an even longer standing than the recently announced official attitude toward the problem of human rights in general. Unjustified as this attitude is, the United States apparently is of the opinion that the improvement of labor standards is a matter exclusively within the domestic jurisdiction. Accordingly, of the two devices at the disposal of the ILO to achieve its purposes, namely, convention which, when ratified, creates international obligations, and recommendation, which merely outlines the desirable goals by which national legislations should be guided on matters not yet regarded as ripe for convention-type obligations, the United States favors the less stringent form of a mere recommendation, and apparently also believes that the ILO should restrict itself to adopting recommendations rather

than conventions. If this is the United States attitude, it seems to me to be contrary to both the letter and the spirit of the ILO constitution. In determining whether a proposal before the International Labor Conference should take the form of a convention or a recommendation the members of the ILO are expected to be guided by purely objective criteria, namely whether the matter under consideration is suitable or not, for a convention. In casting the vote on this preliminary matter a member should not be influenced by domestic policy considerations and in particular by its constitutional system, but only by the general consideration which form, convention, or recommendation, is best suited to achieve the goals of the ILO. This clearly results from the provisions included in the ILO Constitution on the obligations of members which have a federal structure. They stipulate that a federal state has the same obligations as a nonfederal state when the adopted conventions and recommendations are under its constitutional system appropriate for federal action. If this is not the case, the federal state has no other obligation than to refer them to appropriate federal and states authorities for further action, to arrange for periodic consultation with a view of a coordinated action, and to inform the ILO of the measure taken. These provisions take care of the constitutional problems with which the ILO members having a federal structure are confronted. Accordingly, whenever the subject is a federal matter, as it certainly is insofar as the proposed convention of slave-labor practices is concerned, the ILO member should not—except when there are other valid reasons—oppose the adoption of a convention. Furthermore, under no circumstances should a member, directly or indirectly, attempt to influence other members of the ILO to give, as a matter of general policy, preference to the form of a recommendation rather than that of a convention, if in the interest of the ILO as a whole the convention form is more desirable. The attitude of the United States toward the activities of the ILO is among the factors which explain why the United States record as to the ratification of conventions adopted by the ILO has been so poor. Out of 103 conventions thus far adopted by the ILO, the United States has ratified only 7.

Most recently, the ILO has been subjected to vehement attacks in this country, among others by the United States Chamber of Commerce and the National Manufacturers Association which have been designated by the United States Government as the most representative organizations of the employers and with the concurrence of which the employers' delegates to the International Labor Conference, constituted on a tripartite basis, are nominated. The mentioned organizations recently designated the representatives of the employers on only a yearly basis. The Government is urged to appoint a commission which would investigate the desirability of the United States continued participation in the ILO. Without awaiting the findings of this commission, petitions are circulated urging that the United States should withdraw from the ILO.

The arguments put forward in support of this extremist proposal may be summed up as follows: It is pointed out that the United States derives no benefits from the participation in the ILO. The ILO is said to have leftist tendencies and to pave the way toward socialism, which are incompatible with the free-enterprise philosophy adhered

to by this country. It is alleged that the participation in the ILO of Soviet Russia and of a number of other Communist states following her lead resulted in distorting the tripartite structure of the International Labor Conference, which was to be composed of 4 representatives of each member, namely, 2 government delegates, and 1 employers and 1 workers representative designated by independent employers and workers organizations. In support of this view it is pointed out that the employers and workers representatives nominated by the Communist states do not actually represent independent employers and workers organizations, which are not existent in these countries, but merely increase the number of government delegates from 2 to 4. This view is apparently shared by the Senate which, on April 19, 1956, adopted a rider proposed by Senator Bricker to a bill providing for United States contribution to the ILO, according to which the United States contribution would be restricted to a certain minimum amount if it has been found that during the preceding year employers and workers representatives of the Communist countries "have been permitted to vote in the International Labor Conference or in other meetings held under the auspices of the ILO." In connection with the participation of the Communist countries in the ILO it is finally argued that this participation has thrown the ILO out of balance.

None of the above arguments stands serious criticism.

There might be some truth in the allegation that the participation in the ILO has not benefited the United States to such a degree, as it did other nations, and this in view of the fact that the labor standards in this country are among the highest in the world. It seems to me, however, that the United States derived one clear advantage from the activities of the ILO. They resulted in raising living standards throughout the world, and in particular in the underdeveloped countries, and helped to narrow down the gap between the high cost of labor here and lower cost abroad. They indirectly contributed to making American goods more competitive and foreign goods less so.

I wonder if those who support the high protective tariffs and the cheap-labor argument in their support are aware of this fact.

This being so, the United States should have had taken the lead in ratifying the ILO conventions to induce other nations to follow its example. Even if it were true that the United States does not derive any benefits from its participation in the ILO, the proposal to withdraw from it would be completely unjustified if only for this reason that this participation enables the United States to share its experience with other nations and to get a better understanding of their problems.

Neither does the fact that the ILO has allegedly leftist tendencies, imcompatible with the free-enterprise system adhered to by this country, justify a withdrawal from the ILO. It is only natural that various countries have different political and economic institutions. In most cases, they are the outgrowth of centuries-long evolutionary process, based on past history, specific peculiarities of a nation, and different environment. We have to reconcile ourselves with the fact that nations have different political and economic systems, whether we like them or not, if we wish to live in peace. It would be a fatal

mistake for a nation to attempt to "export" and to impose its institutions on other nations on the theory that they are superior, or refuse cooperation with other nations on the ground that their systems are incompatible with ours.

The argument that the participation of the Communist countries has thrown the ILO out of balance is the weakest of all, and actually is a reflection of the broader argument that it is undesirable to cooperate with other nations which are believed to pursue incompatible philosophies. It is certainly true that the ILO constitution envisaged the existence of independent employers and workers oganizations, which would designate their representatives to the International Labor Conference.

At the same time, however, it was realized from the very beginning that the degree of their independence would vary from one country to another. It is next to impossible to define the criteria which would permit the measure the degree of that independence. That is why the ultimate decision as to the admission of the employers and workers representatives was left to the International Labor Conference which, by a vote of two-thirds, may refuse to admit any delegate who has not been nominated in accordance with the provisions of the ILO constitution. And actually from the very beginning the ILO was faced with the now perennial problem of whether or not to accept credentials of employers and workers representatives nominated particularly by the totalitarian states.

For the most part the endless discussions in the Credentials Committee of the International Labor Conference invariably ended with the admission of representatives whose credentials were challenged, in recognition of the fact that the refusal of their admission might cause the respective members to withdraw from the ILO and would impair the achievement of the goal of the universality of membership. The present regulation on representation is certainly not ideal. Well aware of this, the ILO has appointed a special committee to investigate the degree of independence of the employers and workers organizations in the several member countries. On the basis of this study the decision is to be made whether the present constitutional provisions as to the representation should be amended. If, in the opinion of the Senate, which recently adopted a Bricker rider to the bill providing for the United States contribution to the ILO, the present regulation pertaining to the representation of employers and workers on the International Labor Conference is unsatisfactory, it would seem to have been more proper to ask the administration to instruct its delegates to press for an amendment of the ILO constitution, rather than high-handedly to penalize the ILO by cutting down the United States contribution.

Senator DOUGLAS. Let the record show that the chairman voted against the resolution.

Mr. SULKOWSKI. Be that as it may, it is completely wrong to assert that the participation of the Communist nations in the ILO has thrown it out of balance. Actually, as of present, the Communist nations cannot significantly influence the decisions of the ILO organs. With eight Communist nations now participating in the ILO, they have in the International Labor Conference but 32 of the 284 total votes. As for the governing body, only Soviet Russia, as one of the member

nations of chief industrial importance, is permanently represented on it by a Government delegates, and has 1 vote of the 40 total votes.

In summary, it may be said that the United States attitude toward the problem of the protection of human rights, and in particular toward the proposed ILO convention on forced-labor practices, as well as the recent attacks on the ILO which reached their climax in suggesting that the United States should withdraw from this organization, seriously impaired the leadership position of this Nation. They are likely to reinforce the impression, already widely held abroad, that the United States is not willing to cooperate with other nations unless it has its own way and that it would like to mold the rest of the world in its own image.

It is against this background that the Senate joint resolution under discussion should be evaluated. It proposes that the United States should take the lead in developing and adopting an international convention which would effectively outlaw forced labor for political and economic purposes. It rightly emphasizes that the outlawing of forced labor should take the form of a convention which, when ratified, would create binding international obligations. It also has the following merit:

Since the convention on forced-labor practices is sponsored by the ILO, the United States support for its adoption would indirectly reaffirm its recognition for the usefulness of the ILO activities aiming at achieving social justice, and would at the same time repudiate the unjustified attacks to which the ILO has been recently subjected.

It would be most regrettable, indeed, if for domestic policy consideration the United States failed to manifest its solidarity with other nations in condemning forced-labor practices for political and economic purposes by which Soviet Russia and other nations now controlled by her have discredited themselves in public world opinion.

May I thank you, Mr. Chairman, for this opportunity to express my views on the Senate joint resolution.

Senator DOUGLAS. I want to thank you.

Is it your feeling that if Russia was found guilty of violating the convention that complaints could be filed with the International Labor Office?

Mr. SULKOWSKI. Of course.

Senator DOUGLAS. If the International Labor Office approved, could the case be taken to the World Court?

Mr. SULKOWSKI. Yes. If there is a dispute as to the interpretation of the convention, the matter may be brought before the International Court of Justice. In case of non-observance, the constitution provides for a special enforcement procedure under which a committee of inquiry is to be established by the governing body and further steps may be taken.

Senator DOUGLAS. So you think that this would have possibly an added advantage that if Russia violated the agreement, we could put her on trial, both before the International Labor Organization, itself, and also possibly before the World Court?

Mr. SULKOWSKI. Certainly. It would be an advantage, provided that Soviet Russia will adopt this convention.

Senator DOUGLAS. Thank you, Doctor.

The next witness is Miss Toni Sender, the United Nations' representative of the International Confederation of Free Trade Unions.

Miss SENDER. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

STATEMENT OF MISS TONI SENDER, UNITED NATION'S REPRESENTATIVE OF INTERNATIONAL CONFEDERATION OF FREE TRADE UNIONS

Miss SENDER. Soon after my appointment as consultant to the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations by the American Federation of Labor, I was informed that things were going on behind the Iron Curtain that were of such a horrible character that they had to be made known to the people of the world.

The American Federation of Labor took the initiative to investigate by its own means. The result was, that I was aksed to submit a memorandum to the United Nations asking that the question of forced labor be put on the agenda of the Economic and Social Council. The request was granted. However, although the item was put on the Council's agenda, it was not discussed for a long time. It was never reached, until in 1949 it could not be kept any longer on the agenda without being dealt with.

The discussion was opened by the United States member of the Council, Mr. Willard Thorp, who, in very restrained but at the same time very grave terms, opened the attack on the system of forced labor. Mr. Thorp was not obliged to be the fist speaker. The American Federation of Labor representative had the right to make the introductory remarks. He certainly deserves the respect of all freedom-loving people for his act of courage. He assumed a highly recognized leadership in this fight against world barbarism.

Meanwhile, a great number of documents, affidavits, letters, texts of laws, and decrees had been accumulated, bringing to light a situation much worse than any Western citizen could have expected. The representative of the American Federation of Labor was receiving evidence from former victims or relatives of victims of the forced-labor camps. Not only was the number of letters increasing, the description of the suffering, physical and moral, became more revolting. Those who have listened to the stories of these human beings will never forget the human tragedy not shown by a dramatic group on the stage but perpetrated by a government in the 20th century on defenseless human beings.

The defense of the Russian policy consisted in simply declaring that all was lie and slander and in describing the situation in Russia in all detail and giving a picture of happiness and welfare that the workers of all other countries would envy. But his main effort was the expression of pity for the workers of the United States who, according to the delegate, live in poverty and conditions of slavery, like all workers in capitalist countries.

It is always stressed by those who do not want any action on this question, that the action against forced labor constitutes an illegal interference in the domestic affairs of the Nation. If this was the case, the very existence of the United Nations and its charter has such an interference. How can any international body act if even criticism is considered as interference? If this is true, then the U. S. S. R. is the worst sinner. She does not feel hampered by any legal consideration and goes much further in its demands than any democratic nation ever did.

There are two main reasons for which there may not be any neutrality toward anyone who defends murder, torture, and cruelty against a human person. The nations of the still free world have a historic mission to save the world from going savage. It is human dignity that is in danger to perish. The United States of America should be proud of being the leader of this struggle.

But there is also a strong compelling reason that does not leave us any choice but to struggle if we wish to survive in this era of diminishing civil liberty. Wherever communism advances forced labor comes immediately behind the armies. You have evidence here from the captive nations. There, all the details of Communist oppression are shown and handled if any differently than in a much higher speed than was possible in the U. S. S. R.

Since the Communists deny the existence of terrorism in the countries under their domination and control, why don't they open their doors—they were asked by the American Federation of Labor representative—and give free access ot the places where members of such a mission wish to go? The answer was a very weak one—they do not want to show all strategic military places to spies from the democratic front. Is it to be considered as a fact that forced-labor camps are being used for military purposes?

If we, the American people, should become neutral when confronted with expanding Communist totalitarianism, then we would soon have no friend left and what seems impossible today, namely, the defeat of the free world, would become an immediate threat.

What the Communist governments cannot do in an open way would be possible by a policy of intimidation. I can speak on this topic because of personal experience. Since submitting to the council the evidence their tactics consist in threats and attempts of intimidation. It reached its climax when the council meeting took place in 1951 in Santiago, Chile, and the Russian and Polish delegates worked by all means to stop the representatives of the ICFTU—the organization of about 55 million workers on all continents of the world.

Under the leadership of the Polish delegates the powers of the Communist group started such an avalanche of vile language against me in order to prevent me from taking the floor. When finally it seemed that I could speak and I started it, the interference set in immediately again until the chairman finally succeeded in reestablishing order and I could make the presentation of new facts showing the condition in the camps with the exact description of diet, discipline, and general conditions in camp. All was shown from a handbook edited by the Russian administration.

One has the impression that the more recent the action is taken the more cruel has the matter become. As an example of this fact, I wish to introduce only a few examples of the methods used after the conquest of the mainland of China. I wish to state that all the information that I received was given out by Communists and nothing has been added to it by myself.

Writing in the Peking paper, Jen Min Jih Pao of October 11, 1951, Public Security Minister, Lo Jui-Ch'ing stated that:

The subjection of counterrevolutionaries to forced labor is an indispensable means for the liquidation of the counterrevolutionary class. It is up to all

levels of the People's Government and the various public security organs to pay adequate attention to make a success of this work.

It was another leading Communist, Tong Tzu-hui, who in the course of a speech to the Central South Regional Government—reported in the "Ch'ang Chiang Jih Pao" of December 13, 1951—referred to the execution of numerous "archcriminals" and continued:

But when the measures had been embraced and the counterrevolutionary flames quenched, it was a most enlightened policy (*a*) to seek the reform through labor of lesser elements, and (*b*) to suspend death sentences for 2 years on those elements who had undermined the interest of the state, but not to a very serious degree.

He said that of those arrests in the Central South Region—

only 28 percent were executed; 2 percent had their sentenced stayed for 2 years and 50 percent were made to undergo reform through labor.

The report from an official Chinese news agency dispatched from Peking is quite frank in describing the operation of one of the camps which has been run by the Peking Public Security Bureau since March 1950. The report is frank about the condition of work. It states:

For instance when ditches were dug last spring, water in the ditches froze, but some criminals stood digging, barefooted on the ice, and moved as much as 34 cubic meters a day.

These things—

the report naively adds—

cannot be realized simply by compulsion.

What happens to prisoners who prove to be beyond reform may be judged from the case of the Kuomintang Army agent, TU Hsi-Chin, who resisted control measures during the period of reform through labor and organized the escape of six criminals:

Criminal Tu was apprehended by our border security bureau at Peking, sentenced to death after trial and escorted to the camp to face a firing squad.

All this evidence comes from official Communist sources.

In order to understand the language of these sources, one must have in mind that any anti-Communist in their eyes is a "counterrevolutionary criminal." Wherever communism established its government, the members of cabinet have as their first obligation to create reserves in material and in men to be placed at the disposal of the Communist regime.

In this direction, the China Union Press reports under date of August 21, 1951, that the Communist authorities in Peking had to meet the labor shortage in the Soviet Union and that therefore 100,000 able-bodied males from 20 to 25 years old were to be chosen from the "criminals" throughout the mainland for "service" in Siberian mines. The Shanghai area was to supply 20,000 such "criminals," and part of the 100,000 were to be designated for reclamation work in Sin Kiang Province.

These examples could be extended over pages and pages. Suffice it to say, one cannot read these stories without feeling the deepest pity for the people concerned who are entirely defenseless and also innocent of any crimes that would be called a crime by Western standards.

77294—56——15

When this great and noble fight started, we were all aware of the dimensions of it. We felt an obligation to be ready to make all the sacrifices that might be required. The immediate task was to prevent Communist totalitarianism from continuing its expansion.

I have been now almost 10 years a consultant to the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations. I have had the opportunity to observe the Communist delegates almost daily. They have never changed their political line, not even their language. Chief target always was and still is—it was even during last year's celebration in San Francisco—the United States of America. This is an additional reason why we may not show any sign of weakening.

There is another very realistic reason for the Government of the United States to have its strength known by the enemies of freedom. We know the skill of Russian propaganda. Being without any scruples they are in a position to show life in the U. S. S. R. in its brightest light. With the instrument of the Iron Curtain they would have some success if not warned by their leadership. Such leaders, besides the workers' organization, would be first of all the Government of the United States. Should they become neutral the conquest would be possible even in the United States.

The American Trade Union organizations have done their duty so far—they have been in the forefront of the struggle and will continue to be so. But because they expect that the Government on its part gives the example of strength to the Nation and to all the groups, they are ready to support this fight.

The trade unions have made the necessary preparations in their camp. They are the strongest wall against Communist penetration. But they cannot continue being successful if the most responsible in the fight for freedom, the Government, does not underline the importance of a very positive attitude against slavery of all sorts. This struggle is made difficult by the existence of the Iron Curtain.

When, nevertheless, we succeed in bringing news to the West, the next thing to do is to show that we are interested in truth and therefore bring to our membership only the true facts. But we may not reach all the groups of our society. A Government strong in its will to maintain liberty in the United States of America and in the free world will have to do its share.

Why does everyone in the countries of the world look at the United States? They do so because they know that without the United States there is no defense possible. They still have confidence in the sincerity of our language. But there is no doubt that some people are inclined to doubt. Here, again, I may say we have defended the people of the United States as being trustworthy. This fight against forced labor may become the most essential struggle which our generation will have to win. For this reason, we must have confidence in one another. Nobody should be in a position to state—as it was expressed by some—that the United States is fighting only as long as the cold war is on, as long as it seems expedient.

Such an opportunism would be a most serious deterioration. The American people must understand the character of this very decisive battle—can we accept a regime of contempt for the individual, of unanimity achieved by the terror of a gestapo, or is there enough faith and willingness to fight left, so that our generation will go into history as the saviors from barbarism.

Expressed in practical terms it means: In this battle for decency and respect for the human person we may never give the impression to become indifferent. We knew when we started that this would be a hard and long fight. We therefore should not take anything less than a convention at this moment. This choice will have a moral effect. But we have learned that the psychological factor is of predominating value.

Senator DOUGLAS. Thank you very much, Miss Sender.

The next witness is a gentleman from my own State of Illinois, Mr. John Noble, of Wheaton, Ill., a former prisoner in Vorkuta slave camp, U. S. S. R.

STATEMENT OF JOHN NOBLE, WHEATON, ILL., FORMER PRISONER IN VORKUTA SLAVE CAMP, U. S. S. R.

Mr. NOBLE. First I would like to state this testimony is the truth and nothing but the truth and that prisoners in Vorkuta have asked me to make statements of this kind in the free world to open the eyes as to the conditions behind the Iron Curtain.

I as a citizen of the United States herewith testify that I was subject to forced and slave labor under the Soviet authorities in the Soviet Arctic slave camps during the years 1950 to 1954.

After local internment by Hitler Germany throughout World War II, I was arrested by Soviet secret police on July 5, 1945, and held in prisons and concentration camps such as Muehlberg and Buchenwald for 5 years without being sentenced or even accused of having committeed a crime of any kind. Thereafter, on August 8, 1950, I was informed of being sentenced to 15 years of physically hard labor and transported for 6 weeks in disguised prison cars and box cars to the slave region of Vorkuta in the Soviet Arctic Circle.

Records that were secretly held and checked by a group of Ukrainians sharing the same barracks as I, based on reports from prisoners being exchanged from camp to camp in Vorkuta as well as from the other slave districts, stated as follows: 400,000 to 500,000 men and women prisoners were slaving in the Vorkuta area, while a grand total of prisoners throughout the Soviet Union in slave, concentration, and secret camps together with the inmates of the prisons and youth forced-labor camps amounted to between 25 and 28 million men, women, and children.

Senator DOUGLAS. How many were in the Vorkuta camp, Mr. Noble?

Mr. NOBLE. Between four and five hundred thousand.

Senator DOUGLAS. And you more or less saw them yourself?

Mr. NOBLE. Yes; I did.

These figures include criminals, estimated at about 20 percent.

In Vorkuta there were less than 10 percent criminals, but they worked and slaved along with the so-called politicals, mainly in the shrewd coal mines.

Other work, such as the building and operation of brick factories, cement factories, limestone pits and refineries, communication lines, powerplants and even the huts and barracks for the officers and guards was the work of the slave laborer.

In all cases, no matter where the work took place, the men or women were marched to work by MVD guards and dogs. I personally was

subject to slave labor for 1,385 days in and on the coal mines of Vorkuta.

From October 4, 1950 to March 5, 1954, I was forced to work in the coal mine No. 16, Brigage 139, later 136, and then 135, by Major Bogamolov, who was later replaced by Major Tschevtchenko, as commanding officers of Camp Dept. III.

From March 5, 1954, to June 10, 1954, I was subject to forced or slave labor in mine No. 29 under command of Major Dolugin and later under Major Karovin as commanders of Camp Dept. No. 10.

While at forced labor in mines Nos. 16 and 29, I, as well as all the others, received no pay whatsoever until April 1952.

Not fulfilling the quoted norm meant to be put on a punishment ration amounting to approximately one-third of the normal food ration. My body weight stayed about or under 100 pounds for close to 8 years. By repeatedly not fulfilling the norm, the prisoner would be accused of sabotage, punished in a dungeon, and in many cases an additional sentence was given.

To prisoners of the ZK group (political prisoners) a new sentence need not be given since his OSSO of Troika sentence was limited to 15, 20, or 25 years under the conditions that the prisoners' camp behavior and work was accomplished.

After April 1952, we were permitted to receive up to 100 rubles per month, depending on the fulfillment of the required work. Less than 100 percent of the set norm meant no pay.

Following the uprising and strike against the slave dictating Soviet Government in July 1953, in which the gunfire commanded by the MVD and Assistant Minister for Internal Affairs, General Masslenikov, killed and wounded hundreds of slaves while punishing and executing thousands of the strike leaders, those that went back to work could receive up to 300 rubles per month. The wages were according to the Soviet standards for the Arctic Circle.

For a specially trained worker, the mine paid 1,200 rubles per month. We, as prisoners received the same pay as did the so-called free workers, only that there were the following deductions:

The salary was 1,200.

The Government deduction for prisoners, which was called in Vorkuta the "slave due," was 50 percent or 600.

Besides the 50 percent, there was an employment tax of approximately 10 percent.

There was a childless tax of 20 rubles per person, no matter if you had a dozen children at home.

For food, 140 rubles were deducted.

For clothing, 60 rubles, and we also had to pay for the guards, 160 rubles a month.

That amounted, from a total salary of 1,200 rubles, the prisoner was allowed to receive approximately 100 rubles.

These 100 rubles meant an improvement for the poor food conditions but was far, far from an equitable compensation for the work. There was no choice as to where the prisoner wanted to work and also little difference, since intentionally almost all work was accomplished by human manpower.

The reason for this is that the Soviets fear to place one man behind a machine that might replace 100, 200, or more men because he might

not be a true Communist and easily stall the production for days or weeks. To cause 100, 200, or more men to stall for a day or two, while each is working on his own job, is almost impossible, except for example in July 1953 where there was no organized power in the Soviet Union at all.

Sabotage on equipment, tools, and human bodies are on the daily order, since that seems to be the only way out of slave labor, even if it will cost their life. We had a number of men in both camps 3 and 10 that were sentenced to 7 to 10 years forced labor because of coming late for work three or more times.

Despite that the Soviets have announced that these trespasses are no longer being punished with a slave-labor sentence, they arrest these people and sentence them for sabotage against the 5-year plan.

The Soviet prisoners from 8 to 14 years of age are held in youth forced-labor camps in and around the larger cities of the Union. In Kharkov, for example, there are two youth forced-labor camps selling their young working power to the "Fed" factory where the children are employed and even become experienced workers while the Russian "Leica" camera is being sold in the outside world and these forced laborers receive nothing for their work.

The forced labor in the Soviet Union begins with the 8-year-old child and is carried on to death. Since the Soviet worker receives no considerable compensation, he sees no benefit in working under communism. For this reason he is forced with a pistol or whip on his back.

Even though 5 or 6 major cities in the Soviet Union as well as the Arctic Circle district receive double pay for the same work in other cities or regions, they do not earn enough to maintain a living standard compared to the lowest in the United States.

I would like to add that later, after I left Vorkuta and was taken to the camp of Portma, near Moscow, we three Americans—there were only three of us there—were the only ones that were threatened with punishment and the dungeon for refusing to work. All the other prisoners there at Portma were not working because they were to be transported home.

Another point I would like to point out is, concerning the slave labor, I personally think it is a problem of America, indeed, since there are so many Americans held in the concentration camps in the Soviet Union and are being forced to work under the same horrible conditions as the Soviet citizens are.

Also, during the strike, the uprising in July 1953, when the Soviet guards were firing into the camp, I also was in a group of people where the Soviet guards fired upon us. As a matter of fact, within about 1 yard's reach of me, 5 bullets entered the wall behind me.

I also wish to emphasize that never was the question of my nationality brought up in the camps. The Soviet authorities knew exactly who I was. They knew exactly the nationality of other citizens, so that there is no excuse that they are not informed about having foreign citizens, or non-Soviet citizens in slave labor.

Senator MURRAY. I am sorry I wasn't here for your opening statement. I was wondering how did it happen that you were put into this slave labor camp.

Mr. NOBLE. My father possessed factories in Germany and Czechoslovakia, still while living here in the United States. My father's

health condition was so that he was forced to attend medical treatments in Czechoslovakia and Germany. During these opportunities, our whole family went over to Europe, shortly before the war. At the time of the outbreak of the war, we were locally interned by Hitler Germany, and after the war arrested by the Soviets.

Senator MURRAY. There was no doubt that you were American?

Mr. NOBLE. That's right. They had our passports. That was the first thing that disappeared from us.

Senator MURRAY. Thank you for your statement.

Of course I will read it carefully on the record.

We appreciate your statement here this morning and I think it is very important.

If you have any supplementary documents pertaining to this matter which you would wish to put in the record, we would be glad to have them.

Mr. NOBLE. There was a series of articles from the North American Newspaper Alliance. Then there is a book-length story in True magazine, November 1955, and the book condensation in the Reader's Digest of February 1956. There are two books being written by me at the moment. They are not complete yet.

Senator MURRAY. When will they be completed?

Mr. NOBLE. They will be completed approximately in 8 to 10 weeks.

Senator MURRAY. We will have access to them?

Mr. NOBLE. Certainly.

(The series of articles for the North American Newspaper Alliance follows:)

[From the New York Times, April 3, 1955]

TORTURE IN SOVIET JAILS RELATED BY AMERICAN FREED AFTER DECADE

This is the first of five articles by a native of Detroit who was a prisoner of the Russians from 1945 to last January. The articles were written in collaboration with Martin L. Gross.

(By John H. Noble)

(Copyright, 1955, by North American Newspaper Alliance)

I first met the Russians in May 1945, a few days after the Nazis capitulated in Europe. I was in Dresden, Germany, where my father, mother, brother, and myself were under local internment by the Germans under protection of the Swiss consulate, part of the 900 Americans caught there by World War II.

The United States and Soviet Armies had met early in May at a line 35 miles west of Dresden. Dresden itself was occupied by the Russians, who soon became aware of our presence by two large American flags we had hung out. I had sewed them from cloth in 1943 and hidden them from the Germans.

Others saw the American flags too; United States soldiers who had been prisoners of war or escaped prisoners hiding out in the countryside. From May 10 on, our place was like a United States Army replacement center—behind Russian lines.

On May 20 a caravan of 2 ambulances, 3 jeeps, and 2 United States staff cars with 2 colonels from the 76th Division drove up at our place. They had come to pick up a sick GI whom the Russians would not admit into their military hospital.

"We have no room for anyone but our own troops," they had told him.

A few minutes later, with the GI in an ambulance, the entire caravan, including myself, left for the townhall, where the colonel had an audience with the Red Army general in control of Dresden. The colonel asked about any sick United States or British troops who might be in the area, but the Soviet general brushed aside the request.

"This is the Soviet sector, and not your affair," he said. "If there are any Americans about, they will be sent back to your lines."

The colonel disregarded this advice and the caravan scoured the city. We found 35 sick GI's, some in a former prisoner camp, others in nearby homes—all too weak to go anywhere on their own. From that day on, 76th Division cars came to our place twice a day to pick up incoming GI's.

On the morning of June 28, my father and I went to the United States zone for a few days. When we returned to Dresden the evening of July 5, instead of jeeps parked in front of the house were 2 cars with large red stars. Inside was a Soviet captain with the blue epaulets of the MVD, 5 guards, and an interpreter, Stepanenkov, an aide to General Klebov, MVD (Soviet secret police) chief of the area.

I found out what had happened in our absence. The Russians had come a few hours after we left and had put my mother and brother under house arrest. Twelve United States GI's in the house were arrested and taken to MVD headquarters, on Dresden's Hausenstrasse. Three days later a United States colonel from the 76th Division and a French officer friend were arrested as they entered the house and were interrogated for 2 days before they were released. The two American flags had been ripped down by the MVD captain.

We were searched and asked to produce our papers. I showed the captain my United States passport and protested that he had no control over United States citizens. He took the passport and just smiled that it was routine. Our papers had to be checked further, however.

"Would you please come with me?" he asked.

A few minutes later, in a bumpy Soviet jeep, I was on my way to MVD headquarters on Hausenstrasse.

IN SOLITARY CONFINEMENT

Dresden prison had been half destroyed by an allied air raid, but the Russians were using the part still intact. I was put in a 6- by 8-foot cell. There I stayed in solitary confinement for 70 days, talking to myself out loud to keep from going mad.

I was never questioned and never charged with a crime. During those 5 months I lived in the same suit I was arrested in, without a bath, a shave, a haircut or fresh air. I was given 1 pint of warm water a day in which to wash my hands and face—but not enough to rinse out my filthy clothes.

The diet bordered on slow starvation. Each morning we had bread and watery brown coffee. We had pea soup at noon and thin cabbage soup in the evening. The weakest of the prisoners finally died from malnutrition, but on August 2 the young MVD captain who patrolled the halls with a whip at his side (perhaps, in deference to Russia's allies, I was never touched) decided to hasten the process. That morning, instead of bread and coffee, we were given only coffee. For the two other meals, our soup was replaced by a cup of warm water. The next day it was the same. We were being starved to death.

The clatter the second and third day was deafening. Prisoners banged on the doors and screamed violently for food. Dr. Ring, a former Communist mayor of Chemnitz, clanged his stool ferociously against the steel door and cursed the Communists at the top of his voice. He was silenced by 20 whiplashes. Then, as the starvation continued, the clatter slowly ebbed as the prisoners lost their strength.

We received no food for 12 days. Some spent all the time seated cross-legged in front of their cell door, whimpering. They were too weak to crawl back to their bunks. I tried to conserve my strength as best I could. I stayed on my bunk, the coffee or water on a stool next to me, and took a sip every half hour to sustain life.

PRISONERS LOSE SANITY

More than half the prisoners died during this ordeal, and many other lost their sanity. There were an enormous number of suicides.

The next few months we were kept between life and death. They continued the 2-ounce ration of bread for a month, then added 2 ounces more daily each month for 4 months.

My deliverance came on January 6, 1946. I was put to work cleaning floors, delivering food and helping the prison doctor. For this I was given extra rations.

In March I was given a more responsible job—one I believe that finally sent me

to Vorkuta instead of being released with my father and others in 1950. I was put in charge of all the prison office work.

I had access to 21,000 MVD records, from which I learned that there were three kinds of prisoners; those seized by the MVD; those court-martialed by the Red Army and the MVD; and those arrested by the branch of the Communist police organization called the KPZ. The court-martial prisoners included Russian AWOL's who got 5 to 8 years, and a town's entire 7-man MVD staff, charged with wanting to defect to the West.

PEOPLE ARRESTED OFF STREETS

The KPZ police arrested 20 persons off the streets of Dresden at random each day—sent to prison those against whom they could find a charge and dispatched the others to one of the concentration camps. It made little sense, except that it succeeded in keeping the civilians in perpetual fear.

I left Dresden Prison after 15 months, on August 30, 1946, and was sent to Muhlberg concentration camp, where I stayed until September 20, 1948. Then I was transferred to Buchenwald, the Nazi horror camp, now converted to Communist use.

Some of my fellow-prisoners at Buchenwald had been inmates there during World War II, jailed by Hitler as Communists. They had been freed by the Russians in 1945 and were now imprisoned there for the second time, this time by their liberators. These former Reds violently complained to an investigating commission from Moscow that although the Nazis had been more brutal, the food and sanitation conditions were worse under the Russians.

In the middle of April 1950, 60 of us were taken to Weimar Prison, where my head was shaved. (I wasn't destined to grow hair again until 1954.) I stayed with 10 other men in a room 15 by 15 feet for months—until at 10 p. m., the evening of August 8. I was called out of my cell.

I was taken into a somber room. Though unlike the ones in the United States, it was unmistakably a courtroom. A Russian in a civilian suit but with an army shirt underneath was seated behind a long table between two tall burning candles. A young girl, an interpreter, asked me to take a seat. She handed me a paper and a pen and told me to sign the statement.

"How can I?" I protested. "I don't know what it is. I can't read Russian."

"This states," she said, "that a court was held in Moscow and that you have been sentenced to 15 years of hard labor."

"For what?" I yelled. "What is the charge? What crime have I committed? How can I be sentenced without a trial?"

"Your sentence has been confirmed in Moscow," she answered. "If you have any questions, ask them at the camp where you are going."

When I hesitated about signing, she said offhandedly: "You might as well sign it. It just acknowledges that you heard the sentence. If you don't, someone will just sign it for you." I signed.

Two days later I was taken to East Berlin by truck. At one point I could see the signs of the United States sector just 150 yards away. I wanted to reach out and grab it. We were taken to the Prison Lichtenberg in Berlin.

A week later, at 11 o'clock the evening of August 17, 1950, I was told to get my things together. Handcuffed, I was loaded onto a truck full of prisoners and driven to a portion of East Berlin that was still a mass of ruins. On a double railroad siding there were two steel trains. It was a bright night and the moon lit up the Russian characters painted across the side of the first one. I asked a companion what it said. "Postage," he answered.

A few minutes later, we boarded the train and the doors to the "Postage" car were opened, revealing eight cagelike prison cells. It was one of their devilish stalopinski prison cars—and it was headed eastward into the Soviet Union.

[The New York Times, April 4, 1955]

JAILED AMERICAN CAGED IN RAIL CAR—NOBLE TELLS OF TRAVEL ACROSS SOVIET UNION CRAMPED ON A SHELF FOR MONTH

This is a second article by a native of Detroit who was a prisoner of the Russians from 1945 to last January. It was written with Martin L. Gross.

(By John H. Noble)

(Copyright, 1955, by the North American Newspaper Alliance)

The Stolypin prison car, borrowed by the Communists from Czarist times, is named after an early Minister of Interior. It is a fiendish but quite efficient method of prisoner transportation.

Our car had eight steel-barred prison cages facing on a narrow hallway. The hallway windows were heavily curtained. Each cage had three wooden shelves. The doors were opened, and 15 of us were put into a cage, 5 on each wooden shelf. We lay there side by side on our stomachs. My head was facing toward the bars and the hallway.

It was impossible to sit up or turn around. In fact, I could not lift my head more than a foot or so, for right above me was the next shelf, with five more prisoners. Except for occasional stopovers, and a scheduled few minutes twice a day when we were taken to the bathroom, I ate and slept in this fantastic position for 4 weeks while traveling across a good part of the Soviet Union.

We were fed dry bread and some fish, and once during the month I was given a half can of meat. I was afraid to eat the salty fish because I would need more water afterward.

Our route from Brest-Litovsk to Moscow covered a distance of 700 miles, passing through Baranovichi, Stolbtsy, the outskirts of Minsk, Borisov, Orsha, Smolensk, Vyazma, and finally Moscow.

OLDEST PRISON IN SOVIET

From Moscow our stolypin car took us northward 300 miles to Vologda, where waiting trucks drove us to one of the oldest prisons in the Soviet. Thirty of us were put in a cell 20 by 10 feet. The ceiling of the room was slanted and began just 2 feet off the ground at 1 side. My wooden bunk was at the low side, and as I lay there the ceiling was just a few inches over my face.

Fortunately, the last leg of the trip, from Vologda northward, was more pleasant. We left the dreaded stolypin car, and 70 of us were put in a prison boxcar in which we could actually walk around. About 45 of the men were Soviet political prisoners. I was the only American.

We left Vologda on September 7, 1950. We traveled for a few days through dense pine forests. Then, on the 13th, the pines and white birch began to get shorter. Ahead the horizon seemed to flatten out. We were approaching the Arctic timberline.

By this time the Soviet old-timers aboard knew where we were going. They laughed at their misfortune. Straight ahead, north of the Arctic Circle, was Vorkuta, one of the coldest places on earth, and one of the largest slave-labor regions in the Soviet Union.

Two weeks after I arrived at Vorkuta, on September 16, 1950, the snow started to fall and I experienced by first Arctic snowstorm. The temperature in Vorkuta was continually below zero, and most often fell to between 30 and 70 below. Once it hit 72° below centigrade (—96° Fahrenheit). The fierce polar winds froze our faces, hands and feet, and blew the snow into 7-foot drifts.

THE SUN NEVER RISES

Vorkuta looks like another world. During January and February the sun never rises at all. Snow is on the ground for months of the year, and since there are no trees or vegetation that far north, nothing protruded above the endless snow but the barracks of our ugly camp.

After 10 days in a transit camp, I was assigned to Camp No. 3 and given a bunk in one of the barracks. The barracks were makeshift affairs, insulated with ashes in the walls and patched here and there with wood. My bunk was actually less than a 2-foot space on a long wooden shelf that held 120 men.

We were issued cotton-padded clothes with our number stenciled across the hat and the upper right leg of the pants. I was slave No. 1–E–241. Our camp of 4,500 men worked coal mines 12, 14, and 16. I was assigned to heavy duty work on the surface of mine No. 16, pushing coal cars full of 2 tons of slate. I was now a full-fledged slave laborer.

A Soviet slave is something unique in modern times. Our hard labor without pay was not punishment or rehabilitation—just plain economics. Without us there would be no coal production in Vorkuta, no gold in Magadan in the Far East. In all there are approximately 20 million slaves like myself in the Soviet Union. If the Communists had to pay us full wages it would wreck the Soviet economy.

Vorkuta is basically a coal-mining area although many of my fellow 400,000 slave laborers worked on construction jobs in cement and brick factories, in electric tower stations, and on the railroad. We also had a large number of women prisoners in these other industries. Vorkuta is a 600-square-mile area 50 miles north of the Arctic Circle, 60 miles south of the Arctic Ocean, and 1,500 miles northeast of Leningrad—to which we were connected by railroad. Our 40 mines produced all the coal for Leningrad and about one-twelfth the total Soviet production.

WASHED IN ICE WATER

My day began at 5:30 in the morning when we washed in ice-cold water or snow. Our outhouse was a little unheated shed 150 yards from the barracks. To make it without freezing I ran like a deer through 2 feet of snow. The first breath of cold air each morning was so sharp it almost suffocated me.

We worked like truck horses but lived on a starvation diet. We had only two meals a day. Breakfast consisted of sticky brown bread and coffee. That had to hold us through a day of work until 6 p. m., when we had cabbage soup, a little "kasha," a sort of barley, and sometimes a one-and-one-half-inch piece of fish.

We watched each other's faces for the telltale white marks of frostbite. When signs of frostbite appeared, we rubbed the skin with our bare hands until it turned red again. To keep my toes from freezing, I wiggled them constantly in my large canvas shoes. Even though we were weak, we often ran through the snow just to create a little warmth.

My job was on the surface of the mine. The slate dug up with the coal was dumped into a small car, which another prisoner and I had to push 160 yards. The slate-filled car weighed 2 tons. When we got to the end of the track, we tilted the car and dumped out the slate. We did this 70 times a day, with no lunch and no time off. The work was more than I thought a human body could stand.

CARD PLAYING FORBIDDEN

We had no recreation. Card playing and singing were strictly forbidden. No more than 5 men could gather together at 1 time. For entertainment, we had radio Moscow, which came blaring over the loudspeaker in the barracks.

I had 3 days off a month. These were my salvation. Generally I spent them in the barracks sleeping.

I had nothing to look forward to in my life at Vorkuta. Only the dream that some day a rebellion in the Soviet Union or a shakeup in the Kremlin would somehow free us gave me enough strength to keep going.

[The New York Times, April 5, 1955]

VARIED GROUPS FOUND IN VORKUTA, ARCTIC SLAVE CAMP OF THE SOVIET—IMPRISONED DETROITER CAME ACROSS REDS, ANTI-REDS, HARDENED CRIMINALS, AND FREEMEN IN FRIGID COMMUNITY

This is a third article by a native of Detroit who was a prisoner of the Russians from 1945 to last January. It was written in collaboration with Martin L. Gross.

(By John H. Noble)

(Copyright, 1955, by the North American Newspaper Alliance)

Soviet slave camps are sometimes thought to be reserved for the enemies of communism, but the prisoner complement of Vorkuta read more like a Who's Who of the Communist world.

A former First Secretary of the Communist Party of Estonia, who had labored to turn his country over to the Russians, was handing out food in Mine No. 29. There were a number of former deputy ministers of East Germany and the satellite countries and regional leaders of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union itself.

In my Camp No. 3, was imprisoned a Soviet diplomat, Gureyvich, who had been recalled from Paris shortly after World War II and arrested as he got off the plane in Moscow. We also had a colleague of Trotsky's who had been in Soviet prisons for 19 years; a former professor the the University of Leningrad and Dmitri Bespalo, an active member of the Young Communist League from the University of Kiev who had been arrested for "agitation."

There were many disillusioned East Germans who once thought communism was a good idea, and even two Spanish Communists who had helped expedite war materials from Odessa to the Spanish Loyalists during Spain's civil war. They stayed on in the Soviet Union after Franco won and were arrested by the MVD, the secret police.

Not everyone at Vorkuta, of course, was an ex-Red. We were a polyglot army of slave laborers from every walk of life and almost every country in the world. In my camp there were Poles who had served with the Allies in General Anders' army during World War II, and hundreds of Lithuanians, Latvians, and Estonians who had resisted the forced deportation of millions of their people.

There were 10 Greeks who had been taken prisoners by the Communists during their civil war, and hundreds of Ukrainians who fought for independence in the "Bandera" Army against both the Nazis and the Communists during World War II.

HUNDREDS OF GERMANS

There were hundreds of Germans, both Communists and Nazis, and some ex-S. S. troopers. We had representation from France in one prisoner named René Feret. An Englishman named Chapman was in Camp No. 10, and Eve Robinson, an Englishwoman, was in the women's camp.

We had prisoners from Iraq, Italy, Mongolia, China, Czechoslovakia, and later, two North Koreans accused of disloyalty to their regime.

I was known as the "Amerikanitz." I was the only American prisoner in Camp No. 3. After I was there a while, though, I heard about other Americans in Vorkuta—Cox, Towers, Private Marchuk, and Private Verdine, and a Roy Linder, who said he had been an officer in the United States Air Force in West Berlin. Linder has since been released and the last I heard he was working as a "free" laborer in the city of Vorkuta.

There are definitely other Americans still in the Soviet Union as slaves. From a Yugoslav who talked with them, I learned that eight American fliers whose plane had been shot down over the Baltic Sea were imprisoned not far from Vorkuta. They told the Yugoslav they were afraid they would never be released because the Russians had officially reported them dead.

From other prisoners I heard some startling news. Laborers coming to Vorkuta from camps in Taishet, and Irkuntsk and Omsk in Siberia, and Magadan in the Far East told me there were American GI's and officers and South Korean soldiers working as slaves in their camps. They had been taken prisoners by the Reds during the Korean war and shipped to the Soviet Union.

Ninety-five percent of Vorkuta's inmates were political prisoners. The rest were the accursed "blatnoi," the hardened criminals—the most hated and feared men in the camp. They had an unwritten agreement with the MVD. In return for keeping us political prisoners in line, the blatnoi were given certain privileges.

LIFELONG SOVIET CRIMINALS

The blatnoi were an ugly group. They were lifelong Soviet criminals, many of whom had started life as bezprizorni—the wild vagrant children who are common in Russia. Their backs were covered with vulgar and grotesque tattoos.

The blatnoi either stole what they wanted from us or simply demanded we surrender anything they admired. It wasn't wise to refuse. They ruled with an iron hand. Those who came into the blatnoi's disfavor were sometimes beaten, more often murdered.

Officially, the blatnoi were also slave laborers, but they would kill anyone in their ranks who so much as picked up a shovel. They spent their time in the barracks eating, playing cards and cursing. They came down to the mines only to sharpen their homemade knives.

The blatnoi were popular only when one of them killed a prisoner who had turned MVD informer. Those blatnoi who became too tough for even the MVD to handle were shipped to the Arctic Ocean island of Novaya Zemlya, from which there is no return.

Vorkuta had other inmates besides the slave laborers. It has a population of almost 750,000, including more than 300,000 "free" people who live in Arctic isolation to service the slave camps.

We prisoners lived in 175 camps, from a few hundred up to 12,000 inmates in each. The "free" people lived in downtown Vorkuta, a cobblestoned town built since World War II, in one of the 4 villages outside the city, or in one of 30 poseloks—little settlements next to the coal mines and factories.

I had a rare opportunity to make friends with these Russians from the outside and to learn first-hand just what life is like in the Soviet Union, for I ultimately was assigned to care for the free workers' washroom.

It was a university education in Soviet life. I worked there for a year, 24 hours on duty and 24 hours off. The room was next to the camp office and the young Communist executives would come in to change their good clothes.

There are two kinds of "free" people in Vorkuta, I learned. Most are either Communist executives assigned there or ordinary workers from all over the Soviet Union who have come for the Arctic bonus pay. The others are former slave laborers who have completed their sentence but are now in lifelong exile.

Many of these "free" people are completely dissatisfied with life, not only in Vorkuta but in the Soviet Union itself. The average Soviet male worker earns about 700 to 800 rubles a month, but he needs more than 1,500 rubles just to give his family the bare necessities. In almost every case, the women—who get 600 rubles a month—must work so the family can have enough to eat. There is very little left over for anything else.

Some of the "free" people of Vorkuta had short-wave radios and listened to the Voice of America, Radio Free Europe, the West German stations and the BBC. But most Russians are quite ignorant of the outside world. (The average Russian three-tube radio can't pierce the Iron Curtain. However, the trusted people can buy short-wave sets. There is no law against listening to foreign broadcasts.)

But there is one thing most Russian people do know about the world. Rumors of the prosperity of the American worker and the development of Western Europe have reached every portion of the Soviet Union.

The Red executives asked me question after question about the United States. What does a worker make? How much do shoes cost? How long do you have to work to buy a radio? They knew the American workers were better off, but some of the more stalwart Reds called it "a bubble that will burst."

They openly admitted that there was no freedom in the Soviet Union, but some half-heartedly defended this. "The Government could not control if the people had freedom," one told me. The freedom they miss personally is the chance to get up and quit a job and take another.

[The New York Times, April 6, 1955]

VORKUTA STRIKE SHOCKED SOVIET AFTER DISTURBING EVENTS OF 1954—NOBLE SAYS REBELLION IN ARCTIC CAMP WAS RELATED TO THE DEATH OF STALIN, BERIA DOWNFALL, AND EAST GERMAN TROUBLE

This is the fourth of five articles by a native of Detroit who was a prisoner of the Russians from 1945 to last January. The articles were written in collaboration with Martin L. Gross.

(By John H. Noble)

(Copyright, 1955, by North American Newspaper Alliance)

Vorkuta seethed with discontent. We slave laborers were fed up with the inhuman conditions, the abject monotony, the incessant work, the MVD informers, the terrible cold, the persecution by the murderous criminal blatnoi and the hopelessness.

Many of the "free" people were also fed up with the Arctic isolation. Then too, there was continual strife between the Soviet Army and the MVD secret police troops. The army men, who lived on the tundra, sympathized with us be-

cause their life was so similar. The MVD, whose pay was six times higher, lived in town, where there were dancing, women, and a movie, and considered themselves superior.

In camp, our resentment boiled up occasionally in sabotage. Prisoners blew up mine shafts with stolen dynamite. All Vorkuta was a ticking time bomb. It needed only a spark to set it off.

THREE RELATED INCIDENTS

In 1953, three closely related incidents provided the spark. The first was the death of the old one, Stalin, in March.

Stalin's death sent a wave of hope through Vorkuta. The release of the Jewish doctors, who had been freed after being charged with involvement in murders suggested something must be happening. Then, on April 14, an amnesty was given all prisoners serving less than 5 years.

Months passed. Then, in June, we heard startling news. Lavrenti P. Beria, the boss of all the slave camps, had been arrested. From then on, the officials of the camp were split—some loyal to Beria, the others to Georgi M. Malenkov, the new Premier. The MVD officers were visibly shaken.

What happened next surprised even the most astute of my fellow slave laborers in camp No. 3. One hundred thousand slaves in Vorkuta went on strike.

CREDIT TO EAST GERMANS

Part of the credit belongs to the East Germans. On June 18, when Radio Moscow announced over our barracks loudspeaker the news of the Germans uprising we cheered. Their spirit inspired us and we discussed the possibility of striking for our freedom. But we were afraid it was impossible.

Someone else made the decision for us. The first week in July, when the snow was all melted and the sun shone continually, I heard from the "free" people in the washroom that mines No. 17 and 18 were striking. The slaves had simply put down their tools and refused to go into the mine. And, strangest of all, the MVD was doing nothing about it.

Then the strike spread to mines No. 9, 10, and 25, then to mine No. 7, in our neighboring camps.

Coal cars coming through our camp from mine No. 7 were three-fourths empty, and chalked across the inside in big, bold Russian letter was written: "To hell with your coal. We want freedom!" Leaflets pasted on the car read: "Comrades from mines 12, 14, and 16. Don't let us down. You know we are striking."

We formed a strike committee. The leader was Gureyvich, the former diplomat. A committee representative came to see me in the barracks.

"When the time is ready for the camp to strike, you will have the most important job, Noble," he said. "It is your responsibility to convince the Communist department managers and engineers not to interfere. You are an American. They respect you. They remember all the equipment your country sent during the war. They know your food was the only thing that kept them from starving."

The time came July 23. The prisoners needed something to give them extra courage. We went to work that morning, but about noon, new arrivals from the Karaganda slave camp refused to go into the mine unless they were issued working clothes. The storeroom had none. That set it off. Everyone took the example of the Karaganda rebels and refused to work.

PRINTED STRIKE LEAFLETS

In the washroom one of the department managers seemed pleased. He said: "I see you've finally gotten up enough courage to start." I convinced him he should leave the camp and take one of the others, a dogmatic Communist, with him. A few minutes later the chief engineer and the other "free" people left. I had done my job.

When I got back to the barracks I learned that printed strike leaflets with our demands were posted in all the barracks and outhouses—although we had no press. I rushed into our outhouse to see. I saw an MVD guard pasting a leaflet on the wall. We had excellent allies. Some of Beria's men obviously had helped to start the revolt or were using it to their advantage.

Our demands were simple: Release of all prisoners who had served 10 years or more in any Soviet prison; for the rest the authorities should check the records, release all the innocent, and set new, lower sentences according to international law. Otherwise, we said, no coal comes out of the mine for Leningrad.

Thirty of the Karaganda men who had set off the strike had been put into the camp prison. Immediately 2,000 of us, with Gureyvich and the strike committee, stormed down toward the prison. MVD Major Tchevchenko, the camp commander, and his political officer, Captain Buikov, tried to calm us, but we parked in front of the prison and yelled for the release of the Karagandas.

Meanwhile the MVD lieutenant in charge of restriction pulled up with several police cars and trucks. One hundred MVD and army troops piled out and surrounded the camp fences. Our crowd started cursing and barred their way through the gate.

Then suddenly the Karagandas, who had overcome three drunken guards in the prison, dashed out into the yard. We set up a tremendous yell. Immediately the MVD lieutenant ordered: "Open fire."

I was pinned against the administration building about 50 yards from the troops and was caught in a crossfire of submachinegun and rifle bullets. I pressed flat against the wall. From where I stood I could see that the army men and some of the MVD guards were not firing.

[The New York Times, April 7, 1955]

MASSACRE ENDED 1954 REBELLION IN VORKUTA, SOVIET SLAVE CAMP—DETROITER WHO TOOK PART IN INCIDENT IN THE ARCTIC TELLS HOW GUARDS SHOT DOWN A CROWD OF STRIKERS

This is the last of five articles by a native of Detroit who was a prisoner of the Russians from 1945 to last January. The articles were written in collaboration with Martin L. Gross.

(By John H. Noble)

(Copyright, 1955, by North American Newspaper Alliance)

The first day of the strike at Vorkuta, about 300 soldiers were deployed around our camp gates in newly dug trenches. We could see the machineguns and mortars being put in place.

At 6 p. m. Captain Buikov, political officer of the MVD, the secret police, asked permission to enter the camp and speak with us. He came in unescorted and unarmed and read an order from General Derevyanko, the MVD chief. From this day on our pay was to be tripled to 300 rubles a month; the bars were to be taken off the windows; it was no longer required to wear slave numbers sewn on our clothes; the barracks would not be locked after evening rollcall; Russian citizens could write home once a month instead of twice a year.

On July 27, Derevyanko himself, accompanied by the Minister of Internal Affairs for the Komi Republic, came to speak with us. They, too, were unarmed and unescorted. They walked from one group of us to another, asking in a solicitous, fatherly manner, "Don't you think it would be best to start production again?" Before leaving Derevyanko announced that General Maslennikov, Deputy Minister of Internal Affairs for the whole Soviet Union was being sent up from Moscow to speak to us.

MOSCOW'S REPRESENTATIVE

On July 29, at noon, someone ran into my barracks and announced that Moscow's representative was coming up the road.

One hundred heavily armed guards formed two lines directly inside the gate. Between them a long black car drove through. The general got out.

Following Maslennikov on foot were thirty officers, mostly colonels. They all walked to the football field, where we had set up chairs and a long table for them.

For days before Gureyvich and the strike committee had prepared a list of 20 speakers.

The scene was the most stirring I have ever witnessed. On the football field in front of the assembled Kremlin brass we stood 4,500 strong. Then, from the ranks, one man at a time would step out to speak—slowly slave laborers—given their chance to pour out their hearts about Red indecency to the Communist mightiest.

The speeches were beautiful—intelligent and biting. A former professor of history from the University of Leningrad said before he started that he knew

this would mean an extra 10 years in jail, but it couldn't be helped. He traced the history of slavery, then compared our lot to that of other slaves. "Never in the history of the world have working slaves been treated so cruelly as they are in the Soviet Union," he said.

SPEAKER BRINGS TEARS

Another speaker brought tears. In a loud, angry, booming voice, a former officer of the Red army showed his contempt for communism.

"I was raised as a Communist since childhood, and I knew no other way. I served heroically in the Red army during the war. I was decorated many times, and 17 times I took bullet wounds, and returned to fight again. I was wounded the 18th time and fell unconscious in the field. When I came to, I was a German prisoner. I escaped and joined a band of our countrymen fighting the Nazis as Partisans. Then, in 1946, when the Government learned I had once been a German POW, I was sentenced to 20 years in Vorkuta. Now I have come to the conclusion that communism breeds slavery."

Maslennikov was obviously shocked. He listened for over an hour, his face blanched. He had never heard such works spoken in the Soviet Union since 1917. He never spoke, except every few minutes to warn: "Remember, you are insulting the great Soviet Union."

Nothing happened until 3 days later. At 6 a. m. on August 1, someone shook me in the bunk. The men of mine No. 7 were being removed from the camp in small groups. Under heavy guard they were being taken into the tundra. We watched carefully from our camp. When 30 groups were assembled in the tundra, the slaves started returning one at a time into the camp.

Soon after we found out what happened. The troops had let the first group go back without a word. Then they told the second group that the first had agreed to return to work. "Will you agree to go back to camp and return to work too, or do we have to shoot you all right here and now?" one of the MVD guards in charge asked each group by pre-arranged order.

That broke the strike in camp No. 7.

Then at 9 a. m. 800 heavily armed MVD and army troops especially brought in from Moscow came to the gate of our camp, with General Masslinenkov at their head. The strike committee went out and spoke with the general. Masslinenkov gave Gureyvich the ultimatum of work or death. Gureyvich, stalling for time, asked for 24 hours "to think it over." Masslinenkov agreed. As events showed the delay saved many of our lives.

OUTBURST OF GUNFIRE

From our camp Masslinenkov and his troops moved to mine No. 29 up on the hill next to us. At 11 o'clock, we suddenly heard an outburst of gunfire that lasted for 2 full minutes. At the time it seemed like a lifetime.

Later, we were able to reconstruct what had happened. As he had at our camp, Maslennikov arrived at mine No. 29 with his small army equipped with heavy machineguns. Immediately, the 2,500 slave laborers crowded around the gate. Using the loudspeaker on his staff car, Maslennikov bellowed: "Go back to your barracks! Do as camp No. 7 has. They have agreed to return to work." The people called back insults and crowded closer to the fence.

Maslennikov ordered guards to go in and split up the crowd. One squad went in single file, then, frightened at the sight of the crowd, ran back to the gate. A fire hose was brought up and pushed through both fences surrounding the camp. But the strikers twisted the nozzle and made it useless.

Again the general ordered them to go back to the barracks, and again they refused. "All those who want to go to work, come outside the gate," he ordered. The crowd glared as 50 men of the 2,500 walked out.

Then he called out on the loudspeaker the third time. "Go back to your barracks. Organize yourself to work. This is the last warning I am giving you."

The strikers answered defiantly: "If you won't give us our freedom, we'll take it!"

THE GUARDS OPEN FIRE

Then the guards opened fire; 800 of them shot until no one was standing. It was 2 full minutes of continuous fire into a packed crowd. Blood was over everyone; 110 were killed instantly; more than 500 were wounded.

Maslennikov ordered the gates opened and barked orders to those still living to step over the bodies of their fallen comrades and come out to the tundra. Those who wouldn't agree to return to work would be killed on the spot.

The slaves of mine No. 29 cried as they walked over the bodies of their friends. The next day we, too, went back to work. The uprising was over.

The day after we returned to work the 300 men in my camp who were most active in the strike, and 7,000 throughout Vorkuta, were arrested and brought in for interrogation. Two of the men who were released a few days later told me what happened. One thousand prisoners were sent to the Far East, 1,000 were put in the camp prison, and most of the others were given 3 to 5 years additional sentences and sent to other camps. Three hundred men, including the strike committees of all the camps, were executed. We never again saw Gureyvich or the heroes who had spoken for us on the football field to Maslennikov.

ORDERED TO MOSCOW

Early in June I was eating my usual cabbage soup dinner in the messhall when my barracks master rushed in. "Amerikanitz, the camp commander is looking for you. You have orders to proceed to Moscow."

The next morning I was taken to mine No. 15. Outside a prisoner was repairing the fence. He asked, "Te tagshay Amerikanets (are you an American)?" I nodded.

"We also have two here who are going away." A few minutes later I met Privates Marchuk and Verdine, and it was a pleasure to speak English with someone again.

At the Moscow station there were 10 MVD officers on hand to greet us. We were put in a shiny bus with blue curtains and a civilian driver. Inside, away from the eyes of the people, were three prison cages. We were taken to the modern Burtyrskaya prison in downtown Moscow, where we stayed for 2 weeks. The next stop was Poima, a 12-hour train trip from Moscow.

On January 2, 1955, I was told I was going back to Moscow. I arrived there on the 5th and started receiving what appeared to be the Soviet VIP treatment.

The next day the three of us took the Blue Express from Moscow to East Berlin.

Senator MURRAY. The next witness is Mr. H. Haines Turner, Friends Committee on National Legislation.

STATEMENT OF HOWARD HAINES TURNER, FRIENDS COMMITTEE ON NATIONAL LEGISLATION

Senator MURRAY. You may state your full name and the organization you represent.

Mr. TURNER. My full name is Howard Haines Turner. I am living in Wallingford, Pa.

My occupation is adult education. I am employed by the Amalgamated Food and Allied Workers Union in New Jersey, a part of the AFL–CIO, an educational director.

I appear here today under the auspices of the Friends Committee on National Legislation.

While this organization is widely representative of the thinking of the Religious Society of Friends, it does not purport to speak for all Friends.

The democratic organization of the Society of Friends does not lend itself to official spokesmen.

In testifying in support of this resolution, before the committee, I feel, however, I am expressing the views of a great many Friends, and I come because I consider it my religious duty to testify on this resolution.

We Friends often emphasize the mystical nature of our religion. We try to attain an inward communion with God through periods of silence and meditation. Out of this silence we often find that there

arises a concern to help our fellow men. You may be familiar with the saying of William Penn:

> True godliness does not drive man out of the world but enables him to live better in it and incites his endeavors to mend it.

We have read about the forced labor which exists in several countries at the present time. The facts were substantiated by an investigation conducted jointly by ILO and the United Nations. It appears that many thousands—even millions of persons—have been put at forced labor, either as a means to change their political attitudes or to achieve the economic ends of the state.

And of course we have heard about it in more detail here today.

These systems seem to exist principally within the Communist countries, but it should be mentioned that the investigating committee also found evidence of forced labor in parts of Africa. They could not conclude for certain that forced labor was not also practiced in some other places.

Friends cannot rest easily when they realize that such conditions exist. I don't think any American rests easily when they are aware of the conditions that we have just been hearing about. We need to remember here, today—and this committee, I am sure, will be aware—that we are not just concerned with words on pieces of paper, but we need to be concerned with the fact that there are these people at this very moment at other points on earth who are struggling under these conditions. And the discussions which we may have here as to the meanings of particular words will undoubtedly be meaningless to them.

Senator MURRAY. It seems to me this story should be very startling to the American people. Many people would doubt that such conditions could exist in the world without serious effort to correct them. It doesn't seem to me that the world has been given the information on this subject that it should have been, for a long time.

I hope that as a result of these hearings, we will get some action.

Mr. TURNER. I am sure we all hope so.

If I may continue with this written statement, which is not very long—and I may take the liberty of elaborating at times, if I may do so.

Senator MURRAY. You may do so.

Mr. TURNER. I have said here that we have a responsibility to protest against this use of forced labor just as we opposed slavery in the past.

Friends are pleased to remember that their people had some part in helping abolish slavery in the United States.

In colonial days there were many Friends who accepted the custom of holding slaves and used slaves themselves.

John Woolman led the Quaker movement to do away with this practice in the 1700's. John Woolman decided when he was a young man that he could not practice slaveholding. He even refused to write wills for men who wished to hand on the ownership of human beings.

I would like to point out that John Woolman was not content to sit by while other people—even in distant parts of the Colonies—still held slaves. He spent many weeks on journeys to Virginia and to New

77294—56——16

York and New England where he visited slaveowners and let them know, in his gentle way, of course, how he felt about this practice.

Yearly meetings of the Society of Friends adopted formal minutes in the year 1776 asking the local Friends meetings to disown members who persisted in the ownership of slaves. These edicts had no force of law. Yet by the year 1800 it is said no slaves were held by members of the Society of Friends in this country.

As we all know, the American people as a whole adopted the same position in 1865, when the 13th amendment was added to the United States Constitution, forbidding slavery within the borders of our country.

Friends oppose forced labor for the same reasons that they opposed slavery. We believe that in every man, no matter how humble, there is planted the seed of God. Each man has the possibility not only to grow into a distinctive individual personality, but to show love and mercy and untold helpfulness to his fellow human beings. Every person, no matter what his present behavior may be, should be respected for this hidden seed of the divine nature.

This divine spirit can flourish only in an atmosphere of freedom and brotherhood. If man is compelled to labor against his will, violence is thereby done to his inward spirit.

The history of our country bears testimony to our beliefs. Our ancestors came to America in search of freedom. The words of our Declaration of Independence and the provisions of our Constitution stress the equal rights of all men to liberty in their pursuit of a livelihood.

Our message to the other nations of the world must be: Slavery and forced labor are contrary to the will of God and to the nature of man.

The International Labor Organization, with 74 nations represented at its last conference—seems an appropriate forum in which the United States may reaffirm its beliefs.

We realize that a convention of the ILO, if adopted, will give the Organization no authority to intervene in the affairs of any country—even though a country be a signatory to the convention, itself. Of course, this does not mean that an action of the International Labor Organization is without influence.

I would like to compare our responsibility today to that of the Friends toward slavery 200 years ago.

The Friends had no legal authority to compel others to abandon slave labor. Yet John Woolman and other Friends took great pains to speak against it. At their urging, the Friends' yearly meetings adopted resolutions, or "minutes" asking that slaves be set free.

Like those Friends' minutes, the Convention of the International Labor Organization is a statement of principle. Of course it is more. It is an international standard against which every country's conduct can be judged.

It calls for repeated inquiry, and it asks for reports of progress.

We do not know how successful these efforts will be. It is nonetheless our responsibility to our fellow men to speak out on their behalf.

We find it difficult to understand why our Government, representing a people who abandoned forced labor over 90 years ago, not only is not taking a strong lead in working for its peaceful abolition in the remainder of the world, but appears actually to be refusing to join in an

international effort to solve this problem. Or, as we heard this morning, at least delaying by discussion of legal terminology.

I would like to conclude by recalling an admonition from Edmund Burke. He said that only one thing is needful for evil to prevail: "Let good men do nothing."

We trust that our country will support this convention.

Senator MURRAY. Thank you very much for your statement.

You are familiar with the movement in ILO to accomplish the result that you are seeking, and you believe that that is probably the only way this country can operate to bring about an end to slave labor. There are 74 nations represented there. I believe that nearly all those nations, with the exception of those which come from the Soviet area, are in favor of ending slave labor. It is strange that in this country there would be some people who would like to end the ILO and circulate stories indicating that they are afraid that this ILO may subvert our freedom and independence in America, which of course is absolutely untrue.

I notice this morning an article in the Post by Marquis Childs. It is entitled, "Trouble Brewing in the ILO," and it tells the facts with reference to the present situation.

I will have this article by Marquis Childs copied into the record at this point.

(The article referred to follows:)

WASHINGTON CALLING

(By Marquis Childs)

TROUBLE BREWING IN THE ILO

The difference between doing and saying is something this administration has never understood. The words sound fine, but more often than not, deeds fail to match words.

The latest example is in the approach to the International Labor Organization, which is a United Nations agency concerned with labor standards, the training of workers in industry, and such matters.

After holding back for a long time, the Soviet Union decided, as it had a right to do, to join up and send delegates representing organized labor, the employer and government, as the ILO charter requires.

Now, obviously, for Soviet Russia to send representatives of employ and employee organizations as a fiction, since such organizations in a totalitarian society are window dressing.

But the large majority of the 71 member nations of ILo believed it was preferable to challenge this fiction within the ILO framework and, therefore, opposed any effort to keep Communist Russia's representatives out.

Not so, however, the American employer representative, William L. McGrath, who began conducting something resembling a one-man sit-down strike, at the ILO in Geneva.

Mr. Grath, named by the United States Chamber of Commerce and the National Association of Manufacturers, is an old-fashioned isolationist who supports the Bricker amendment limiting the treatymaking power of the Government, an amendment which President Eisenhower and Secretary of State John Foster Dulles have said would seriously handicap the conduct of foreign policy.

The Eisenhower administration proposed to increase the American contribution to ILO which was limited by a ceiling of $1.75 million. This gave Senator Bricker, frustrated in his main goal, a chance to snipe at ILO. He introduced an amendment providing that no increase should be granted if it was shown that employer or employee representatives from Soviet Russia or the satellites had been permitted to vote in ILO.

Not a single spokesman for the administration arose on the Republican side to explain or defend the administration proposal and the reasons why the amendment would be harmful to America's position in the ILO and the world.

The defense came from the Democratic side, with Senators declaring that the amendment would be interpreted as an attempt by the United States to dictate unilaterally the policy of this U. N. organization.

The vote was 43 to 40 for the amendment. In voting for it, 6 southern Democrats joined 37 Republicans. Among the latter were Minority Leader William F. Knowland of California and Senator Styles Bridges of New Hampshire and Leverett Saltonstall of Massachusetts. Only seven Republicans voted in opposition to the amendment. The House has not yet acted on it.

The ILO under the vigorous direction of its executive director, David Morse, has pushed an investigation into the slave labor that is the most far-reaching of its kind, showing the extent of forced labor in the Communist countries. A recent supplementary report concludes that, while there has been some slight improvement in recent years, the use of slave labor is still widespread in the Communist countries.

Covering Communist China for the first time, the report expresses the belief, on the basis of a great deal of documentary evidence, "that forced labor exists on a very large scale and that the number of persons involved represents a considerable proportion of the total population."

The documented exposé of forced labor has led to a demand within ILO for a convention which upon adoption would require member nations to abolish it. And here is a striking instance of the new flexible strategy of the Soviet Union in the post-Stalin era. In a confidential poll of members, Soviet Russia has said it would vote in favor of the convention and the satellites also will support it.

But such conventions are anathema to Senator Bricker and those who believe like him that they infringe State and Federal laws. So the United States has not made up its mind on this question, which is sure to come up when the ILO meets again in June.

It could turn out that the United States was the only major power opposing such a convention or declining to be recorded on it. With the Communists voting for it, this would put the American delegation in a highly embarrassing position.

For the free trade unions and for most European employers, the ILO is an important organization for good. It is carrying on extensive work in underdeveloped countries teaching industrial skills. For the millions who regard it as an instrument for strength and cohesion in the free world, the American attitude is hard to understand. America appears to be afraid to meet the challenge of communism in the ILO.

As several speakers pointed out, the Communist countries can muster at most only 32 votes against 280. So there is no real danger they could dominate the organization.

Senator Hubert Humphrey (Democrat of Minnesota) concluded his plea for defeat of the amendment as follows:

"I should hate to think that we in America were less confident of our position than is, let us say, Great Britain or any one of the other countries. I personally feel that any time we have an opportunity to join issue on any matter of politics, economic, culture, or social welfare with delegates from the Soviet bloc countries, we should accept it not only as a challenge but as an opportunity. We have never lost an argument in the United Nations. When it came to arguing with the Soviet bloc, we won the argument by vote."

Through much of the argument for the ILO fund amendment ran a reminiscent theme of past isolationism. If these European countries would not follow the American precept, then it might be better just to let them stew in their own juice.

This is an ominous portent for the decisions that lie beyond this election year when American policy in matters far more important than ILO may be overruled.

Mr. TURNER. I have not heard it said here that ILO should be abolished or that we should not cooperate with the ILO, but it has been suggested there are different ways in which the United States could achieve this purpose.

I do not wish to urge that the Convention of the ILO is the only way by which we could attain the purpose of outlawing, or doing away with, slave labor, or this forced-labor system, but we have heard that

the majority of other nations have already taken a position in favor of the Convention.

It seems to me it is our duty to cooperate with them in bringing about a purpose to which we, above all nations, must subscribe.

Senator MURRAY. The employer delegate of the ILO, though, is opposed to this Convention and has made speeches condemning it.

I have here an article that I prepared, once, back in 1952, discussing this effort on the part of the employer delegate at the ILO, seeking to end the ILO. I would like to have that copied into the record at this point, too. It is entitled "A Speech by the Honorable James G. Murray, of Montana," and it is dated March 27, 1952.

(The speech follows:)

INTERNATIONAL LABOR ORGANIZATION SPEECH OF JAMES E. MURRAY, OF MONTANA, IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES ON MARCH 27, 1952

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I recently received in my office an article written by the Reverend George A. Higgins, assistant director of the social action department of the National Catholic Welfare Conference.

The article refers to the purposes and programs of the International Labor Organization and answers some unfounded criticisms directed at that Organization. The article deals particularly with some statements made by Mr. William L. McGrath, who is the appointed adviser of Mr. Charles P. McCormick, the official employer delegate to the International Conference of the ILO. Mr. McGrath, speaking under the auspices of the United States Chamber of Commerce, said:

"In the case of the United States and Canada, the Government delegates sent to the Conference merely reflect, to all intents and purposes, the dominance of the the labor influence in our present respective administrations and go right down the line of state socialism. They, too, along with labor delegates from the United States and Canada, apparently join in the assumption that nothing can be effective save through governmental regulation and control."

These remarks of Mr. McGrath are obviously without foundation or justification in any respect.

In calling attention to this matter, I wish to say that I have a very high regard for Mr. McCormick, who is the employer delegate to the ILO. Knowing Mr. McCormick as I do, I am convinced that when he studies Mr. McGrath's statement on the merits he will arrive at a totally different conclusion than the one arrived at by his adviser. I am confident that industrial and commercial organizations of the United States, interested in developing a better spirit of cooperation between workers and employers in America and improved conditions for workers throughout the world, will not approve Mr. McGrath's statements.

American industry has found that organized labor in the United States has been of great benefit to our capitalistic system in meeting on a sound and intelligent basis the difficult problems that arise in American business and industrial life.

The Wall Street collapse of 1929 and the depression of the 1930's which followed were due mainly to the unorganized condition of American workers and farmers and the lack of adequate legislation recognizing their interest and concern in our economic system. Workers in that period were not receiving their fair share of production. The employers were taking too large a cut in the profits of industry, with the result that the purchasing power of workers and farmers finally became insufficient to support our capitalistic economy. The result was economic collapse, mass unemployment, and a serious threat of communism.

In this country, following the collapse of our economy in 1929, which was followed by the great depression, we set to work to remove the shackles from the American worker and the American farmer. The purchasing power of these groups soon began to rise. In a few short years we had full employment and a purchasing power of such magnitude as to raise our economy to the highest record of production and earnings in our history. Thus the United States became the greatest industrial power in the world.

In discussing the conditions which brought on the economic collapse in the United States in the thirties, Fortune magazine said:

"With the successful establishment of many of the principles of those early political thinkers, and with the fulfilling of many of the dreams of those early capitalists, the system that they conceived has faltered. Its irreversibility is no longer apparent. Three of the biggest nations in the Western World, and many lesser ones, have rejected it almost in entirety. * * * Capitalist democracy no longer stands forth as the emancipator of mankind. Its enemies denounce it as a humbug—a system that pretends to emancipate all men but in actuality has emancipated only some men in certain portions of the earth under favorable circumstances. Its friends, on the other hand, fail to defend it. Their words result in oratory and their deeds in confusion."

Fortune magazine, in continuing its editorial, points out that "in operating the capitalist economy, American business has consistently misappropriated the principles of democracy. American business has made use of its principles to its own enormous profit, but it has failed entirely to grasp the social implications of its profitmaking. As representing the capitalist economy, business has an obligation to build a workable economic system."

But by 1932 it was evident that business had failed to do this. The result was an economic collapse, and the Government was compelled to act in the national interest. A liberal Congress was called into action in 1933. It acted with courage and dispatch. Most of these evils which heretofore prevailed in our economy have now been corrected. The workers and the farmers have been emancipated. Very important changes have taken place in our economy and, as a result, we laid the foundation in this country for a vast industrial expansion and widespread prosperity. This changed economy is now being called the American way of life.

I would recommend that anyone interested in this matter should read the article by Mr. Will Lissner, entitled "Shift in Income Distribution Reducing Poverty in the United States," appearing in the New York Times of March 5, 1952—see Congressional Record of March 5, page A1462.

This article tells the complete chronological story of how we saved democracy in America and made the economic system operate for the welfare of all. This is the only way in which the nations of the world can oppose the march of communism.

The aim of the ILO is to improve the condition of the workers and farmers, strengthen democratic government, and raise living standards throughout the world and thus build a barrier against communism.

Low wages and evil working conditions in other parts of the world directly affect the United States as well as other countries that seek to maintain high levels of wages and working conditions. The United States and other countries maintaining similar policies cannot compete with countries that indulge in sweatshop practices and low wages. The program of the International Labor Organization, as I have stated, is to improve labor conditions, encourage the development of backward areas, and spread prosperity and raise the standard of living throughout the world. It thus would strengthen capitalism, combat communism, and make it possible for all countries to compete in the markets of the world under fair competitive conditions.

A short time ago I read a press dispatch from Frankfurt, Germany, in which Mr. Jean Cattier, the United States economic adviser and Marshall plan chief in Germany, warned the German industrialists that they must pay higher wages. He said, "It is unhealthy for any economy to operate in such a manner that a small group of people live in luxury while the great masses have a meager existence." "Germany is now operating under such conditions," Mr. Cattier said. "Its industry and business must learn to operate on a smaller margin of profit and to pass on more of their proceeds in wages and salaries. The German worker should have a greater share of the proceeds of his labor. The consumer and wage earner cannot go on bearing the burden of high profits, heavy capital expenditures, extensive building up of reserves which fall on him by way of high prices and low wages."

Mr. McGrath appears to question the Government's control and regulation of industry. I need only say that every regulation and control of business that has been enacted by Congress has been demanded by the American people. Who is there to complain about the Securities and Exchange Commission, the Federal Trade Commission, the National Labor Relations Board, the Interstate Commerce Commission, the Federal Communications Commission, or the many other

agencies set up to regulate business and protect the interests of the investors, the businessmen, the workers, and the consumers of the Nation? If we had had the National Labor Relations Act, the present banking laws, and the Securities and Exchange Commission in operation in the late 1920's, there would have been no Wall Street collapse in 1929.

Mr. President, the legislation enacted in the 1930's, following the Wall Street collapse, has saved our capitalistic system from the self-destroying greed referred to by Fortune magazine that was gnawing at its vitals. It has saved democracy from the various desperate forces that were threatening it.

Mr. President, I think the points I have made completely refute the statements of Mr. McGrath. If the economic policies and programs now being advocated by the ILO are carried into practice everywhere, the threat of communism will disappear and we will be rescued from the fog of fear and uncertainty under which we have been living since the end of the war.

Senator MURRAY. Does that end your testimony?

Mr. TURNER. Yes.

Senator MURRAY. Thank you very much.

The next witness was to be Mr. Jerzi Glicksman, representative, Jewish Labor Committee.

If Mr. Glicksman desires, he may file a statement with the committee, and any other person here who wishes to do so will be permitted to file a statement at any time before the hearings are closed.

That will conclude the hearings today, and the committee will recess, subject to the call of the Chair.

(Whereupon, at 2:35 p. m., the subcommittee recessed, to reconvene at the call of the Chair.)

APPENDIX

UNITED STATES SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES,
Washington, D. C., March 27, 1956.

Hon. LISTER HILL,
Chairman, Senate Committee on Labor and Education,
United States Senate, Washington 25, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR HILL: Pending before your committee is Senate Joint Resolution 117, introduced by the junior Senator from Minnesota, Mr. Humphrey. This resolution calls upon the United States Government to work with other nations—in fact, assume leadership—through the International Labor Organization to develop and adopt a convention to abolish forced labor for political or economic purposes.

As you know, the convention is the strongest weapon available to the ILO which will act on the question of forced labor next June. The United States is the only major industrial nation of the world that has not acted or indicated it will act to support a convention to abolish forced labor. In fact, the United States Government is the only government among member states to fail to answer an ILO questionnaire asking whether the forthcoming ILO discussions on forced labor should take the form of a convention or the weaker form of either a recommendation or a resolution.

It is utterly inconceivable to me that the United States Government should take this position when the opportunity is now before us to outlaw throughout the world the inhuman practice of forced labor. It is particularly incomprehensible in view of the fact that the United States Government has spearheaded the joint United Nations-International Labor Organization investigation into forced labor. As far back as 1947, at the request of the American labor movement the United States Government introduced the question of forced labor in the United Nations. Our Government pursued this question with vigor until the subject was referred to the ILO by the U. N. and a joint ILO-U. N. ad hoc committee was assigned to study the question and make its report.

This report, issued in May 1953, showed clearly that forced labor for both economic and political purposes exists in the Soviet Union, Bulgaria, and Czechoslovakia. The report showed that forced labor for political purposes existed in Rumania and that in Rumania there also exists legislation which could be the basis of forced labor for economic purposes.

Of extreme gratification to the free world the report likewise showed there was no evidence to support allegations of forced labor in the United States, the United Kingdom, France or other nations of the Free World.

This joint ILO-U. N. report has mobilized world opinion against slave labor as never before. Its subsequent adoption by the U. N. for the first time in history officially condemned the Soviet Union for its inhuman practice of slave labor.

A new ad hoc committee is now at work updating the 1953 report.

In the glare of this international spotlight, the Soviet Union is reported to be willing to support a convention. Indeed, reports indicate that in the Soviet Union and other Iron Curtain countries which have used slave labor extensively, there have been some significant changes in the operations of forced labor camps. Many of Stalin's infamous concentration and forced labor camps are reported to be closed. Some inmates are said to have been rehabilitated and restored to as complete freedom as exists in these countries. In this manner, the Soviet Government attempts to present a new face to the world.

In spite of these publicized reforms, there is reason to believe that slave labor continues to be one of the bulwarks of the Soviet economy and the Communist way of life. Just last February 2, the Chinese Nationalist Government charged that Communist China has sent 1½ million slave laborers to the Soviet

Union and its satellites in exchange for military supplies; this charge is part of the U. N. Secretary-General's report to the Economic and Social Council, and will be considered by that group April 17.

This is no time to let up the fight against man's inhumanity to man. It is the time to keep the splotlight of public opinion focused on these nations which continue to practice slave labor.

Let the United States of America, where labor has achieved its greatest freedom and reaped its highest rewards, and whose Government has led the fight against slave labor, once again assume leadership in this cause.

A hearing before your committee is the vital first step toward passage of Senate Joint Resolution 117 and United States support of a convention to abolish forced labor. I respectfully urge such a hearing at the earliest possible moment.

Passage of Senate Joint Resolution 117 and subsequent adoption of the convention by the ILO will be a smashing climax to a fight America should be proud to have started. To fail to pass Senate Joint Resolution 117 would be to back away from victory.

Sincerely yours,

HENRY M. JACKSON, *United States Senator.*

STATEMENT BY JAMES B. CAREY, PRESIDENT, INTERNATIONAL UNION OF ELECTRICAL, RADIO AND MACHINE WORKERS, AFL-CIO

Gentlemen, it is a pleasure and a privilege to make known to you the opinion, on Senate Joint Resolution No. 117, of the organization I have the honor to represent.

The men and women of the free American trade unions are naturally and deeply interested in every step toward the stamping out of forced labor. We have encouraged every advance in that direction. We have done this in our active cooperation with the free labor unions of other lands united in the International Confederation of Free Trade Unions.

Many and many a time, official spokesmen for our country have made loud and massive noises on international questions when they might better have seized the opportunity to remain silent. Yet now, when a clear-cut opportunity is presented to speak up firmly in a matter where our conscience must lead us to stand with free people everywhere, this is the moment some people here in Washington have chosen to show how well they can imitate the ostrich. Moral leadership and the dignity of man seem to be words in very good standing in our Department of State. That would not, however, be evident from their stand on Resolution No. 117, as presented in Assistant Secretary Robert C. Hill's letter to your committee on April 25, 1956.

The two arguments advanced by these critics of this resolution show that indeed the Department of State bases its stand not on any inspired strategic ability to express the aspirations toward freedom of hundreds of millions of humble people on both sides of the Iron Curtain, but rather simply on fear, uninspiring fear of Bulganin and Senator Bricker.

I am certain that your committee is giving the two arguments of the Department of State the consideration they deserve. Here is our State Department objecting to this resolution because it would raise matters of "domestic concern." Is forced labor any more purely "domestic" than the United Nations Declaration of Human Rights? Is the Department of State trying in its own faltering fashion to inform us that the present administration is out to reverse our traditional American conviction that destruction of freedom anywhere is a blow to the security of our own freedom? And is this what they are trying to inform the world as well? Will the Voice of America urge the millions of slave laborers in Siberia to take consolation in the thought that, by neglecting a chance to bring pressure to bear for their freedom, we are at least making Senator Bricker happy?

The other argument advanced by the Department of State is monumental. According to the New York Times of April 26, 1956, their statement "noted that the Soviet Union had endorsed the convention idea" and said that this "is indicative of what might be expected from the adoption of this form of action." We thus serve notice on the rulers of the Soviet Union: Do you want to kill any program desired by America and other free peoples? Make believe you accept it—and the United States Department of State will kill it for you.

The United Nations Economic and Social Council requested the ILO in 1949 to investigate forced labor. At that time, and for several years afterward, the Russians voted against and often made this the subject of bitter and insulting

attacks against the ILO. Whether Stalin was too stubborn, or he thought that American spokesmen were too clever for him to try to trip us up by claiming to agree is a moot point, particularly with Stalin dead. By cleverly claiming to support the convention to outlaw forced labor, the present Soviet leaders have shown that they are very much alive. Would that the same could be said for our present administration.

The vote of 13 to 2 by which the Economic and Social Council on May 1, 1956, commended the ILO work in this field has given us a new opportunity. The American vote in favor of the resolution, which urges action toward the elimination of forced labor, is highly commendable. The Russian and Czech vote against the resolution, after their failure to secure amendments cutting out reference to the ILO report exposing forced labor in Communist countries, showed the hypocrisy of the Soviet support of the convention to outlaw forced labor. American diplomacy cannot, however, turn these events to good use to expose that Soviet hypocrisy as long as our own Department of State continues to take positions that must appear to the world as equally contradictory.

Certainly, there has been sufficient testimony before this committee to show that there need be no legitimate fear of even seeming to usurp the treaty-making powers of the United States Senate by taking a stand on a convention that must meet with a two-thirds vote of approval before it can become effectime in this country.

A resumption of the State Department's new retreat from the reality of world politics will discredit its authors in this country, where the pioneering spirit has always been more beloved and respected than the spirit of fear and timidity. Perhaps more disturbing is the effect such pusillanimity will have on our friends in the world who expect us to show some courageous leadership, or if not leadership at the very least partnership, in the fight for liberty and against such scourges as forced labor.

SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF., *April 25, 1956.*

Senator PAUL H. DOUGLAS,
Chairman, Senate Subcommittee on Labor,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.:

Impossible for me to be in Washington to testify in person at public hearings April 27, on Senate Joint Resolution 117. However, I am sending you short written statement of my views on the resolution in hopes it will be helpful to subcommittee's deliberations.

Sincerely,

J. D. ZELLERBACH,
President, Crown Zellerbach Corp.

STATEMENT OF J. D. ZELLERBACH, PRESIDENT, CROWN ZELLERBACH CORP.

My name is J. D. Zellerbach. I am president of Crown Zellerbach Corp. of San Francisco. I was United States employer delegate to the International Labor Organization from 1945 to 1948, and also served as vice chairman of its governing body. I have continued to follow the activities of the ILO with keen interest, and I am submitting a brief statement on Senate Joint Resolution 117 in hopes my views may be of help to the subcommittee.

I am strongly in favor of Senate Joint Resolution 117. In fact, I hardly see how the United States Government can do other than "* * * exercise leadership in the International Labor Organization to develop and adopt an international convention which will effectively outlaw forced labor for political and economic purposes."

The United States has a strong parental responsibility for the ILO's work on forced labor. We originally took the initiative in urging the ILO to conduct a comprehensive study of forced labor. We supported the study while it was in process, and after its completion. We reaped inestimable benefits from the ILO's objective exposé of forced labor throughout the Communist world—indeed, the ILO's work in this field has probably done more to discredit Communist pretensions of operating on behalf of the workers than any other single activity over the past 10 years. So we have not only a parental responsibility but a national self-interest in the successful completion of this work.

Thus, it strikes me as morally and politically indefensible for the United States now to abandon its leadership in this field. Such abandonment would foster the impression abroad of an American relapse into isolationism. And if we are the

only ILO member nation to oppose an international convention outlawing forced labor, we will surely foster the impression that we have something to hide—that we perhaps do indulge in some type of human servitude. It is not hard to imagine the serious damage that would result to our already somewhat precarious position among hundreds of millions of people in such critical areas as Asia and the Middle East. Nor is it hard to imagine the kind of a field-day Communist propagandists would have were we to be so foolish.

While I do not believe that international conventions are always the best method for dealing with social and economic problems, I do not see how the United States can oppose the convention method in this particular instance. We stand a far better chance of getting a good convention if we participate constructively and exercise leadership in the drafting process than we do if we abandon the field by default. And our leadership should enable the ILO to frame a convention which would not only protect American interests but which would promote our foreign policy by keeping the onus of forced labor where it belongs—on the Communists.

Consequently, I hope the subcommittee will approve Senate Joint Resolution 117.

STATEMENT BY CONGRESSMAN HENRY S. REUSS ON SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 117

Mr. Chairman, in one of the most curious twists in United States foreign policy even for a period when consistency has been conspicuous by its absence, the United States Government is now apparently prepared to go on record before the bar of world opinion as opposed to an international agreement against forced labor.

The issue arises in the International Labor Organization where the United States heretofore has taken the active role in exposing the slave-labor conditions of the Iron Curtain countries. It was, indeed, the American Federation of Labor which initiated the whole international study of forced labor in 1947. The joint United Nations-ILO report in 1953 is the authoritative work on the entire subject and, among other things, has provided the documentation for our own Voice of America broadcasts exposing conditions in Iron Curtain countries.

Today the ILO is preparing to draft a convention against forced labor. Almost every country in the world has already favorably replied to an ILO questionnaire inviting support for such an agreement. Even the Soviet Union and its satellites, in their new masquerade of fellowship and good will, have indicated their endorsement of such a document—how falsely we can well imagine, but how effectively from the propaganda point of view we should not underestimate. Why is the United States holding back?

The answer appears to lie in the exaggerated fears within our State Department that an anti-forced-labor convention would in some way "circumvent procedures" in relation to "matters of domestic concern." Not only does this view completely ignor the 13th amendment to the United States Constitution, which in no uncertain terms outlaws involuntary servitude. It also overlooks entirely the ILO's own procedures which specifically provide that ILO conventions are to be considered only recommendations until they are formally ratified, in our case by the President and Senate.

In view of this official State Department attitude, it seems to me extremely important that Congress should clearly and unequivocally express its abhorrence of slave labor through the adoption of Senate Joint Resolution 117 proposed by Senator Humphrey. Such a restatement of traditional American hatred of slavery will give renewed faith to the oppressed millions behind the Iron and Bamboo Curtains. It will also give justified recognition to the pioneer efforts which American free trade unions have played for so many years in exposing the bitter and revolting truths about forced labor under the Communist dictatorships.

STATEMENT OF VERY REV. MSGR. GEORGE G. HIGGINS, DIRECTOR, SOCIAL ACTION DEPARTMENT, NATIONAL CATHOLIC WELFARE CONFERENCE, WASHINGTON, D. C., ON SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 117

My name is Very Rev. Msgr. George G. Higgins. I am director of the Social Action Department of the National Catholic Welfare Conference with headquarters at 1312 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D. C. It is a privilege to be able to present my views to your committee on Senate Joint Resolution

117, introduced by Senator Humphrey, which calls upon the Government of the United States to "exercise leadership in the International Labor Organization to develop and adopt an international convention which will effectively outlaw forced labor for political or economic purposes."

In my judgment, the adoption of this resolution is the minimum expected of us by the rest of the free world and is morally and in good conscience the least that we can do to put an end to the evil of forced labor.

The force of events has thrust upon our country the leadership among the free nations of the world. By failing at this stage to exercise this leadership vigorously in favor of an effective international instrument to outlaw forced labor, we would be considered by our free allies as defaulting on our obligations. The spark of hope among millions of oppressed people in the Iron Curtain countries would be dimmed. Our influence for good in the world community of nations would be gravely impaired. Free peoples in many nations of the world would feel that we had deserted them. The cause of democracy and human dignity would suffer severely as a consequence.

A brief historical reference will indicate why this is so. Since 1949, when the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations, with the strong support of the United States, requested the ILO to undertake an investigation of forced labor, three scholarly, judicious, and well documented studies have been published by the U. N. and the ILO proving the existence of mass systems of forced labor in the Communist countries of the world.

The United States Government has strongly and rightfully supported these investigations and the publications of their findings. Free peoples everywhere look to the United States to continue its leadership in the taking of the next logical step.

The next logical step is to do something about forced labor.

The logical way to proceed is through an international agency.

The logical and competent international agency is the ILO, one of the most effective and highly respected specialized units of the United Nations.

The logical instrument is an ILO convention outlawing forced labor for political or economic purposes.

A great majority of the 71 member countries of the ILO have officially indicated support for the formulation and adoption of an ILO Convention outlawing forced labor for political or economic purposes. Many of them probably assumed that in doing so they were following United States leadership.

It seems certain that a Convention will be adopted—and by an overwhelming majority. The United States will be in a most awkward and embarrassing position before the world if it is not in the vanguard of this movement. Our allies will be disappointed and bewildered. They will feel that we have led them up to the point of action and then deserted them.

Beyond this, and even more important, is the moral question whether our great freedom-loving and God-fearing Nation can fail to support all peaceful means of fighting human slavery wherever it may exist.

This should include the continued employment of all the honorable and effective devices for exposure heretofore used and now being used. And it should include support of the formulation and adoption of an ILO Convention.

The existing program of exposure and condemnation of forced-labor practices could not possibly be hampered in any way by the adoption of an ILO Convention. On the contrary, a convention would supplement, buttress, and enhance the effectiveness of the existing program.

If Communist countries failed to ratify such a convention, they would put themselves in a very bad light. If they ratified the convention and then continued their forced-labor practices, the ILO machinery provides for adequate methods of exposing their hypocrisy. They would then be in an even worse position.

The transcending moral question which the United States must answer is this: How can America even give the appearance or leave the impression of being complacent about the abominable and sinful use of forced labor of human beings anywhere on earth? All human beings are children of God, made in His image and likeness. We cannot as a nation in clear conscience fail to do everything possible to help make them free, to help restore to them the human dignity which God intended them to possess.

I am convinced that an ILO convention banning forced labor for political or economic purposes would be helpful to that end. Consequently, I urge your committee to support Senate Joint Resolution 117.

STATEMENT ON SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 117 BY PHILIP M. KAISER, FORMER ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF LABOR FOR INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS AND UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT REPRESENTATIVE ON THE GOVERNING BODY, INTERNATIONAL LABOR ORGANIZATION, 1949–53

I wish to express my appreciation to the chairman and members of the committee for this opportunity to present my views concerning Senate Joint Resolution 117.

I respectfully urge support of this resolution. In my opinion, failure to act in accordance with its recommendations would mean that the United States is prepared to abdicate leadership on an issue that goes to the heart of the struggle between democracy and communism. It would constitute a breach of fundamental American principle, and it would seriously damage United States prestige among millions of working people throughout the world.

It is difficult to understand why our Government is not supporting an International Labor Organization Convention "which will effectively outlaw forced labor for political and economic purposes." This is particularly disturbing in view of the fact that the initiative in raising the slave-labor issue came from the United States. In 1947 the American Federation of Labor submitted its first request for action on forced labor to the United Nations. Two years later, at a meeting of the governing body of the International Labor Organization, the AFL pressed for the establishment of a Commission of Enquiry on Forced Laobr.

Their proposal had the active support of the United States Government representative as well as the American employer member on the governing body. In fact, it was due largely to the unanimous American position that in 1951, a joint ad hoc committee was set up by the United Nations and ILO to conduct an impartial inquiry into systems of forced labor.

A distinguished international tribunal was appointed and extensive hearings were held in both New York and Geneva. In its report, submitted in May 1953, the committee stated that the new forms of forced labor uncovered in certain self governing territories—actually only the Communist states—are a new form of slavery used as a means of political coordination and economic exploitation; and that it is an integral part of the philosophy and practice of all Communist regimes. The committee concluded that:

"Its inquiry has revealed the existence of facts relating to systems of forced labor of so grave a nature that they seriously threaten fundamental human rights and jeopardize the freedom and status of workers in contravention of the obligations and provisions of the Charter of the United Nations. The committee feels, therefore, that these systems of forced labor, in any of their forms, should be abolished, to insure universal respect for, and observance of, human rights and fundamental freedoms."

Over the objections of the Soviet countries and at the insistence of the United States, the General Assembly adopted a resolution based on the report, and for the first time in history the Soviet practice of forced labor stood officially condemned by world opinion. The resolution also asked the ILO to continue its efforts to abolish forced labor.

The ILO took the next logical steps. First, it initiated a supplementary survey of forced labor to bring up to date the developments since 1953. The results of the new survey have only recently been made public. They confirm the findings of the first committee and produce new evidence of forced labor in Communist China and other countries not previously covered. From Czechoslovakia to Communist China, in every country under Communist control, this new slavery is being practiced on a large scale for purposes of political coercion and economic exploitation.

At the same time the ILO placed on the agenda of its annual conference this coming June a proposal that its member governments draft a new convention—or treaty—as the most effective instrument for outlawing the practice of forced labor and focusing a steady international spotlight on this abuse of basic human rights. This step is in line with the stated ideals of the ILO, its constitution, and its historic activities. It befits in every sense the mandate from the General Assembly to move ahead in this field.

As part of the usual preparatory work on an agenda item, the ILO has sent out questionnaires to its member governments asking whether they favor a "recommendation" against forced labor or a "convention" which is a draft treaty, subject to possible ratification.

In the replies to the ILO questionnaire, there is a remarkable degree of unanimity on the need for a new international instrument to cover the new

forms of forced labor which are not covered by the Forced Labor Convention of 1930; and the great majority of the countries feel that the new instrument should take the form of a convention as the most effective way of achieving the end in view. So far 49 countries, including the Soviet Union, favor a convention. But the United States has issued no reply.

Apparently our Government is preparing to take a position against a convention. Recently this committee was told by an official spokesman of our Government that the United States is opposing an ILO convention because the administration does not want to use treaties as a "device to circumvent constituional procedures in relation to matters of domestic concern."

This statement has no relevance to the issue. There is nothing in the proposed convention that could possibly be construed as circumventing constitutional procedures.

The fact is that an ILO convention outlawing forced labor would in no way impose any new obligations on American citizens; nothing in the convention would change present law and practice in the United States; nothing in it would entail a "usurpation" of State power by our Federal Government.

In its report VI (2) of this year, the International Labor Office suggests that the proposed convention be limited as follows:

"SCOPE

"2. The proposed convention should provide that no person shall be required to perform forced or compulsory labor—

"(*a*) as a means of political cercion or education or as a punishment for holding or expressing political views;

"(*b*) as a normal method of mobilizing labor for purposes of economic development; or

"(*c*) as a means of labor discipine.

"3. The proposed convention should provide that every member of the International Labor Organization which ratifies it should undertake to take effective measures to secure the immediate and complete abolition of such forced labor."

Under the 13th amendment to our Constitution which prohibits involuntary servitude, we are already subscribing to these provisions.

The administration is, of course, against slave labor. Why then is it opposing the convention? Because, one is forced to conclude, it is showing undue sensitivity to those who are proposing that the treatymaking power of the executive branch of our Government be curtailed. The sad irony is that, in this particular instance, this sensitivity is completely misplaced. It is also based on a fundamental misunderstanding of how the ILO operates, and what the United States responsibilities are as a member.

During the last few years a good deal of wrong information has been circulated about the International Labor Organization. This is not the occasion to answer all the false charges—they are many—leveled against this international institution. I would, however, like to refute one in particular because it may in some measure be responsible for the opposition to the proposed convention on forced labor. I refer to the charge that through our membership in the ILO changes might be imposed on domestic laws against our will.

This charge has no basis in fact. Even if the United States were opposed to the principles of the convention—which we know is not so—it still remains true that under the constitution of the ILO member governments are free to determine what implementing action, if any, they shall take in respect to conventions and recommedations adopted at the annual International Labor Conference. Conventions are proposed treaties, and we are under no compulsion to ratify any of them. Thus out of a total of almost 60 adopted since the United States became a member in 1934, we have ratified only 6 substantive conventions, all 6 relating to maritime affairs, and 2 procedural ones. Adoption of a convention by the conference does not impose that convention upon a member government. In considering any convention we have the freedom to determine under our constitutional system what action will best serve the interests of the United States.

Moreover, because of special provision in the amended ILO constitution, there is added protection for federal governments. Under article 19, section 7, of the ILO constitution, it is recognized that under certain circumstances it would be inappropriate for a federal government to even consider certain ILO conventions for possible ratification. Where, in a country with a Federal Government like our own, it is decided that the subject of a convention comes under the jurisdiction of the constituent states as well as the federal authority, that

particular convention is treated like a recommendation. It is referred to the states for such action as they may care to take.

In short, it would seem impossible to use an ILO convention as a "device to circumvent constitutional procedures in relation to matters of domestic concern."

It is not surprising that the procedures of the ILO are held up as a model for dealing internationally with the treaty problems of federal states. In a joint report issued in September 1951, the standing committee on peace and law through the United Nations and the section of international and comparative law of the America Bar Association stated:

"It was agreed that if the subject of human rights and freedom in the world under the United Nations Charter is to be pressed in the current state of conflicting and confused ideologies, the best approach would be by way of the procedure followed by the International Labor Organization, rather than by way of legally binding multipartite treaties. The International Labor Organization proceeds in an advisory way formulating standards which are embodied in recommendations for legislative action by the members of the Organization or in conventions for ratifications in the usual course, except as specifically provided with respect to federal states which, where an International Labor Organization convention is wholly or partly within the sphere of state action, have the duty to make effective arrangements for reference of the convention to the proper federal or state authorities for the enactment of legislation or other action, and to report from time to time what has been done."

Based on this report, in February 1952, the house of delegates of the American Bar Association adopted the following resolution:

"*Resolved*, That the American Bar Association is of the opinion that the participation of the United States in international measures for the promotion of human rights and fundamental freedoms should be provided for within a framework similar to that of the International Labor Organization."

It seems fair to state that whatever merits the arguments for curtailing the executive branch's treatymaking power may have, they certainly do not apply to the functioning of the ILO. This is particularly true in the case of the proposed convention on forced labor. Forced labor is clearly a matter that comes under the jurisdiction of our Federal Government. It is also a matter about which we clearly committed ourselves in the 13th amendment. There is no reason why we should not support the convention in Geneva this June, and ratify it once it has been adopted, as surely it will be.

The best that can be said for the opponents of a convention on forced labor is that they are being supercautious about a danger that does not exist—and, at the expense of putting us on the wrong side of a great moral and political international issue. Whatever their motive, their success up to now has put the United States in the preposterous position of withdrawing from a key battle on the issued of slave labor after we have led the forces of freedom to the verge of a great victory.

It will also throw doubt on whether we intend to continue to participate actively and fully in the work of the International Labor Organization. To the delegates from other countries—particularly the free world, who make up the overwhelming majority—there can hardly be any other explanation for our failure to support a convention on an issue so vital to the objectives of the ILO, when there are no valid reasons for denying such support.

We are placing ourselves in a dangerous posture. Labor is one of the critical areas in the struggle between democracy and communism. In its new pose as a moderate and peaceful country, Soviet Russia is concentrating—as it always has—on wooing, or rather subverting, free labor throughout the world. No issue highlights more the difference between freedom and communism than the issue of forced labor. No international organization provides a better arena for handling that issue and for projecting the democratic way in dealing with the legitimate aspirations of free working men and women.

Are we prepared to seriously damage our prestige among free labor throughout the world and our position of leadership in the ILO? How long now are we going to allow the alleged needs of domestic politics to interfere with the real tasks of statesmanship?

The ILO was founded as democracy's answer to the Communist Revolution after World War I, and Samuel Gompers, the great American labor leader, was one of its chief architects. It continues to serve as a bulwark against communism.

The ILO is a unique international body. Governments, employers, and workers from some 71 countries participate in its work on an equal basis. Its aims are our aims: to raise the working and living standards of wage earners through democratic methods. Through our participation, we have been able to promote policies and views in the ILO which serve the fundamental objectives of our foreign policy. We have pushed continually for the ILO technical assistance program; and it was our leadership that brought about the ILO programs on freedom of association and, ironically enough, forced labor. As Mr. David J. Zellerbach, president of Crown-Zellerbach Corp. and United States employer-delegate to the ILO from 1945 to 1949, recently stated, "The ILO has encouraged positive programs for alleviating poverty, insecurity, and human exploitation which are among the principal causes of social upheaval, revolution and war."

Instead of weakening our position in the ILO, we should use it as a major instrument of our foreign policy in the labor area where the major struggle is taking place for the hearts and minds of men.

It is for these reasons that it is difficult to exaggerate the bad effects of our failure to support a convention when in fact we should be taking the lead. Several months ago Mr. Michael Hoffman, the distinguished Geneva correspondent of the New York Times, stated "Western circles here fear that if the United States does not in the end support a forced labor convention, while the Soviet Union and its satellites do, the circumstances would be generally regarded as a major Soviet triumph."

Unfortunately these fears are now being justified. If the State Department persists in its present position, there is only one way to retrieve the situation: overwhelming congressional support of Senate Joint Resolution 117.

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF MANUFACTURERS,
New York, N. Y., April 24, 1956.

Hon. PAUL H. DOUGLAS,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Labor, Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: This letter is directed to Senate Joint Resolution 117, now before your committee proposing that the United States "develop and adopt an international convention which will effectively outlaw forced labor for political and economic reasons." It is written on behalf of the National Association of Manufacturers—a voluntary nonprofit organization composed of about 20,000 members—for the purpose of clarifying the views of this organization on international conventions.

This association has long studied the problem of international conventions which deal with internal domestic affairs. Over the years, this matter has been examined by two of our policy committees; namely, the international relations committee and the industrial relations committee; and also by the NAM board of directors.

Furthermore, the NAM has participated in the ILO since 1946. The question of draft conventions as proposed by the ILO has been under intensive examination by a joint committee composed of representatives from the NAM and the Chamber of Commerce of the United States. This committee has repeatedly expressed its opposition to international conventions which deal with internal matters of a country and has, over the years, expressed the view that, in effect, an ILO convention is an attempt to secure the adoption by member nations of binding international obligations for the purpose of setting standards to cover the internal domestic, social, and economic relations of a nation.

The tendency of the ILO to press for the adoption of conventions which, if ratified by the Senate of the United States, would take on the full force of international treaties, has been of increasing concern to the NAM.

Accordingly, the NAM in June of 1952 adopted the following policy which was again confirmed in February of 1955:

"It is recognized that there are many matters which can properly be the subject of international conventions. They deal with the relationship of a national or his government to foreign citizens or their governments, such as for example aviation, patents and copyrights, shipping, the mails, and cables. International conventions should be restricted wholly to subjects in the field of international relations and many of these could more properly be negotiated as bilateral agreements.

"As a principle of universal application it must be said that it is manifestly improper and impossible for an international group to formulate conventions having the dignity and effect of domestic legislation and which affect the relationship of an individual to his government and his political, social, and economic environment, that are adaptable to the requirements of countries offering an infinite variety of political, social, and economic structures.

"With particular reference to the United States, it must be stated that this process does violence to our constitutional system of enactment of law. It bypasses the House of Representatives by depriving it of its constitutional role in the enactment of domestic legislation. Furthermore, such Senate ratification may result in the enactment of laws binding on individual States without the knowledge or consent of the legislatures of those States and may result in nullifying State laws or even provisions of the Constitution of the United States. Through this process people are deprived of the opportunity to be heard and to participate in the formulation of legislation affecting domestic affairs and lose safeguards which flow out of public hearings at which under our constitutional system our citizens may give their representatives considering proposed legislation the benefit of their judgment and counsel. Such conventions are in principle opposed to the tenet of representative government, and the United States Government should not be a party to this procedure.

Very truly yours,

COLA G. PARKER, *President.*

EDWARD P. MORGAN AND THE NEWS, APRIL 24, 1956, AMERICAN BROADCASTING CO.

There are so many groups, bodies, committees, agencies, and the like in existence these days that you may never have heard of ILO, the International Labor Organization. This is neither a supercolossal union nor a world employment office. It is a combination of employer, worker, and government representatives from 71 countries. It is the oldest international organization of its kind in existence, stemming from the Versailles Treaty of 1919. It is now a special agency of the United Nations. It busies itself with projects designed to improve working conditions and raise living standards around the world.

How? Well, for instance right now ILO is engaged in a combined operation with other U. N. agencies for the vocational training of Indians in Bolivia, Peru, and Ecuador. This involves teaching them to read and write, how to use soap and water and other radical customs. It reintroduced the use of the wheel in a special agricultural project in a remote region of Haiti. It is now helping train 2,000 industrial supervisors for steel mills and other factories in Pakistan.

You'd think that here was one international outfit enjoying the fullest possible support from the United States. Not so fast. The United States Chamber of Commerce and the National Association of Manufacturers have raised the question of whether we should continue as a member of the ILO. Less than a week ago Senator Bricker of Ohio maneuvered through the Senate a move to restrict United States contributions unless the agency ousts the employer and employee delegations from the Soviet Union and the seven other Communist nations who belong.

Perhaps the most implacable single foe of the ILO is Senator Bricker's friend and fellow Ohioan, a Cincinnati industrialist named William L. McGrath who has been the United States employer delegate to the agency and who is still on its executive committee. McGrath appears to regard the ILO as a sort of organizational Mata Hari, an agent of the enemy. In fact he once wrote an article entitled "ILO: Back Door to Socialism." It was printed, interestingly enough, in the semimonthly letter of the National Economic Council, Incorporated, whose president is Merwin K. Hart, who gained a certain dubious distinction as an America Firster during World War II and has demonstrated a lively interest in various Fascist movements.

McGrath argues that the United States should pull out of the ILO, on the allegation that it is being taken over by the Communists. Certainly nobody would contend that the employer-employee distinctions are anything but meaningless in a Communist state but this is not fooling the ILO, in which the free countries have an overwhelming vote. The most dramatic demonstration that the ILO had not been and was not likely to be taken over by the Communists came 2 weeks ago when the agency released a report finding that forced labor exists in 11 countries, including China, Soviet Russia, and her satellites.

It happens that the Senate Labor and Education Committee opens hearings tomorrow on a bill by Senator Humphrey, of Minnesota, to direct the United States Government to take the lead with the ILO to "develop and adopt an international convention which will effectively outlaw forced labor for political and economic purposes."

Of the 71 ILO member countries the only major one which has not already replied in favor of such a convention is the United States. Many groups, including organized labor, have endorsed the move but the administration is divided. The Department of Labor is for it. The State Department is against it. It seems that Secretary Dulles has undertaken to avoid pushing treaties or conventions which would give Senator Bricker ammunition in his dogged campaign for his amendment to restrict the President's hand in foreign policy.

This, of course, is a brilliant maneuver. We appease Senator Bricker and friends at the trifling cost of restricting our vitally needed influence in the ILO and becoming the world champions of forced labor.

This is Edward Morgan saying good night from Washington.

[From the New Leader, March 29, 1947]

Concentration Camps in Soviet Russia

(By David J. Dallin)

Soviet policy has been signally successful in obscuring the issue of concentration camps in Russia for 17 years. From time to time, some correspondent or some single refugee has mentioned masses of men deported to forced labor in far-off regions of Russia; from time to time, the issue would come up in debates and meetings, in parliaments and in the press. Each time, however, the discussion of this problem would cease almost instantly because of a lack of reliable information, because of denials issued by various pro-Soviet organizations and publications, and because of the general disorientation of the public. The average newspaper reader was inclined to consider all this news as unbelievable, fantastic, and grossly exaggerated. He knew of Soviet claims to be the freest country in the world, and he was aware of a multitude of false reports from and about Russia being circulated abroad. He turned his back on one of the gravest problems of our time.

But now the secrecy surrounding the concentration camps of the U. S. S. R. is finally coming to an end. The war brought about unprecedented shifts of population, especially in central and eastern Europe; it was as if a gigantic crane had lifted millions of men, women, and children out of the steppes, forests, and tundras of the East and dropped them into the valleys and fields between the Carpathians and the Pyrenees. When the flood was over and the tide began to recede, hundreds of thousands of Russians, Ukrainians, Kirghizs, Poles, Balts, and Jews remained behind in the West. Among them are thousands of witnesses and former inmates of the Soviet concentration camps. There are among them many Soviet Army men, former Soviet officials, and civilians, men, and women, who have passed through the gates of concentration camps; thousands of Poles deported to the Asiastic camps in 1940 and liberated after the amnesty which Sikorski got from Stalin in 1941; and along with them, thousands of Jews who were suddenly permitted to leave Russia in 1945–56. The next few years will undoubtedly see a flow of reports, books, and articles by these new arrivals in the Western World. What they will tell is a tale of horrors, of 20th century slavery.

The Growth of Soviet Serfdom

Concentration camps were officially established in Russia in 1918–23 as a means of repression during the civil war. Their number is unknown; many camps were closed down; new camps grew up elsewhere. When, in 1923, almost all of these camps were abolished by decree of the Soviet Government, 25 remained in existence. The prisoners in these camps consisted mainly of "bourgeois": this term included officers of the white armies, leaders of the rightist parties, wealthy merchants and capitalists, and groups of anti-Soviet intellectuals. When the camps were done away with, a number of prisoners were released, some were sent to prisons, and a certain number deported to the only concentration camps that remained in existence until the late 1920's: the northern camps of special

designation on the islands in and along the shores of the White Sea, usually known as the Solovetski camps.

Under Lenin, the term "concentration camp" was officially employed. Lenin sometimes preferred brutal frankness to diplomatic courtesy and cant. He openly preached and practiced Red terror, and he frankly stated that Russia's political system was a dictatorship. His successsors increased the terror and strengthened the dictatorship, but at the same time they claimed for themselves the title of democrats and boasted that the Soviet Union is the freest country in the world. This caused, among other things, a shift in terminology: "concentration camps" soon disappeared; instead a new term came into use: "Corrective labor camps."

Not until 1929 did the labor camps begin their greatest growth. Their new development coincided and was casually related to three factors: collectivization of farming, industrialization, and suppression of the political opposition within the Communist Party.

The collectivization was carried out as a campaign against the kulaks, or prosperous peasants. They were to be expropriated and deported, with their families. In this way, the creation of the kolkhoz system produced a multitude of potential laborers, of both sexes and all ages, for possible needs in industry and tranportation. At the same time, the first 5-year plan and the general trend toward rapid industrialization brought home the increasing shortage of labor; among the multitude of projects there were many in which great masses of unskilled labor could be used, as for instance, the construction of highways, railroads, and canals; the expansion of the state's agricultural economies (sovkhozes); lumbering in the huge forests of Russia's north and east; mining of coal, peat, and somewhat later, of gold in eastern Siberia. As time went on, new jobs were found for forced labor; the labor camps grew and spread farther and farther. While the huge camps were concentrated in the thinly populated north and east, small camps with a limited number of prisoners were established near industrial centers, cities, and ports, as reservoir of labor for various uses.

In the same period the bittle struggle within the Communist Party was coming to an end. The Trotskyites were beaten and Trotsky deported; later the Bukharin-Zinoviev faction was silenced. In the fight of Stalin's group against his opponents, especially against the right-wing Communists, one of the many issues was the problem whether class enemies (kulaks, capitalists, and non-Communist intellectuals) could ever be corrected into loyal Soviet citizens. By implication this was a question of life and death for the millions classfied as enemies of the people. The group around Stalin maintained that the masses of men and women grown up as members of a privileged class were lost for the purposes of a socialist society; they could never be corrected; the only use the Soviet state could derive from them was to put them to work without incurring too much expenses for their upkeep. Stalin made fun of those of his comrades who could not understand why the dispossessed peasants should be sent away into the traditional places of prerevolutionary exile. Somewhat later, Andrei Vyshinski denounced the sentimentalists who believed that a class enemy could develop into a loyal Soviet citizen. All this meant in practice a sentence to slow death for the masses of convicts and deportees.

Since the early 1930's, ordinary prisons have been regarded merely as places of detention until the sentence is pronounced (by either a court or the MVD). After their conviction, only persons unfit for work remain in prison. Along with the old penal institutions, three new types of exile and hard labor exist in the Soviet Union:

(1) Corrective labor camps for those sentenced (by either a court or the MVD) to a term of 3 years or more;

(2) Corrective labor colonies for prisoners sentenced to terms shorter than 3 years;

(3) Mere exile, i. e., assigned residence without confinement.

THE GULAG AND MANPOWER

The entire system of penal institutions—prisons, labor camps, labor colonies, and exile settlements—is under the jurisdiction of the GULAG, which is a branch of the Ministry for Internal Affairs (the NKVD, remaned MVD in March 1946). The word "GULAG" consists of the Russian initials of its complete title: Chief Administration of Labor Camps, Colonies, and Settlements of the MVD.

The central administration of the GULAG in Moscow directs the greatest enterprise in the world, by far exceeding not only the biggest industrial monopolies in the Old and New Worlds but even all state enterprises, past and present, of any nation, including the mammoth state economy of Hitler's Germany. It disposes of a labor force hitherto unknown in numbers throughout the history of either private or state economy; it is not a capitalist economy since the standard employer-employee relationship does not exist; it is rather based on a master-slave relationship. Since 1930 increasing segments of the 5-year plans have been assigned to the GULAG for fulfillment. Though never publicized, the GULAG is used to performing its tasks not only with energy and perseverance but also with its characteristic disregard for the value of human life.

In Soviet Russia the fulfillment of the 5-year plan by an economic agency is for its head officials the road to advancement and honor, while failure to carry out the assigned tasks usually leads to reprimands, punishment, and dismissal. The central and local heads of the GULAG's enterprises are therefore among the most eager and zealous executors of economic blueprints.

The GULAG's enterprises are mainly based on common labor, without the benefit of complicated and expensive machinery. Often it is the most primitive kind of industrial economy. Therefore the procurement of manpower is its main preoccupation. Every year a great part of its prisoners die or become invalids; there are camps in which the yearly death toll reaches 20 percent; in the gold mines of the Far East it is as high as 30 percent a year. Besides, a number of prisoners have to be released every year, and despite all efforts to keep them at work as free laborers after the expiration of their sentences and despite the introduction of forcible exile for released prisoners, the accumulated yearly loss of slave labor reaches enormous figures; it must be made up by new arrests and convictions; and that is the preoccupation of another section of the MVD, which takes care of the constant flow of replacements from all classes and regions of the Soviet Union into the institutions of the GULAG.

The corrective labor camps, the principal component of the GULAG penal system, are located mostly in thinly populated regions, i. e., in the northern provinces of Russia in Europe, in Siberia, and in central Asia. In these regions many labor camps are grouped together into huge clusters, with hundreds of thousands of inmates. Each camp and each group has specific economic assignments to carry out. Among the biggest of such groups are the Pechora camps, where about a million prisoners are said to be interned; these camps have almost completed the construction of the great Kotlas-Vorkuta Railroad; now they are concentrating on the mining of coal in recently discovered deposits, on oil drilling, and on lumbering.

A second great cluster is located in the Archangel region, with a population of around 500,000; this one was of particular importance during the war, when its inmates built airfields, expanded port facilities, worked on the construction of railway branch lines, and other essential wartime tasks.

In Siberia huge camps are located to the north and east of Lake Baikal; they are concerned with the construction of new railway lines and with mining. The population of these clusters is estimated at nearly a million.

The Dalstroy in the Far East is a special region, completely under the control of the MVD. Among its economic tasks the most important is gold mining on the Kolyma River; living conditions in these camps, situated in one of the coldest regions of the world and thousands of miles from civilization, are the hardest possible. The death toll is high, illness perennial, and liberation more than problematic for the prisoners, whose number is in the millions.

The Karaganda camps in central Asia have about 150,000 internees, employed mainly at iron, copper, and especially coal mining. There is a women's camp in this cluster, in which a sizable number of wives and widows of former Soviet leaders are interned; it is commonly referred to as the "wives' camp."

HOW THE CAMPS ARE RUN

Besides these and a few other big groups a multitude of smaller camps are located near large cities in order to perform current jobs. These smaller camps are moved from one city or one region to another whenever necessary. These individual camps are most important wherever new industrial units are to be built; the prisoners' task is mostly the performance of unskilled or semiskilled labor, such as digging, leveling the ground, building outer walls of plants, constructing highways and railroad lines. Most of the internationally known new industrial establishments in the Urals, such as Magnitogorsk, have been built in

this manner. Even the expansion of existing industrial units and the construction of additional buildings is often entrusted to detachments of prisoners from transferred labor camps.

The internal life of a great labor camp is ruled by three institutions: The general administration of the camp, the ISO, and the KVCh.

The administration consists of a sizable body, of course, under instructions from the central GULAG. It employs also a considerable number of prisoners, notably intellectuals, as engineers, organizers, bookkeepers. To the administration there are attached the armed guards, under an officer of the MVD; the guard recruits helpers from among the prisoners, particularly the criminal elements—no political prisoners are elevated to jobs as guards. The hospitals, subordinated to the administration, are insufficient in number and capacity, and possess highly inadequate medical supplies. The doctors and medical assistants are usually taken from the prisoners' ranks.

The ISO is the internal police in the camp—a kind of MVD inside an MVD camp. It consists of a few paid officials and of a great number of unofficial agents among the prisoners. It has plenty of informers who hope to improve their status or get better food by serving the ISO. The suppression of plots inside the camps, and the prevention of escapes has more often than not been due to the work of these informers. The ISO has at its disposal special punitive cells in which prisoners condemned to further punishment have to endure severe, often cruel, conditions. Conditions in these unheated cells are particularly unbearable in the cold winter.

The KVCh is the cultural educational section. Its task is to explain work assignments and camp orders to the prisoners. Certain items of political news are also distributed by this agency. Where radio loudspeakers are available, they are operated by the KVCh. At the head of the department there is usually a Communist or a member of the Communist Youth League, and the quality of the education is low.

The prisoners are usually divided into 4, sometimes 5, groups, in accordance with their individual productivity. Those in the upper category (the Stakhanovites) enjoy a bearable diet, but only the very strongest and youngest prisoners are able to attain this high level. For the rest, rations are always inadequate; hunger is a normal condition of life. The lowest category, those whose productivity falls below a prescribed minimum, get only 12 ounces of bread (equal to a small American loaf) daily, and nothing else; such a diet is equivalent to slow death.

For the so-called politicals (who constitute the majority of the prisoners and who include persons without any actual political affiliation, guilty of no political offense whatsoever), the hardest feature of everyday life is the common criminal. The criminals enjoy privileges denied to the politicals. Often they are appointed to supervisory positions. These murderers and professional burglars mistreat the politicals in the most cruel fashion; bribing the criminal bosses is indispensable for a political who wants to live in peace; thefts, an everyday occurrence, are usually unpunished; numerous deaths are the result of this peculiar institution in the Soviet camps.

HOW MANY MILLION SLAVE LABORERS?

Neither the exact number of labor camps, labor colonies, or exile settlements of the MVD is known. Only estimates are possible, varying greatly. The horror of the Soviet population in the face of this MVD institution is so great that absurd exaggerations are widespread in Russia, with guesses ranging as high as 40 million.

The number of camps changes almost monthly, since some camps close down and new ones emerge in other locations. On the basis of the available evidence it has been possible to locate about 125 individual camps in all parts of Russia.

The latest available estimates of the number of prisoners in the labor camps are: S. Mora and P. Zwierniak, in Justice Sovietique (Rome, 1945), on the basis of Polish documents, 15 million; Victor Kravchenko, in I Chose Freedom (New York, 1946), about 20 million; Arthur Koestler, in The Yogi and the Commissar (London, 1945), 17 million; W. L. White, in Report on the Russians (New York, 1945), 14 million. Brooks Atkinson, in the New York Times, July 7, 1946, reported that "the estimates run all the way from 10 million to 15 million." Prof. Sergei Prokopovich puts the number at 5 million to 7 million at the end of the war. German documents reveal that their intelligence agents estimated the number of Soviet prisoners in the labor camps at 9,600,000 in 1941.

It is probably correct to estimate the number of prisoners at about 8 million to 10 million on the eve of the war. It had shrunk considerably by the end of the war, after increased deaths as a result of famine had taken their toll and mobilization into the armed forces had further depleted the population in the camps. It may have dropped to less than 6 million by 1944–45.

Since the end of the war, the population of the camps has again increased. Such a replenishment of manpower is a prerequisite for the fulfillment of the new 5-year plan.

The first source of the new flow of prisoners into the camps was the great purge of the Soviet population in territories occupied by the Germans during the war. All persons guilty or suspected of any sort of collaboration with the enemy were arrested; they were tried by the NKVD and, while only a few were executed, the majority were deported to labor camps. The maximum penalty for treason is 25 years in the "corrective" labor camps.

A second source for the replenishment of the slave labor force has been the population of the five liquidated "National Republics" and regions (Volga-Germans, Chechen-Ingushs, Kalmyks, Crimean Tatars, and Karachayevians). The people of these areas were found to be "disloyal" to the Soviet Union; the deportations carried out in the latter stages of the war were later sanctioned by a law adopted by the Supreme Soviet on June 25, 1946.

The third source of new prisoners was the Russian prisoners of war returning from Germany. It is little known abroad that a Soviet prisoner of war is considered a criminal by the very fact of having fallen into enemy hands. Since many of the prisoners had been drafted by the German Armed Forces into labor battalions and military formations, every prisoner returning home is being screened and, unless he can show why he failed to die fighting rather than surrender, he is sentenced to a term of forced labor. This procedure, unbelievable at first, has now been confirmed by a multitude of reports from Russia as well as from individuals who managed to escape back to Germany or France. The total number of Russian prisoners of war was given by Germany as about 5 million; it is not known how many of these have survived and returned home.

Along with the prisoners of war, Russian laborers, men and women dragged by the Germans from the occupied areas into forced labor, are undergoing the same process of screening, and many are sentenced to deportation.

A search by the MVD for Soviet citizens in Western Europe is continuing even now. In France, the MVD maintains a special camp for this purpose, with the consent of the French authorities. In Germany, the UNRRA has allowed the MVD to administer a few camps specially designated for Soviet citizens who are to be repatriated. Officially, compulsory repatriation has been abolished; in fact, however, UNRRA officials in Germany have served the MVD in a scandalous manner.

During recent years foreigners have been added to the Soviet population of the labor camps. First came the Poles, then citizens of the Baltic States; soon German prisoners of war began to arrive in force. Since the end of the war, German, Italian, Japanese, and other former Axis subjects have constituted a mass of laborers that runs into the millions. These prisoners usually live in separate camps. All camps, however—old-style "corrective labor camps" as well as the new prisoner of war camps—are part of the same integrated system run by the MVD.

Forced labor has become an essential element of the Soviet economy. This kind of cheap and obedient labor is a prerequisite for the fulfillment of the ambitious plans of industrialization, industrial expansion, and military preparedness. The Soviet slaves form the lowest class of Soviet society, the foundation on which rests the entire structure.

EYEWITNESS ACCOUNTS

1. A trade-union leader reports

An eloquent narrative of his experiences in the labor camps was given by a well-known Polish labor leader (Trade Union of Miners) and member of the Executive Council of the Polish Socialist Party. Arrested upon the arrival of Soviet troops in eastern Poland in September 1939, he was sentenced to 10 years of hard labor. Together with many other Poles he was first taken to Odessa and thence to Vladivostok—a trip that took 40 days, during which the prisoners received very little food.

"In Vladivostok," he writes (in The Dark Side of the Moon, London, 1946, pp. 118–121), "there was an enormous clearing center from which prisoners

were distributed among lagiers (camps) in the province of Khaborovsk, which are under the supervision of the Office for the Northeast. There were some 25,000 prisoners camping here in the open. Two barracks were reserved for Poles. On May 20, 1940, together with a large transport of my fellow-prisoners, I was taken across the Sea of Japan to Magadan, and from there, by lorry, to another distributing center. From this center we proceeded to Maldiak, 1,700 kilometers away on the River Kolyma. We arrived in Maldiak on the 26th of June. There were 4 camps there, each containing 200 persons, and we lived in huts covered by tenting, 100 prisoners in each hut. We slept on bare bunks made, not of planks, but of logs. Everybody slept in their clothes. In the summer there were sudden changes of temperature and very light nights. The summer was short, with great heat in the daytime. But even at its hottest, the smallest cloud would cause an instant change in the temperature, and it would then become intensely cold. Swarms of flies, a kind of mosquito, very tiny and very bloodthirsty, caused us great misery, getting into our eyes and biting us to the bone.

"By the middle of September the snow was up to our knees. At Magadan we were given winter jackets, and in the camp a few received felt leg coverings and another type of warm jacket called bushlaki.

"The whole region about the camp was utterly deserted. Apart from the prisoners and the administration no one lived there. The native inhabitants moved farther and farther into the taiga at each Soviet advance into the interior of their country, keeping always as far away as they possibly could from the intruders and living by breeding animals, which they graze in herds.

"Reveille was at 5 a. m. Before going to work, the prisoners got a piece of bread each and a portion of gruel. After this, and in a column of four across, we were marched under escort to our places in the mines. The mining was for gold. On our way to work, an orchestra sometimes played. The work on the surface consisted of digging earth, often mixed with gravel. We dug with crowbars, picks, and shovels, and in the winter when the ground was frozen, with gouges (chisels). It was indeed convicts' work. The daily norm was 125 barrows of earth dug, which had then to be pushed to a distance of from 300 to 400 meters. Below the surface these mines were 120 to 150 feet deep, and accidents below the surface were frequent, as many as 5 or 6 a day. The underground corridors were narrow and the ceilings not propped up. The unfortunate victims of accidents were hauled to the surface, their hand cut off in proof of death (to be shown to the authorities) and the bodies then thrust below the brushwood. At 12:30 there was a half-hour break and we got our dinner, consisting of 150 grams (6.25 ounces) of bread and a portion of thin skilly; occasionally a piece of fish. After dinner we kept on uninterruptedly until 8 p. m. The prisoners who had not by then accomplished their norm had to work 2 hours more. After the return to camp, there were still a lot of things to be done. Bread had to be brought from a point 5 kilometers away, the firewood too. Supper consisted of a piece of bread and the soup again. The ration of bread varied between 250 and 500 grams (9 oz. to 18 oz.) a day, according to the norm accomplished. The prisoners were of all classes, representing a cross-section of the whole of Soviet society, and not only of all the nationalities of the Soviet Union but also of the states who are her neighbors.

"The orchestra very often played while the prisoners were at work. To the accompaniment of this music, the guards would fall out prisoners whose work was especially feeble and shoot them, there and then. The shots rang out one after another. The bodies of the murdered men were also buried under the brushwood on the surface of the mines.

"A Jew from Lwow working alongside me was so exhausted that he repeatedly fainted at work. The guard ordered him to fall out, took him to a nearby shed, and there he was shot. I heard the shot and saw the body a few minutes later.

"The same fate overtook prisoners for the slightest breach of regulations, especially for moving even a few steps away from the spot where they were at work or for not keeping in line when they were marching. Everybody was pitilessly robbed the moment they arrived and all the prisoners were utterly demoralized. There were frequent fights, mutual denunciations, and at work no pity of any kind was shown by one prisoner to another. The whole inner functioning of the camp depended on present criminals or ticket-of-leave men. There was nothing they would not do to secure for themselves a larger piece of bread. The more intelligent among the prisoners were perfectly open-eyed about the functioning of the regime in the union and were hostile to it, though quite powerless. Their only hope was that something might happen from outside, under the impact of which the system would come crashing down.

"As a result of the 12- to 14-hour day, with no day of rest in the week, and of the quality and quantity of the food, after a very short period in the camp the prisoners suffer from exhaustion, and are easily attacked by disease. A prisoner gets sick leave only when he has at least 40° C. (102° F.) of temperature and then only if the quota of sick leave for that day is not filled. The exhaustion of the prisoners brings about a slowing down in the output. When the output goes down, the guards begin to beat them with their rifle-butts, put them in solitary confinement, and finally shoot them. Those who are in the lock-up (called tubes) also work under incessant supervision, and get only 200 grams of bread and 100 grams of soup. Dysentery and tsinga are endemic. Out of a camp of 10,000 men, some 2,000 die every year, a considerable proportion of these from exhaustion. Every morning there are some prisoners who cannot be roused. They have died during the night. In the first 2½ months of my time in the camp on the Kolyma, out of the total of 20 Poles in my group, 16 died. Four, including myself, survived.

"In winter, one has to work even in 65 degrees C. of frost (—85° F.). Clothes get worn out very quickly in the mines. We went about wrapped in rags which we almost never took off; only very rarely in the bathhouse. The ice-bound rags on our feet would thaw out in the vapor. After the bath, we had to wrap our feet again in these sodden rags.

"In this camp, the best workers occasionally get a little pay in cash. For this money it was possible to buy from a fellow-prisoner, or in the camp shop, a piece of bread. But if found, this bread was immediately confiscated as prisoners were not allowed, on any account, to keep food with them.

"This regulation was made to prevent prisoners from escaping. The prisoners' one dream was to get away to hospital. The hospitals were run by medical orderlies, all prisoners or former prisoners, and the equipment was extremely primitive. Nevertheless, life in hospital was incomparably better than everyday life in the huts. A prisoner willingly chopped off his fingers in the hope of getting thus admitted. Self-inflicted wounds were universal. I myself, with another Pole, shortly before our release, decided to cut off fingers and toes. We had come to the end of our endurance."

This man was released after the Polish-Soviet agreement in September 1941. He concludes his narrative:

"At Magadan I met some 1,200 Poles. From what they said, I learned that 60 percent of the Poles deported to the camps along the river Kolyma had died. Conditions for the Poles at Magadan did not change much in practice after the amnesty. The same regulations as before remained in force."

2. A young woman in the Potma camps

"The camp authorities treated us utterly shamefully. The watchword was—'Work and fulfillment of the plan.' Nor did they recognize any sickness; you had to have over 100° F. to be excused from work. No attention was paid to the periodic indisposition of the women. The least negligence in our work was considered sabotage. Once one of my fellow workers, feeling ill, left the factory to return to the barrack 5 minutes before the end of our shift. For this 'crime' she was locked up in an isolation cell for 8 days.

"In May 1941 I was transferred to the 19th lagpunkt, the worst of all those I have known. There were about 200 Polish and 500 Soviet women prisoners there, but no men. The Soviet women were mostly convicted for political offenses. There were also minors among us. Although a minority, they terrorized everybody, just as they did everywhere else. * * *

"In the 19th lagpunkt more than a hundred women lived in each barrack; there was only one floor to it. The work consisted in sewing uniforms for the armed forces and in knitting gloves." (Testimony No. 14970, reproduced in S. Mora and P. Zwierniak, La Justice Sovietique, Rome, 1945, pp. 288–289.)

3. Trotskyites in the camps

"When the end of the prisoners' terms approaches, the sentences are in the greater number of cases renewed, and the prisoner is notified of this in a brief official note the day before he is due to be freed. Neither old age nor sickness are sufficient motives for liberation. I have seen old men, 70 years old, white ghosts, incurably sick prisoners, blind people clinging to the walls, people who should have been taken to a heated hospital, given some care and attention, whatever their crime may have been. I have seen old men, with lung conditions, paralyzed, rotting away in the stench of the barracks, for years already unable to move. And they still had 3, 5, or 7 years of their sentence to serve. The youngest tried

to escape. * * * The fugitives were counted by the thousands. There are special camps for captured escapees. There they remain from 6 to 9 months, without working, receiving 11 ounces of bread a day, or a little soup once a day. Then 1, 2, 3, even 5 years are added to their initial sentences. Besides these isolation camps, where the 'culprits nevertheless live together, there also exist immense camps of 'rigorous isolation,' where each prisoner is placed in a separate cell block: here the most dangerous political prisoners, the ideologists, are kept. * * * Several dozen of the most important among the Trotskyites were deported to Vorkuta. While they were still together, they decided to eternalize the people's memory of them by a last manifestation of their inflexible will, and thus remain victorious even if condemned to hard labor.

"They presented a list of demands, claiming (1) the right of political prisoners to be separated from the criminals; (2) to be employed only for work corresponding to their professions, i. e., as intellectuals; and (3) never to be separated.

"They implemented these demands by a threat of a hunger strike until success or death. The NKVD naturally turned down their demands. The Trotskyites then started a hunger strike which lasted for 120 days without interruption. During this time the camp authorities administered forcibly artificial nourishment, despite which many died. When all the efforts to break their spirit proved ineffective, the Trotskyites were separated with the help of a pack of fierce dogs unleased in their barracks.

"The sick men were carried out by soldiers. They were sent in various directions and, after a while, nobody ever mentioned them. It is rather certain that they were shot. * * *

"Last let me tell how I took leave of one of my companions of misfortune. When I was about to leave and I shook everybody's hand for the last time, an artisan stepped up to me. He was a quiet man and had never spoken to me before even though I had often tried to converse with him. During the entire period of our stay in the camp—almost a year—I had never heard him utter so much as a complaint or even a sigh. He was a model stakhanovite, indefatiguable in his work, an excellent master of his trade. He approached me and spoke these intrepid words in a loud voice:

" 'When you leave Russia and regain your freedom, tell of our suffering to the peoples of the West. In the name of true justice—their notion of justice—let them come here and recognize in us human beings similar to themselves! May they come and restore to us human liberty!' " (Testimony of a Polish lawyer, No. 3683, ibid., pp. 302–303.)

4. Exhaustion

"At last I no longer had the necessary strength to fulfill my norm of output, having eaten but 11 ounces of bread and a little dishwaster soup daily. Where could you get the force to work? I was getting thinner day by day; I felt increasingly weaker until I reached such a stage of exhaustion that by the end of the fifth hour of work I could hardly even simulate working. The same was true of my companions: they would often faint from weakness.

"In the summer of 1941 I was detailed to collect hay. We were mowing grass in the forests, some 7 kilometers from the camp. One could not even think of carrying out the required norm. A swampy terrain, clouds of mosquitoes and nasty flies, choking from the damp heat, the brushwork under which we were supposed to mow grass—all this made it impossible to fulfill the plan. Returning from work was even more exacting. Many of us would faint from exhaustion; then a guard would tell the brigade to stop, would fire into the air to inform the authorities of the accident; we would then have to wait for the arrival of a truck to carry those who had fainted back to camp. This meant further lateness and cut down our short eating and resting time. Often we would carry the exhausted women in our arms rather than wait, but we were not always capable of doing so, especially when there were several who had fainted and the rest of us could hardly stand up.

"I fell sick in the course of my work as a result of complications due to a brain condition I had contracted during my stay in the workshop. My head and neck were constantly swollen. I looked like a monster. But that was not enough to excuse me from work." (Testimony of a young woman, ibid., pp. 290–291.)

5. An intellectual testifies

"Our working conditions were almost always deadly. We were forced to work in temperatures of 40° F. below zero. Only when the cold was even more

intense than that were the men sent back to their barracks. Rain and snowstorms were disregarded. We had to cut trees in the forests even when the snow was waist deep. Falling trees would hit the workers, who were unable to get away in the deep snow. In the summer, while mowing in the marshland, the men were obliged to stand knee deep in water or mud for 10 or 12 hours a day. The same thing happened in the turf pits. At night, the clothes, drenched with snow and mud, were hung around the stove. The nauseating evaporation polluted the air in the barracks * * * In the morning, most prisoners had to don damp tatters. No wonder they constantly fell ill. Influenza, bronchitis, pneumonia, tuberculosis (the consumptive cases were not isolated, nor were they relieved of work unless their temperatures rose above 100° F.), malaria and other illnesses decimated our ranks. Scurvy was widespread, wounds opened, and abscesses suppurated. Gangrene was frequent, and often necessitated the amputation of toes and fingers. Frostbite and subsequent amputation were common.

"Sickness was considered fortunate, if it led to hospitalization. The prisoners often mutilated themselves to avoid working. The men were compelled to work by force. Those who resisted were put in jail (into unheated cells, without clothes, and with a food ration of 11 ounces of bread and a bowl of soup once a day). Flat refusal to work entailed a death sentence. Such sentences were often read to us. * * * The camp authorities would force the prisoner to work, by means of beating, kicking, dragging him through mud and snow, setting dogs on him, hitting him with rifle butts, and threatening him at the point of a bayonet or revolver. * * *

"Transports would arrive in camp with hundreds of Mongols, Circassians, Georgians, and Uzbeks. After a year only a few of them were alive. Hard work killed the strongest among them. For a year, the 'hero' prisoner would do stakhanovite work and accomplish 120 or 150 percent of his quota. Then, one night, he would die in his sleep, without a moan, of a heart attack, and in the morning his companions would find beside them a 'healthy corpse'—healthy because he had died suddenly, without having been ill." (Testimony of an intellectual, in ibid., pp. 304–305.)

6. Starvation

"It is not easy to express on paper what hunger means—the daily master of the camps. He who has not experienced it, cannot understand how a man, under the influence of famine, can come to resemble a beast. This incident may help to explain the way in which a starved man thinks and acts.

"In the winter of 1942–43, an epidemic broke out, felling the horses in great numbers. * * * Nothing would be left of the horse but its horseshoes and its tail, the body being the object of a loud and forceful dispute among those who were nearest to it. Generally such banquets would result in death as a consequence of poisoning from raw meat, but you could not prevent the men from touching it. They knew that they would be sick, that they might die, but hunger was strongest: 'Let me once eat to satiety, even if it kills me!' they reasoned. One of my best friends, with whom I had shared my inadequate rations and who would have jumped into the fire for me, threw himself on me with an ax, threatening to hit me, because I took away his stinking 'booty.'

"In the distribution camp I saw how men, after 15 or 16 years of 'education' in the camps, tore live dogs into pieces and ate the bloody raw flesh. Thereafter these unfortunates became practically mad, to the point of cutting each other with their knives and losing their senses." (Testimony No. 1336, ibid., pp. 313–314.)

7. Poles in the Pechora Camps

"The physician in our clay hut was a Soviet prisoner. Having been captured by the Finns during the campaign [of 1939–40], he was therefore sentenced to 10 years after his return from captivity. He really sacrificed himself in his work, doing everything he possibly could to help. * * * Suddenly there was a high mortality in column 92. When I left the hospital, only about half the 120 were still alive, and even the survivors looked like ghosts.

"The chief of administration, an important official, was arrested and sent to Moscow. The chief of the group, his deputy, the chief engineer, Sifinier; the chief physician, Dr. Pomerantz; the chief of the sanitary section, and some other column heads were tried on the spot and convicted, depending on their rank, to from 5 to 8 years of forced labor in the camps. It was learned that from the assigned contingent of 6,500 prisoners 4,000 had died between September 1940

and March 1941, and the survivors were unfit to work. This was when the construction of railroad lines was supposed to begin, and there was a shortage of workers. The new parties could not arrive before summer, and to wait would have been inviting official condemnation for sabotage.

"Of our Polish group, five jews had died one right after another. Cpl. Kasimierz Bielachowiez, a very attractive fellow, died under tragic circumstances. Once during work he made fun of a soldier who did not know how to carry his rifle; the soldier got mad at him, so the corporal threw himself on him, forced the rifle out of his hands, beat him and poked him with his feet while yelling excitedly: 'Poles, to arms! Beat the bastards!' A few soldiers ran over, disarmed and tied Bielachowiez. He risked being shot; I later learned that he was considered insane but given a trial. When I returned after the amnesty I could not find him anywhere, no trace of him was left. I am certain that he was made a martyr.

"When we gathered after the armistice to depart from the Pechora Camps, I found only 2 of my 14 companions alive; we left the others behind in the tundra * * *." (Testimony No. 1662, in *ibid.*, pp. 282–283.)

8. A Zionist leader appeals to the world

Dr. Julius Margolin, a Zionist leader, recently released from Soviet labor camps, wrote the following appeal while on his way to Palestine.

"I have lived in the Soviet Union for almost 7 years, from the fall of 1939 to the summer of 1946. I spent 5 years at hard labor in Soviet 'corrective labor camps.' There I came to understand the secret of Soviet strength and stability. The last year I spent in a small town in the Altai region as a released and legalized Soviet citizen, taking part in the gray, workaday life of the Soviet people.

"I think that I am entitled to speak about and judge of that country. Tolstoy wrote that 'no one who has not sat in prison knows what the state is like.' This anarchist aphorism applies applies surely to the Soviet Union. No one who has not passed through Soviet prisons can say that he knows Soviet Russia.

"Until the fall of 1939 I had assumed a position of 'benevolent neutrality' toward the U. S. S. R.; this was the characteristic attitude of the progressive and radical sections of the European intelligentsia. 'It is true,' we would say to ourselves, 'that their system is no good for us in Europe. But it appears that it is a regime that suits the wishes of the Russian people. It's their business, they've asked for it. For us Europeans it is valuable as a great social experiment, and all of us can learn many important and valuable things from the Soviet Union; for instance, the solution of the problem of nationalities; or planned economy; or the new role of the woman. Let them live and work in good health!'

"Such was my outlook until 1939. When I used to read the prewar Russian emigre press, I could not rid myslf of a disagreeable impression, and I thanked my stars that I was beyond narrowness and petty criticism and could view the Soviet reality with due objectivity. I could not stand violent 'reactionary' criticism of the Soviet regime. In my book, The Zionist Idea, which appeared before the war, you could not find even a trace of hostility toward the Soviet Union. * * *

"The last 7 years have made me a convinced and ardent foe of the Soviet system. I hate this system with all the strength of my heart and all the power of my mind. Everything I have seen there has filled me with horror and disgust, which will last to the end of my days. I feel that the struggle against the regime of slavery, terrorism, and cruelty which prevail there constitutes the primary obligation of every man in this world. Tolerance or support of such an international shame is not permissible for people who are on this side of the Soviet border and who live under normal conditions. And I am happy that I am able to say without fear or intimidation everything I know and think about this regime.

"I know that my capacities shall not suffice for this task. To describe the Soviet hell one would need the force of Dante and Dostoyevsky combined with the realism of Dickens. But fate has given me a pen, and I shall not lay it down until I have written what I have to say. I have no literary ambitions. My task is to speak the truth, a truth which so many people dare not, will not, cannot or simply fear to know. I write with the emotion of a man who feels that he has but 1 day left to live—and in that day he must say what is most essential, the faster the better, for tomorrow may be too late.

"Millions of men are perishing in the camps of the Soviet Union."

TWO WORLDS WITHIN THE U. S. S. R.

"Russia is indeed divided into two parts: one part, the 'free' Russia, is accessible to the visiting foreigners, so far as foreigners are at all permitted into the Soviet Union; there are show places, such as the Moscow subway, with brilliant facades and dirty courtyards, which are at least theoretically accessible to the outsider.

"The other Russia—the second Russia, behind barbed wire—is the thousands, endless thousands of camps, places of compulsory labor, where millions of people are interned. Deprived of their citizenship, these people are excluded from Soviet society and are in a literal meaning of the word the state's slaves. After the completion of their 10-year sentence (and recently a new category of convicts for 15 and 20 years has been introduced), they are commonly transferred to the status of 'special migrants,' not being permitted to return home and often forced to remain in the locality where they have just served their sentence. Millions of slaves colonize the far-off peripheries of the Soviet north. And, in general, there is no corner in this huge land where, between normal towns and villages, there is not a camp surrounded by high fences, with the four standard guard towers, one at each corner.

"This second Russia is a huge sewer, a gigantic dumping heap on which are deposited, whenever desirable, entire groups and classes of the population. This 'invisible' Russia is genuine hell, a diabolic invention, scientifically organized along the latest lines of police technique. It is hard to say just how many people are in it. The inmates mention the most fantastic figures. I think that in some years the camps have housed from 10 million to 15 million people. During the war a considerable number died out. Now new herds of men are sent there again. To mention them aloud or to speak of them is impossible in Russia. Soviet literature shamefacedly keeps silent. At one time foreign correspondents were even permitted to visit Hitler's 'KZ's' but no one has been permitted into the Soviet concentration camps; the only way journalists have found their way into them is as prisoners. And this explains why up to the war the world knew nothing, absolutely nothing, about them. The terror and secrecy in which these camps are veiled are indescribable. As in a Russian fairy tale, you talk to people one day—the next day they have disappeared. The big bad wolf has devoured them. You are no longer supposed to concern yourself about them. If they write to you, do not in vain seek in their letters any clue to their mode of existence. They will ask for parcels and assure you that they are in good health. These people's names have been stricken out of the book of life; their wives will divorce them, and their Komsomol children will not write to them.

"The Soviet state is the only one in the world where people live under continual threat, as if at the muzzle of a cocked revolver. In the camps of the BBK—the White Sea-Baltic Sea Canal—alone, there were about 500,000 people, and the 50,000 Poles sent there easily dissolved in the total mass. All of Russia is covered with these camps as if with a mysterious rash; and the infinite cynicism of the officialdom, well aware of its actions, is expressed in the hermetic isolation of these camps from all foreign visitors. Thus the subservient rascals among the cultured elite of Soviet society have the possibility to deny the very existence of this unprecedented system. After my liberation I held in my hands the official textbook on Political Economy, a collective work published in Moscow under the editorship of Professor Mitin, where one of the erudite scoundrels calls the assertion that there exists slave labor in the U. S. S. R. 'a bourgeois calumny.'

"It is ridiculous to suppose that all these millions of prisoners are guilty. What criminals can be the half a million Poles (mostly Jews) who were sent to the camps in the summer of 1940? A government which does not hesitate to keep millions of its citizens in a state of slavery as a measure of pacification and in order to strengthen the regime; a government that continually tears pieces of live flesh from the body of the most unfortunate people in the world; a government that does not stop sending masses of innocent and intimidated people through the sieve of the NKVD, without trial and without cause, without pity or regard, into the labor camps (and the local staffs of the NKVD, in turn, themselves operate under terror and fear)—such a government is the most monstrous phenomenon of our contemporary world.

"It is true that in comparison with the death factories of Oswiecim and Maidanek the Soviet camps may pass for the highest depositories of humaneness. But Hitlerism has been beaten, while the Soviet camps continue to exist. There are no more ghettos and crematoriums; but the camps where I spent the best years of my life continue to be ignored by the peoples of the world; and the cot

I once occupied is now taken up by my comrades. Since they came into being, the Soviet camps have swallowed more people, have exacted more victims that all other camps—Hitler's included—together, and this lethal engine continues to operate full blast.

"And those who in reply only shrug their shoulders and try to dismiss the issue with vague and meaningless generalities I consider moral abbeters and accomplices of banditry."

JEWS IN THE SOVIET UNDERWORLD

"An entire generation of Zionists has died in Soviet prisons, camps, and exile. We were never able to come to their rescue, and this not only because it was difficult, but above all because we had lost all h art-felt, spiritual contact with them. We did not care about them. I do not remember seeing a single article about them in the prewar press, not the least effort to mobilize public opinion and to alleviate their fate. This was evidence of that criminal passivity and paralysis which showed themselves so tragically wh n the chimneys of Oswiecim were lit up and Polish Jewry marched to death, while the worldwide centers of Jewish life stood by, 'not knowing,' 'not believing,' and therefore failing to do even the little that could be done to help them. One of my most shocking encounters in the Soviet 'underworld' was meeting people buried alive for no other reason than the fact of having been Zionists in their youth. Before me were old men and women, broken in spirit and body, without hope or faith. They asked me to give their regards to their people and their country, as if to holy symbols that would never again become a reality for them. And they further asked me—people with many achievements to their credit, people whom their countrymen must certainly remember—they asked me not to mention their names in the press abroad, for this might be fatal for them or their childr n, for their families living in freedom, in Soviet 'freedom,' that is. I keep silent about them. But there are names that I do not hestitate to list because they are publicly known, and not I but others should long ago have raised the question of their fate.

"M. Kulbak, a brilliant and talented Yiddish poet, a great asset to our literature suddenly 'disappeared' in Soviet Russia, Kulbak was no Zionist. He was a friend of the U. S. S. R. and had gone th re to live and work in the 'fatherland of all toilers.' He wrote two notable books there: Messiah ben Efraim and a novel, Zelmenauer. Kulbak had the same idea of communism as the rest of our naive simplists who live in a world of inflamed fantasy. But he was careless enough to settle not in Paris but in Moscow. Now his books are on the index, his works are forbidden, and he hims lf is listed as 'missing,' i. e., in one of the camps as a unit among working cattle. I think the worst thing about it is the utter indifference of the Jewish people, for whom this man lived and toiled. We cares about him? Does the Jewish public, Jewish literature realize the debt it owes him? We keep qui t, but Kulbak's tragedy is not only shamful for humanity: it is our own tragedy above everything else.

"Every Lithuanian Jew and every Zionist knows the name of Be'amin Berger, before the war president of Zionist organizations in Lithuania. I bow my head before this man, who saved my life, saving me from the most humiliating of all deaths—starvation. In the Kotlas camp, where we met as prisoners, he slowly and patiently put me on my feet. I know of no man more wonderful, more nob'e, or pure than Dr. Berger. His silvery hair and his tired intelligent eyes have the imprint of divine humaneness. All of his life—he is 66 years old now—has been filled with unselfish service to his fellow men, to science, and to his people. There is no man in the world whom Dr. Berger ever harmed; and there are legions who owe him their lives. Dr. Berger did not fail to help a suffering human being whenever he could, and in the prison camp into which he has been thrown, he remains a living personification of warmth and care, attention, and compassion, moral support and paternal love for all the unfortunate, humiliated, and crushed people who for 6 years now have constituted his only environment. * * *

"There is something savage and irrational in the fact that people like Dr. Berger, obvious heroes of human fraternity, are classified as 'antisocial elements' and as criminals in the Soviet Union. After the occupation of Lithuania Dr. Berger was arrested and deported in 1941. For belonging to an organization as 'reactionary' as the Zionists he was sentenced to 10 years at hard labor. For a person of his age and health (he has a serious heart disease), 10 years are tantamount to a death sentence. * * *

"Woe to a society which loses the ability to react strongly and vigorously to crying injustice and to combat the evil. Such a socity is a moral corpse, and where there is moral disintegration, political decline will not be far off. To help Berger means to help ourselves.

"We are faced with an international scandal, and we must say so in a loud voice. There can be no equivocation about it. A turn for the better will never occur as a reward for our 'exemplary behavior.' Those people are murdering our brothers. And we keep silent.

"Let us admit that it was impossible to raise the issue during the common struggle against Hitler. Now the war is over.

"We must delay no longer."

Dr. Margolin directed his moving appeal to the Jewish people. But Soviet concentration camps include millions of every race and creed. The issue is so big and the reality so horrible that these camps ought to be the concern of everybody in every nation who loves freedom. To paraphrase Abraham Lincoln, the world cannot be truly free while one-sixth of it is enslaved. "We must delay no longer."

Forced Labor

By Dr. K. A. Wittfogel, University of Washington, Department of Far Eastern and Slavic Languages and Literature, Seattle, Wash.

Forced labor is an essential institution in Communist China. It serves crucial needs of the new regime, and it reflects, and perpetuates, important conflicts between this regime and its subjects. What then is the character of this institution? What is its historical background? What is its present shape? And what is its future?

A citizen of a modern democratic country who is unfamiliar with the history of China will tend to evaluate Communist forced labor by the standards of his own world. Taking freedom of labor for granted, he will find it difficult to understand that in agro-hydraulic countries, such as China, conspicuous and large-scale forced labor is not necessarily considered objectionable. Unaware of the role of forced labor in pre-Communist China, he overrates the tensions that forced labor creates in Communist China.

On the other hand, a person who has a superficial knowledge of China's despotic past may err in the opposite direction. Assuming that Mao's regime, in a modernized and intensified way, perpetuates time-honored patterns, he will overlook the new quality which forced labor has assumed in Communist China. And he will consequently tend to underrate the tension produced by the Communist system of forced labor.

Both attitudes are theoretically untenable and politically harmful. A valid perspective can be obtained only when Communist forced labor is viewed against the background of forced labor in pre-Communist China.

A. Forced Labor in Traditional China

Our historical survey distinguishes between the conditions of traditional China, which came to an end with the downfall of the empire in 1912, and the state of transition, which prevailed from 1912 on, especially under the Nationalist Government.

Traditional China was familiar with three major forms of forced labor: (1) Corvée labor; (2) labor by slaves and other unfree persons (prisoners of war, convicts); and (3) military commandeered labor. Military commandeered labor overlapped, but was not identical, with forced agricultural labor on "garrison fields," a system of work which served mainly to maintain the army and which was performed by both soldiers and civilians.

All three forms of forced labor must be distinguished from a relation in which the government exercises disciplinary control over workers not subject to forced labor. Such "regulated labor," as I propose to call it, existed side by side with forced and free labor in traditional China. Pushed beyond a certain point, this pattern may approach the character of forced labor. This is increasingly the case in Communist China.

1. Corvée labor (outside the sphere of farming)

The corvée laborer works because he is ordered to do so. He may or may not be given food and shelter. His pay, if he receives any, is one-sidedly determined by the drafting authority; and it is usually low. The corvée laborer need not

be a free man—he may be attached to his village or his land—but he is no slave. After the completion of his corvée task, he goes home and resumes his professional occupation.

In feudal civilizations, such as medieval Europe and Japan, corvée labor was mainly performed on the estates of feudal lords and under the lords' command. In agro-hydraulic civilizations, such as traditional China, corvée labor was mainly organized by the bureaucratic representatives of a despotic state.

In traditional China government-organized teams of corvée laborers created and maintained the major hydraulic installations (irrigation works, dikes for flood control, and communication canals), extended fortifications (city walls and "long" walls), the state highways, government buildings, palaces, and tombs for the rulers. They performed operational services among which the transport corvée was very significant. And at times they also worked in government mines and other industrial enterprises.

The dimension of the labor teams varied with the dimension of the task. In semiarid China, the irrigation installations were spread out over a number of regions; the river embankments frequently extended for long distances, as did the navigational canals. It goes without saying that the three hydraulic tasks occurred in various combinations.

The Pien Canal which was dug in the Yellow River Basin under Han rule simultaneously served the purposes of flood control (drainage), irrigation, and communication. It was created by several hundred thousand "conscripts" (Hou Han Shu 76/9b ff.). The irrigation system in Szechuan was restored under the Yüan dynasty. It then had over 130 sections. Teams of drafted laborers numbering from several hundred to over 10,000 men worked on the individual sections (Yüan Shih 66/12a). That is, altogether the job probably involved the labor of several hundred thousand men.

The Sui emporer, Yang, had China's greatest navigation canal (the Grand Canal) reconstructed and extended through the efforts of a corvée team of more than a million persons, men and women (Sui Shu 3/11a).

In the early days of the Han dynasty, about 145,000 drafted laborers, men and women, built the walls of the then capital, Ch'ang-an (Han Shu 2/3b, 4a). The Northern Ch'i dynasty (A. D. 550–577) mobilized 1,800,000 men for work on the Great Wall (Pei Shih 7/10a). Since Northern Ch'i had a registered population of about 3,000,000 families (T'ung Tien 7/40a), 60 percent of these families must have provided a worker for this gigantic operation. A Later Han inscription commemorating the building of the state highway in west China reported that the government mobilized more than 750,000 free men and 2,690 convicts for this purpose (Chih Shih Ts'ui Pien 5/13a–b).

The building corvée proper also involved large numbers of men. The First Emporer of the Ch'in dynasty, Ch'in Shih Huang-ti, who, in the latter part of the third century B. C., forged China into a tightly centralized empire, drafted about 700,000 people for work on his palaces and his colossal tomb (Shih Chi 6/24b, 31a). Emporer Yang of the Sui dynasty mobilized 2 million people, men and women, for the construction of his palace (Sui Shu 24/16a).

In some cases, the laborers were kept working without regard for the agricultural season. Generally, however, the corvée was so arranged that the peasants could properly attend to their fields. Under Han rule, the standard length of the labor service apparently was 30 days (Hsi Han Hui Yau 47: 481). The above-mentioned walling of Ch'ang-an was spread over several years, the annual work period lasting 30 days (Han Shu 2/3b). In the period of the Six [Southern] Dynasties (220–587) the people had to work for 45 days for the state (WHTK 3: 48a). In T'ang time the normal minimum was 20 days, the maximum 50. Balazs concludes that the T'ang peasants actually worked for the state some 50 or 52 days per year (Balazs 1931: 54). Under the Yüan dynasty, certain corvée tasks were completed in 30 days (Yüan Shih 65/6a). But the men who worked on the above-named Szechuan canals were drafted for 70 days (Yüan Shih 66/12a). The corvée statutes of the Ming dynasty proclaimed 30 days as the norm (HWHTK 16: 2913a).

The Manchu rulers, like their Ming predecessors, endeavored to replace corvée labor by hired labor paid for tax revenues. To be sure, similar efforts had been made much earlier. T'ang statutes permitted the substitution of silk payments for labor service (WHTK 3/48a). The Sung chancellor, Wang An-shih, paid workers out of revenues accruing from a public service tax (Sung Shih 177/6b; cf. Williamson 1935: 213 ff.). The increasing facilities for circulating goods and money may well have suggested such policies. But whatever the reason for its inception, Wang's innovation encountered serious obstacles; and in its original

form it was not upheld long. However, in a modified way, it persisted in Sung (Sung Shih 178/12b ff.; Williamson 1935: 243) and post-Sung time. The Mongols, who certainly were no philanthropists, paid laborers in the southern part of Chekiang Province from funds raised by a surtax on land (HWHTK 16: 2911 C).

Under the Ming dynasty the draft was still resorted to where mass labor was needed. As in Yuan times, men were mobilized to mine gold, lead, iron, copper, and silver (HWHTK 23: 2998 ff.). In 1467, 21 gold mines in Hunan and Hupei are said to have been worked by about 550,000 corvée laborers (HWHTK 23: 3000 B). The gathering of pearls and precious stones was similarly organized (HWHTK 23: 3000 and 3001).

However, with regard to work on the Yellow River dikes, the government seems to have raised a tax in rice or money (HWHTK: 2916 B). In 1581, during the last phase of Ch'ing rule, all male adults had to pay a tax in lieu of corvée labor. It is doubtful that this law was ever fully enforced. It is certain that, after 10 years, it was completely disregarded (HWHTK: 2918 B).

Like other Orientally despotic rulers, the Manchus maintained a virtual monopoly over big construction. But they went further than their predecessors in their efforts to replace reluctant draft laborers with more effective hired workers. In the first part of the 18th century, the Ch'ing Government solemnly abolished the use of the corvée on big state projects.

The effect of this ruling was uneven. Many major hydraulic enterprises were manifestly executed with hired laborers, especially in the 18th and early 19th centuries. But up to the end of the Ch'ing dynasty, every able-bodied adult male was legally liable to render work for the government (Boulais 1924: 181 ff.). And while the drafted laborers were to be remunerated in cash, apparently their pay was lower—at times, considerably lower—than that given to hired laborers. (See CCWHTK: 5050.) In a number of cases, they received no money, only millet or rice (Ch'ing Shih Kao 1734: 127/7a; 1741: 307/5b; 1757: 321/1a). Moreover, conscription remained general policy at the local level. A retired high Ch'ing official explained this as follows: "Since there was no separate source of revenue for local expenses, the public labor that had to be performed for the local government was necessarily imposed upon the people of the locality" (Chen 1911: 668).

Thus the big works of the Ch'ing dynasty were carried out by paid hired laborers, poorly paid drafted laborers, and unpaid drafted laborers. At the close of the period, the hard-pressed government again resorted increasingly to the last category. That it could do so underlies the potential of mass mobilization inhering even in a weakened hydraulic ("oriental") despotism.

2. Military construction labor

But however great this mobilization potential was, the governments of traditional China often used soldiers instead of, or along with, civilian labor. This was particularly so in the case of remote defense works and hydraulic emergencies.

The Great Wall, a combination of old and new structures, is said to have been built in the early days of the Ch'in Empire by an army of 300,000 men (Shih Chi 88/1b). The "conscripts" who in Han times dug the Pien Canal were men drafted for the local militia and labor service. In A. D. 555 the Great Wall was repaired by a gigantic work team that, in addition to almost 2 million civilians, included part of the Army of Northern Ch'i (Pei Shih 7/10a). Under the Ming dynasty the troops stationed at the northern frontier did important work on the defense walls of this critical area (Ming Hui-yao 63/2a–b). In 1413, for instance, northern defense troops built a long stone wall (loc. cit.).

The army also figured conspicuously in efforts to combat or prevent floods. In A. D. 69 "several hundred thousand troops" were kept busy repairing the dikes of the Yellow and Pi Rivers (Hou Han Shu 76/10a). In A. D. 1391 the soldiers of 17 defense bases (wei) assisted the people in rebuilding the dikes (Ming Shih 83/1b). Mixed work teams of this type operated also under the Ch'ing dynasty (Wittfogel 1931: 449 ff.).

3. Forced Agricultural Labor

In traditional China works of irrigation and flood control which required mass labor were basic features of the agrarian order. They provided the peasant with an essential auxiliary material (water). And they protected his life in the low-lying plains, which, while most suitable for intensive farming, were also most likely to be inundated. But this is only one aspect of the hydraulic order. The other, irrigation farming, favored small units of labor.

77294—56——18

In agrohydraulic civilizations, family-based peasant agriculture proved most rewarding both for the cultivators and for the government.

However, there are a few exceptions to this rule: (1) Under simple agronomical conditions, particularly where the animal-drawn plow was unknown, important farming activities might be carried out by larger work teams. (2) The necessity for feeding armies in remote regions encouraged the maintenance of farming colonies in which crops were raised by means of military or quasi-military forced labor. Such colonies might produce relatively low yields, but they enabled the government to avoid the expensive transport of grain over long distances.

The two just-mentioned patterns of agricultural forced labor appeared successively: work on public fields in preimperial China and work in farming colonies in imperial China.

(*a*) *"Public fields" in preimperial China.*—An often cited ode from the earlier part of the first millennium before Christ shows that, at the time of the Chou dynasty, there existed in China "public" as well as "private" fields (Legge, CC IV: 381). Another early ode depicts a rural scene in which thousands of men worked together, clearing and tilling land under the supervision of a steward (op. cit.: 600 ff.).

Whether this type of mass labor was customary only when new lands were being opened up, or whether the "public fields" were generally worked by large teams is a moot question. But even if such giant teams were the exception rather than the rule, and even if the public land, once established, was tilled partly by smaller groups and partly by individual cultivators, as was frequently the case on the domain lands of feudal Europe—as long as the peasants worked the public fields because they were ordered to do so, they rendered (state) corvée labor just as the western serfs rendered (feudal) corvée labor.

From the beginning the peasants' labor on the public fields was probably less effective than their work on the private fields. It was certainly less productive after plowing with oxen and other improvements were introduced. During the period immediately preceding the empire, the communal village system (in which the public fields apparently were a standard feature) was abolished and private landholding established. A book written at the time of China's unification, or shortly thereafter, states drily that the peasants tilled the public fields less carefully then their own land (Lü-Shih ch'un-ch'iu, ch. 17).

(*b*) *Farming colonies in imperial China.*—As a general institution, forced agricultural labor came to an end in the 4th and 3d centuries B. C. It reemerged, however, during the early days of the empire in a limited and specific form—as work done in farming colonies. In this form, it lasted with many modifications and with varying importance until the last imperial dynasty.

China's imperial governments maintained such colonies mainly to provide food for troops stationed at the frontier or in strategic places in the interior; in regions of potential unrest and along vital lines of communications. A recent study of over 800 occurrences of farming colonies found that 57.9 percent of them involved military colonies, 26 percent farming colonies, 7.6 percent colonies employing former enemies who surrendered (most of them under the Mongol dynasty), 3.4 percent colonies occupying convicts, and 0.9 percent lands attached to government officials (T'ang 1947: 212). These percentages should not be pressed. But qualitative descriptions confirm that during most periods the Chinese farming colonies were predominantly garrison fields (t'un t'ien), that the civilian colonies widely known as "camp fields" (ying t'ien) also played a considerable role, and that "camp colonies" based on convict labor were few.

Little need be said here about the garrison fields. Like the civilian camp fields, they were set up in a variety of ways. But when the soldiers assigned to them were tilling their fields, they were only fulfilling another service obligation.

Work in the civilian farming colonies probably came closest to the work that, prior to the empire, had been done on the public fields. But the camp fields never affected the majority of all villagers. The government of Western Wei gave orders to draft 1 out of 10 persons to fill such fields (Wei Shu 62/10b). Other dynasties transferred certain civilians, no doubt primarily peasants, to farming colonies (cf. T'ang Hui-yao 89: 1619). In some cases, persons were hired, in other corvée laborers were drafted (HWHTK : 1137A). Not infrequently former soldiers and persons who had been made homeless by wars or natural calamities were enlisted (T'ang 1947: 16 ff., 131 ff.).

Life in a farming colony, whatever the cultivators' background, was restricted and often frustrating. Far from their native villages and families, the colonists

tended to be homesick. In some instances, they were expected to till the larger part of the "camp" land for themselves, and a smaller part (one-fifth) for the government (HWHTK: 2824B). The pattern resembles the ancient public land system. Or they tilled the bulk of the "camp" land for the government and a fraction (one-tenth) for themselves (Yü-hai 177/40a). This pattern somewhat resembles the modern collective farm system.

Apparently, however, such arrangements were not general. Often members of a farming camp cultivated land that had no special government sector, and when this was the case, the land was either jointly tilled or divided into individual plots and tilled under conditions approaching tenancy (HWHTK : 2824C).

When the colonists were excessively burdened with land and cattle taxes, they were reluctant to fertilize and irrigate, to repair their houses, or plant trees. Disturbed by such a negative attitude, the government of the second Later Han dynasty, in 953, restored the land to the tillers (Chiu Wu Tai Shih 112/12a), who then eagerly resumed the tasks which before they had neglected.

Lack of specific data prevents us from defining to what extent "camp fields" were farmed under a quasi-military system of forced labor, or under a system of tenancy involving rigid supervision (regulated labor), or under the relaxed conditions of a more or less normal tenancy. Assuming, particularly during the earlier dynasties, that a combination of forced and regulated labor prevailed and that therefore elements of forced agricultural labor persisted, we must, at the same time, remember that during the imperial epoch the area occupied by the farming colonies was never more than a fraction of the entire cultivable area.

As stated above, under the Northern Wei dynasty one-tenth of the whole population was assigned to Government-controlled farming colonies. Under Mongol rule, 17.7 million mou are said to have been garrison fields. If the total of all cultivated land under the Mongols was roughly equivalent to the amount of cultivated land possessed by the untruncated Sung empire, that is, between 440 and 525 million mou, then the garrison fields of the Yüan dynasty may have constituted about one-thirtieth of the cultivable land. (Actually the fraction was even smaller, for the 17.7 million mou were not all cultivated simultaneously.) Midway in the Ming period, in 1502, the Government controlled directly about one-eighth of all cultivated land (HWHTK: 2791B). Since the farming colonies occupied only part of the state land, the areas tilled by members of these colonies must have been less than one-eighth of all cultivated land. Under the Ch'ing dynasty, the percentage was much smaller. In the middle of the 18th century, the farming colonies occupied 25 million mou out of 708 million mou of cultivated land (Ta Ch'ing Hui-tien 10/32a, 33a), that is, something like one-thirtieth.

To get a fair idea of the dimension of agricultural forced labor in imperial China, we should at the least halve most of the above figures, and this for two reasons: (1) Generally the camp fields were less extensive than the garrison fields; (2) not all camp fields were tilled by means of forced labor. Thus, even if we include the land cultivated by convicts, which never amounted to much (see T'ang 1947: 180 ff.), we may conclude that during the last 700 years forced agricultural labor in imperial China affected not more than one-fortieth to one-sixtieth of the population, and probably less.

4. Slave labor and slavelike labor

But what about work done by slaves and persons living under slavelike conditions? Slavery was present in China since preimperial times; but its significance was limited. A civilization that in its crucial economic sphere—irrigation agriculture—demanded extremely subtle operations and that applied similarly subtle methods to handicraft had little use for full slaves, who, lacking property and family, also lacked the key incentives for careful and diligent work. Occasional attempts to use full slaves for these purposes yielded poor results. As in other hydraulic societies, slaves were employed in traditional China primarily for personal services. This was true both for private and Government slaves.

(*a*) *Private slaves.*—Prisoners of war, convicted criminals, and persons sold under duress were the main sources of Chinese slavery. Convicts, as might be expected, remained under the control of the Government. Slaves through purchase were essentially the property of private households. And prisoners of war, who were owned by the Government, were occasionally sold to private individuals (Pippon 1936: 40 ff.; Wang 1925: 307; Wilbur 1943: 126).

Under the early Han dynasty, which brought to an end a long period of external and internal strife, slavery was relatively widespread. But even

during that period private and Government slaves together seem to have constituted under 1 percent of the total population (Wilbur 1943: 177). And while there are reports of slave labor in agriculture, handicraft, and commerce, they are incomparably less plentiful than the references to personal service (op. cit.: 178 ff., 195 ff., 216 ff.). In general, "the system remained at the level of domestic slavery * * *" (op. cit.: 243).

Inner Asiatic conquerors of China carried with them their traditionally harsh methods of treating slaves. As a rule, the masters of the major conquest dynasties, Northern Wei (386–535), Liao (916–1125), Chin (1125–1237), and Yüan (1137–1368) did not hesitate to apply these methods to their new Chinese subjects (see Eberhard 1949: 179 ff.; Wittfogel and Fêng 1949: 196 ff., 230 ff.; Pippon 1936; 18 ff., 22 ff., Wang 1925: 311; Biot 1837: 257, 279 ff.). The Manchus originally also followed the inner-Asiatic pattern. However, they were already semi-Chinese when they crossed the great wall (Wittfogel 1949: 10 ff.); and they soon adopted a quasi-Chinese, and much more lenient, attitude toward slavery. They did not go so far as their Ming predecessors, who legally permitted the holding of slaves only to members of the upper class (HWHTK: 2900 B). But in the early 18th century they abolished certain taxes which had driven poor men to sell themselves into slavery. According to Liang Ch'i-ch'ao, this fiscal reform contributed largely to the disappearance of male slaves in Ch'ing China (Liang 1925: 531, 533).

(*b*) *Government slaves and convicts.*—The traditional Chinese governments had direct control over two major groups of unfree persons: convicted criminals and government slaves. Short of the death penalty, persons convicted of serious crimes were exiled to the frontier where they were forced to perform onerous labor tasks. Persons sentenced to prison terms of one or a few years were given work in accordance with the seriousness of their crime and their ability. According to Han law, which particularly stressed the first aspect, male convicts with a 1-year term served as frontier guards or in forced-labor projects; those with a 2-year term were attached to the Ministry of Punishment; those with a 3-year term had to cut sacrificial wood; those with a 4-year term had to work from the early morning building walls; but their heads were shaved, and their necks encased in iron collars (Han Chiu I, B/9a–b).

The purpose of attaching the 2-year terms to the Ministry of Punishment is not clear; the reasons for the other assignments are more obvious. Frontier guard service and the execution of various other forced-labor tasks gave greater freedom of movement, and it therefore makes sense that such tasks were given to short-term convicts who were least likely to run away. Work at the walls was probably particularly strenuous. The convicts with the longest terms were conspicuously marked, certainly in order to discourage them from flight.

In the first century before Christ, the Han government had more than 2,000 prisons (Han Shu 23/21a); and a statement of 113 B. C. concerning the amount of grain transported for the support of convicts and government slaves (Shih Chi 30/15b) suggests that these 2 groups numbered at least 200,000 persons. If at this time there were approximately as many government slaves as in 44 B. C., namely ca. 100,000 (Han Shu 72/16a ff.), and if certain of the convicts (especially the frontier guards) and certain government slaves (especially those on the frontier and in imperial parks) were taken care of from local food stocks, then between 113 and 44 B. C. the government may well have had a total of 200,000 convicts. This figure, which is compatible with the figure of 2,000 prisons, points to a combined total of convict laborers and government slave laborers of less than 0.5 percent of the population.

Government slaves came from several sources. Relatives of persons who had committed serious crimes were enslaved by the authorities, and their descendants might be held as government slaves indefinitely. Private slaves were confiscated, when the state seized the property of wealthy individuals. And some prisoners of war were made government slaves (see Wilbur 1943: 114).

Like the convicts, the government slaves were given a variety of tasks. Like them also, some were engaged in spatially concentrated operations which did not involve personal services. But the majority were assigned to lowly services in different bureaus (op. cit.: 238 ff.).

Labor on the government's frontier ranches and the imperial parks, which occurred under Han rule (op. cit.: 232 ff.), was not a standard occupation for slaves in later periods. The work done by government slaves in the imperial mint (op. cit.: 236) indicates that such persons could be used for certain (simpler) industrial jobs. Government slaves and convicts were assigned to these jobs also in later periods. Under the Ming dynasty, which was greatly

interested in mining, convicts worked in silver mines in Yünnan (HWHTK: 3000). But the increase of wage labor that characterized the later part of the Ming and most of the Ch'ing dynasty greatly reduced the employment of convicts—and of government slaves—in mining and manufacturing.

This is the impression conveyed by the Chinese records of the Ch'ing period (see for instance Yünnan T'ung Chih 74: 23 and 29; cf. also CCWHTK: 5129 ff.). And it is confirmed by foreign observers who, like Richthofen, made an extensive study of conditions in China after the T'ai-p'ing rebellion. At this time private owners used indentured slaves in coal mines in Hunan; but the governor, who suppressed this practice, described it as being in conflict with the prevailing wage labor system (Wittfogel 1931: 620–622). Richthofen also found wage labor prevailing in the many mining and smelting establishments he visited. Whatever the limitations of his study, "nobody," I wrote some years ago, "would have hesitated to familiarize Richthofen with this type of workers (slave laborers) if, according to Chinese opinion, their activity was proper and normal" (op. cit.: 622).

State slaves were still conspicuous at the beginning of the Ming dynasty. But, in 1402, an edict of emanicipation was proclaimed (Ming Hui-yao 52/2b; HWHTK: 2900 A), and in 1424 government slaves were freed (HWHTK: 2900 A).

The Ch'ing government did not restore the custom of having state slaves work in state enterprises or bureaus. Some criminals and relatives of criminals were assigned as "slaves" to meritorious officials, or were sent to frontier regions to work for a border tribe or garrison troops (Boulais 1924: 53, 328, 341, 465 ff., 681; Pippon 1936: 41 ff.). At the end of the dynasty this punishment was replaced by imprisonment or banishment to unhealthy regions (Wang 1925: 308). Thus it may be said that by 1912 state slave labor had ceased to exist.

B. FORCED LABOR UNDER THE CHINESE REPUBLIC (1912–49)

Prior to the establishment of the Communist regime on the mainland in 1949, China was loosely united under the Nationalist Government, which crystallized in central and south China in 1927 and spread its authority in the summer of 1928 over north China. The Nationalist Government in part continued the traditional patterns of forced labor, in part discharded of changed them.

1. The corvée

The provisional constitution, adopted by the National People's Convention in 1931, proclaimed in article 26 that "all persons shall have the duty of performing military service and compulsory labor (for the state) in accordance with law" (China Year Book 1932: 688). A number of regulations indicate the way in which this policy was carried out.

(*a*) *Hydraulic corvée* (*Central Government*).—In 1934, the Yellow River Irrigation Committee published a set of regulations, which stated that "the old pattern of labor service and collecting funds must be continued." If, in an emergency, the regular levy proved insufficient for the task at hand, the country magistrates in the Yellow River area were to draft additional persons, the government to provide material for shelter, food, and lamp oil (MKFKTC I: 767). Similar directives were issued by the Committee of Flood Control of the Yangtze River (op. cit.: 774).

(*b*) *Transportation corvée* (*Central Government*).—Other prewar regulations declared that labor should be drafted for the construction of national (interprovincial) roads, for military transportation, and other arm needs (op. cit.; 567). Laws determining the use of conscripted labor for road work indicate the manner in which the Nationalist Government approached the corvée problem. According to a set of general regulations issued in August 1929, all male adults between 18 and 50 years of age who lived along the projected roads were liable to be called up for work. The drafted men, who had to bring their tools with them, were to be given a cash equivalent for the food they needed. In case of a natural calamity they were also to be provided with food (MKFKTC IV: 5191 C).

Example 1: For the completion of a highway connecting Szechuan and Honan between September 1936 and January 1937, volunteers were first enlisted, then additional labor was drafted. Critics, who included members of the gentry, stated that at a certain section the workers were beaten and that they had not received their "wages and board" (Agrarian China: 111). The complaint indicates the problem raised by this form of corvée labor. But it also indicates that the workers were supposed to get wages as well as board.

Example 2: Construction of the Burma Road, which began in 1929, was undertaken with draft labor; so were repairs. Originally the workers seem to have received no remuneration. "It was only after the Central Government took over the road that wages were paid * * *" (Fei and Chang 1945: 100).

(c) *Regional labor service.*—The provincial government issued their own regulations for drafting labor for regional purposes.

In Shantung, the drafted men were to build roads and dig canals in addition to rendering unspecified general labor service (Chi Lu Chin III: 13a). For road construction Tzu-yang County mobilized peasants between 18 and 50 years of age who lived near the projected road and owned 2 mou or a multiple thereof. The men were to bring their tools and food. Well-to-do families from the nearest villages were to provide beverages (op. cit.: 14b). The regulations, which are undated and which admittedly perpetuate earlier patterns (op. cit.: 13a) were probably issued in the late twenties.

In Shensi, according to a regulation issued on Novemer 11, 1933, adult males between 18 and 49 years of age were to serve 13 days—10 for roadbuilding and 3 for planting trees. They were to receive neither food nor cash when they worked near their villages. When they worked at a distance of more than 20 li. they were to be given "10 Chinese cents or less" for their daily food expenses (Chi Lu Chin IV: 21a–b).

(d) *Wartime conditions.*—The war against Japan increased the Government's need to draft labor. The Minister of Railways, Chang Kia-ngau, states in a book completed early in 1943 that thus far about 20 million persons had been conscripted "for the army, road construction, and other war work" (Chang 1943: 298). Making proper allowance for those among them who were to serve as soldiers, we estimate that, during the first 5 years of the war, the Government drafted about 3 million persons, more or less, for corvée labor annually.

But while the conscription of labor was widespread, it was not general, not even for such work as railroad construction, which required much unskilled labor. Chang mentions several instances in which men were drafted for this purpose (op. cit.: 239, 250, 273). In two, wages were paid; in one of these, fairly good wages, measured by Chinese standards (op. cit.: 251). In others, the workers were hired (op. cit.: 240, 287, 291), as seems to have been customary prior to July 1937.

During the later part of the war, the Nationalist Government legalized the emergency use of draft labor. The National General Mobilization Act of 1942 gave the government the right to conscript "the people"; and the Citizens Obligatory Labor Act, published in December 1943, elaborated this point by stating that all Chinese male citizens between the ages of 18 and 50 were to work for the government without compensation. Their term of service was to be 10 days, with an 8-hour work day. In an emergency, drafted men might be held over for another 10 days. The workers could be employed for (1) road construction, (2) water construction, (3) defense works, (4) local productive projects, and (5) other public works enhancing social welfare (Liu Fa Hui-pien I: 259).

These regulations were broad, and doubtless they were often applied crudely and oppressively. But the Nationalist Government apparently did not intend to perpetuate the emergency measures when the war with Japan came to an end. Different from the Provisional Constitution of 1931, the Constitution of 1946 no longer lists labor service as a duty of the Chinese citizens.

(e) *Discarded elements of the traditional corvée.*—(i) The civilian building corvée: I have no evidence that the building corvée, which for long periods seriously plagued the population of traditional China, was revived to any substantial extent by the Nationalist Government.

(ii) Military construction labor: Some provincial governors, such as Yen Hsi-shan, used soldiers to build a regional railroad. But the Central Government does not seem to have regularly employed troops for such work.

2. Agricultural forced labor

In 1932, the headquarters of the anti-Communist army issued regulations for the establishment of t'un-t'ien colonies in regions affected by the struggle with the Communists. In 1933, this policy was spelled out in detail. Between 4 and 8 mou of land were to be given to each soldier. From the third year on, the civilian colonists were to be taxed 25 percent of their crop (MKFKTC I: 751).

But the army had more compelling concerns; and the local authorities, which were expected to administer the civilian part of the program, were equally unenterprising. Obviously, forced agricultural labor, which persisted through the greater part of the Ch'ing dynasty, played no role in Nationalist China.

3. Convict labor and slavery

(*a*) *Convicts.*—Was convict labor an exception to this rule? A law passed in the first year of the Nationalist regime (1928) prescribed that convicts had to work and that the income from their activities was to be used for the construction and upkeep of prison buildings (op. cit.: IV: 5594). In 1934 a government regulation directed that convict labor be used to till public land. In 1940 new regulations made it possible for convicts serving terms from 3 to 5 years and cultivating "public land" to have their families living with them. The convict farmers were to be given 50 percent of their output (NTFKEP I: 245 ff.).

The latter ruling had much to recommend it. But, like the plan to revive military and civilian farming colonies, it came to naught. Not even in the penal system did forced agricultural labor become an essential feature of Nationalist China.

(*b*) *Slavery.*—Slavery was formally abolished in 1908 (Wang 1925: 325)—that is, when the Manchu regime was tottering. Regulations issued in the early days of the Republic upheld the 1908 law. However, they permitted the keeping of young people in a slave-like condition (op. cit.: 327).

Dr. Sun Yat-sen was fundamentally opposed to slavery. In 1922, the provincial government in Canton, under his direction, decreed the abolition of child slavery. In 1928, the Nationalist Government declared its adherence to the Canton order of 1922. Further regulations, issued in 1930 and 1932, prescribed methods for eliminating the last remnants of slavery (Lamson 1935: 564 ff.; MKFKTC I: 1138). The new Chinese Penal Code, which became the law on July 1, 1935, proclaimed in article 296: "Any person reducing another to slavery, or to a state similar to slavery, shall be punished by imprisonment for a term of not less than one year or more than seven years.

"Attempts to commit the offense referred to in the first paragraph shall also be punishable."

An estimate published in 1929 suggested that there might still have been 2 million child slaves in China (Lamson 1935: 563). However, after that time agencies of the Nationalist Government and private groups worked seriously to free these unfortunate young persons (op. cit.: 565 ff.). A report to the League of Nations, written in 1937, found that in the Shanghai area girl slaves were no major problem (League of Nations, Annex 19). A study of a small Central Chinese town made in 1947 found only one case of the sale of a child (Fried 1953: 67, note).

This does not mean that in 1947 there were no more child slaves. But it seems safe to say that during the closing days of the Nationalist regime slavery in China had completely lost its significance.

C. FORCED LABOR IN COMMUNIST CHINA

1. The forced labor of Mao's China neither a repetition nor a spontaneous development of older Chinese patterns

The system of forced labor in Communist China reflects in part earlier Chinese ways; in part it follows Communist patterns. But even where it continues a Chinese tradition, it includes new features suggested by labor relations developed in the U. S. S. R.

Engaging in a scientific speculation—which in this context seems legitimate, and perhaps even mandatory—we may ask: What would have happened in an oriental country, such as China, if in 1917, the antitotalitarian forces in Russia had successfully defended the authority they gained through the February revolution? Would China in this case have moved farther away from a single-centered despotic society and closer to a multicentered society with freedom of political decision and freedom of labor? Quite possibly so. However, the Bolsheviks prevailed in the U. S. S. R. They encouraged Communist Parties in other countries to fight for total political control. And where, as in mainland China, the Communists succeeded in seizing power, they learned from their Soviet comrades new totalitarian methods of dominating labor.

In Communist China, these methods significantly changed the traditional system of forced labor: obligatory (corvée) labor. They developed an essentially new form of forced labor: corrective ("slave") labor. And they increasingly affected ordinary labor which, being more and more regulated, can no longer be considered free.

2. Obligatory (corvée) labor

The common program of 1949 lists the crucial obligations of the citizen of the Chinese People's Republic—among them labor discipline, tax payment, and the duty to perform public and military service—in a single paragraph (art. 8). The constitution of 1954, in conformity with the Soviet Constitution, separates the various items, which now appear as "a duty" pure and simple (labor discipline and tax payment), or as an "honorable" and "sacred" duty (the defense of the homeland and military service), or as an honor ("work is a matter of honor for every citizen") (arts. 100–103 and 16). The phrasing of this last item is less openly demanding than the comparable passage in the 1949 program concerning "the duty to perform public * * * service," or, for that matter, than article 130 in the Soviet Constitution, which obliges all citizens "honorably to perform public duties." But the operations following the adoption of the Chinese Constitution clearly indicate that Mao's regime is extending rather than reducing the range of corvée labor. Occasionally, these operations interlock with relief measures (Jen-min Jih-pao (Peiping), October 15, 1950; cf. UNESC 92 ff.); and in such cases, as in certain others, the borderline between "voluntariness" and compulsion may be fluid. In general, however, the large Government-directed projects are manifestly carried out with obligatory ("honorific") labor; and the publications of Communist China make no effort to hide this fact.

(*a*) *Hydraulic corvée labor.*—A few records will show how the Communists utilize obligatory labor on Government-directed works of water control: NCNA (New China News Agency), July 13, 1953: In Anhui "the peasants of the area were organized to exert concerted effort to drain the flood water under the leadership of the CCP and the People's government." In a single district, Wuhu, this task involved the work of over 400,000 peasants."

NCNA, December 19, 1954: In Kiangsi Province, 330,000 civilians toiled at the dikes. Competitive drives were initiated to promote the quality of the work and, of course, labor discipline. At one sector, the seventh "squad" of a certain local detachment increased the amount of earth carried daily from 1.5 to 2.7 cubic meters per person.

NCNA, March 8, 1955: 3 million laborers worked on the middle and lower Yangtze dikes. As usual, competitive drives were started. At a certain sector in Kiangsu Province members of Agriculture Producers' Cooperatives set a record by daily moving 2.29 cubic meters of earth per person.

NCNA, December 22, 1954: In Hunan Province, 690,000 laborers were occupied with dike work. One "corps," which was assigned to carry earth over a distance of 85 meters, increased the standard of achievement from 2 to 5 cubic meters per day. A team, led by a model worker, moved a record 9.3 cubic meters per day.

NCNA, May 10, 1955: The peasants of the lower Yellow River strengthened the dikes "with the view of preventing the great flood which comes once every 200 years." "Labor emulation" overcame all difficulties created by heavy rains and water-soaked soil.

NCNA, May 16, 1955: In February and March, 4.4 million "civilian" laborers worked at the Yangtze dikes in rain and deep snow. According to this report, the peasant laborers were in excellent spirits but, according to a report from Anhui (NCNA, May 10), due to the weather conditions the laborers at first accomplished so little that, in the spring, efforts had to be intensified. "Large-scale labor emulation greatly speeded up the work." Official and other members of producers' cooperatives and of Government agencies dealing with grain, communications, and transport vigorously supported the operation.

NCNA, May 16, 1953: A dispatch from Wuhan noted the participation of "large numbers of cadres" in the dike work.

NCNA, January 10, 1955: A bulletin from Hunan dealing with corvée work at the Tungting Lake states that the 800,000 persons engaged in this work were aided by 30,000 cadres dispatched by the provincial government.

The just cited data, which are all based on official Communist communications and which could easily be augmented, show that mainland China is still faced with enormous problems of water control, which the Communists solve through huge teams of drafted labor. Late in 1951, Fu Tso-yi, Minister of Water Conservation, stated that "during the last 2 years, a total of 10,370,000 persons were mobilized for work on water conservation projects" (Jen-min Jih-pao, November 5, 1951). Since the first years the regime's organizational and opera-

tional capacity has grown considerably. In the Yangtze Valley alone, the amount of earth moved is said to have increased three times (NCNA, May 16, 1955).

The data show that in addition to party cadres, the activists who aid the regional officers in the organization of the corvée are functionaries of the new producing and distributing centers which, since 1953, have become a decisive force in rural China. They show that corvée laborers are organized in a semimilitary way: detachments and corps. And they show that the organizers of the obligatory mass labor ruthlessly exploit the unprotected labor force by such Soviet-initiated methods as Stakhanovism and labor emulation.

(*b*) *Corvée labor for the construction of highways and railroads.*—The methods used by the Chinese Communists in the hydraulic corvée also appear, with proper modifications, in the construction and maintenance of highways and railroads.

"Forty-eight thousand kilometers of highways in China have been regularly maintained and renovated by the organized masses, while 32,000 kilometers of highways have been jointly maintained by the people and highway workers" (NCNA, May 15, 1955). Another part of the same report states that about 50 percent of all highways are maintained essentially by "the people" (loc. cit.).

The official news agency claims that the people organize themselves "voluntarily" for this purpose (loc. cit.). But there is every reason to believe that the people's highway work is about as voluntary as the "voluntary" expansion of the agricultural producers' cooperatives or the "voluntary" invasion of Korea by the armies of the Chinese People's Republic.

For work on the railroads—and in sharp contrast with prewar China—the Chinese Communists rely largely on drafted laborers, and to some extent also on soldiers. In fact, military forced labor, which decreased notably under the Republic, has under Mao's regime been playing a not insignificant role in various sectors of the economy, especially in dike and road work (see Hankow Yangtze Daily News, April 30 and June 21, 1952, and Hongkong Ta Kung Pao, September 26, 1954; Wu 1955: 327), in large-scale farming, and railroad building. In 1952 a construction team of 100,000 persons working at the Chengtu-Chungking Railway included 84,000 "mobilized" civilians, local unemployed persons, and soldiers (Chungking Daily News, December 7, 1951).

Our information on this particular enterprise, scanty though it is, illuminates the way in which the Communist government handles corvée tasks of this kind. Again there was a semimilitary setup: local district magistrates served as "regimental officers of the labor force." And construction was speeded up mercilessly. When, quite within normal expectancy, "many workers wanted to go home for the New Year, * * * measures for removing the obstructionists, bandits, and gangsters from the labor force" were "systematically" taken. The result: ninety-nine percent of all workers "voluntarily" decided not to spend the New Year with their families (Chungking Hsin-hua Jih-pao, December 8, 1951). At one section those who were injured or sick had to remain at work, despite their disabilities (op. cit.: June 22 and 26, 1952). And as many as 9,400 women were employed as maintenance workers (op. cit.: March 10, 1955).

In order to open the railroad on July 1, 1952, the prescribed date, "more and more workers were mobilized" particularly for difficult tasks. Some suffered injuries or died, allegedly because of the excessive zeal (NCNA, July 26, 1952).

Between May 1951 and August 1952, 20,000 workers were mobilized for the building of the Tienshui-Lanchow Railway (Sian Ch'ün-chung Jih-pao, December 1, 1951). They were kept on the job without protection even when the temperature fell to 30° below zero. "Frostbite was common" (Hongkong Ta Kung Pao, September 10, 1952). At one section, more than 50 workers died from ailments directly attributable to the excessive cold (Sian Ch'ün-chung Jih-pao, June 26, 1952).

(*c*) *Oppressive corvée labor unavoidable?*—There are a few tasks, such as the control of the big rivers, which require mass labor, and which, in the absence of other agencies, the Communist government must handle. There are others, such as the building of highways and railroads, which this government wants to handle. But neither situation justifies the Communist solution. True, in a society such as China's, the large-scale control of water is vital; and under the conditions of a simple natural economy, the Government could assemble the seasonal surplus labor for this purpose only by recruiting it coercively. But the spread of a money economy made it possible to replace drafted compulsory labor with hired free labor. And free labor being generally more productive than forced labor, its use, in addition to being more humane, is also more effective. In the 1880's, when the Egyptian Government partly abandoned the hydraulic

corvée, it discovered that the wage laborers "could double and triple the work they did by forced labor" (Willcocks 1889: 287 ff.; cf. also 279 and 280, note).

Thus in Egypt, an orientally despotic government humanized its labor system under western (British) influence. And, as related above, in Imperial China, an orientally despotic government spontaneously, comprehensively, and for a long time employed hired labor rather than corvée labor. (See Ch'ing-ch'ao Wen-hsieh T'ung-k'ao: 5050.) The Chinese Communists, by resorting to the crudest form of an orientally despotic corvée, sink not only below the level reached in Nationalist China, before the war, but also, and spectacularly, below the level reached in Imperial China from the end of the Ming dynasty on.

The Communists claim that the progress of their cause makes these methods necessary. Their behavior recalls the attitude of certain early 19th century capitalists who were unwilling to protect labor, because such action would be incompatible with the progress of industry. But when public opinion and organized labor compelled the employers to improve the conditions of factory work, the easy rationalizers soon discovered that the improved conditions were compatible with, and often even helpful to, industrial advance. What they had considered an economic necessity was actually nothing but a blunt assertion of unchallenged power.

In a multicentered society, the callous use of privilege and power can be checked by independent forces that are free to speak and act. The masters of a single-centered society tolerate no such balancing forces. Under the Communist regime no independent voice can challenge the official claim that forced labor is necessary for the purpose of industrialization.

No independent voice can remind the Chinese Communists that immediately before they became the rulers of the mainland, they themselves had participated—marginally and reluctantly, it is true—in a huge hydraulic and successful enterprise accomplished under humane conditions of labor: the restoration of the Huai River dikes, which had been destroyed in 1938, when the opening of the Yellow River dikes led to the flooding of the Huai River Basin. Contrary to their claim that in 1950, they began to restore the devastated area, it was the Chinese branch of UNRRA which, in 1946–47, under American direction, with the aid of the Nationalist Government and ambivalent cooperation on the part of the Communists, took the decisive steps of closing the Yellow River breach and of initiating work at the Huai River embankments. After the repair of the Huai dikes at "certain key sections," hundreds of thousands of people could farm again in the Huai River Valley (UNRRA OAP No. 52: 26; see also UNRRA OAP No. 53: 256 ff., 260 ff., and 262; and The China Press, Shanghai, 1947: January 6, 8, 17, 25, 26, April 8, 22, May 6).

The persons who did this work were hired laborers paid a combination of paper money and food ("as supplementary wages to care for the minimum family expenses of workers"). Although the food was not always forthcoming (UNRRA OAP No. 53: 91) the laborers were free laborers and treated as such.

Railroad construction can be similarly handled. The Chinese Communists, who, after 5 years of uncontested rule over the mainland, still build less than 1,000 kilometers of railways annually, should not be too proud of having surpassed the pre-Communist figures. The Nationalist Government never achieved the exclusive authority enjoyed by the founders of the major imperial dynasties, or the monolithic power wielded by Mao's monopoly bureaucracy, and while in terms of industrial development, Communist China may in general resemble the Russia of the 1890's (Rostow 1954: 300), it should be remembered that as early as the 1870's Russia was building more than 1,000 kilometers of railroads annually (Mattaei 1885: II, 336) with private means and without recourse to government-imposed corvée labor. It should also be remembered that in Nationalist China, even during the war against Japan, when drafted labor was employed on some railroads (Chang 1943: 239, 250, 273), work on other lines still was performed with free wage labor (op. cit.: 240, 287, 291) as was customary in prewar times.

3. Corrective ("slave") labor

(*a*) *The decisive precedent: the U. S. S. R.*—As indicated above, the masters of Imperial China occasionally employed convicts in agriculture, construction work, and manufacturing. State slaves, when they were institutionally important, were mainly attached to government bureaus where they rendered menial or clerical services. Under the last imperial dynasty, state slavery virtually disappeared; and the private slavery of males was reduced to insignificance. Under the Nationalist Government, private female and child slavery was almost entirely eliminated.

The Chinese Communists established corrective labor on a class basis and as a crucial weapon in the struggle against their political enemies. This is alien to the traditions of pre-Communist China. But it closely follows the Soviet pattern.

The decision to confine enemies of the Soviet regime in concentration camps was set forth in a decree promulgated in September 1918, less than a year after the Bolsheviks seized power. And forced labor camps were established in 1919 (UNRFL: 473).

Punitive labor in the U. S. S. R. was originally referred to as "forced labor," but from 1933 on this dismal term was widely, if not altogether, replaced by the formula "corrective labor" (op. cit.: 467). The regulations governing corrective labor were codified in 1924. The new corrective labor code was introduced after the collectivization in 1933. This latter code was somewhat modified in 1940, but its basic ideas are still in force. And they have decisively affected corrective-labor procedures throughout the Communist orbit.

According to the United Nations Committee on Forced Labor, corrective labor played a significant role from the thirties on in the U. S. S. R. (op. cit.: 91). According to the International League for the Rights of Men, it was taken over from the Soviet Union by the sovietized Baltic countries in 1940, and after World War II also by Communist-dominated Poland, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Rumania, Bulgaria, Yugoslavia, and Albania. In 1950 and 1951, when Eastern European People's Democracies inaugurated their first 5-year plans, it became a basic feature of their penal policy (UNESC: 340 ff.). It was at exactly this time that corrective labor was increasingly employed also in Communist China.

(*b*) *The development of the system.*—A statement made by Mao on July 31, 1949, and article 7 of the common program are generally cited as signaling the inauguration of corrective labor in Communist China. This is reasonable enough. But it should not be inferred that, prior to 1949, the Chinese Communists knew nothing of corrective labor or were above using it.

At the close of the first Chinese Soviet Republic in 1934, Mao Tse-tung announced that his government was "reforming" its convicts by teaching them "labor discipline" (Yakhontoff 1934: 262). In 1934 the to-be-"reformed" prisoners were probably few, since at that time the Communists found it easier to kill than to jail their captives. At the beginning of the Yenan period, conditions were not too different (see Kuo-wen Chou-pao, March 2, 1936, p. 27), and the relatively moderate Communist policy which prevailed during the second United Front period also tended to limit the number of prisoners.

Communist power began to spread with the Hitler-Stalin pact. After a temporary slowdown in 1941–42, it grew steadily, involving in the process intensified attacks on politically disliked civilians and devious moves to destroy strategically located sections of the Nationalist army. In the open civil war, which broke out in 1946, the fronts at first were fluid; and again liquidation rather than detention was preferred Communist policy. The many records of public accusations, terror, torture, and killings—including the burying alive of captives (to save bullets)—make nightmarish reading, but they come from serious witnesses (see de Jaegher 1952: 112 ff., 116 ff., 119–127; Su 1954: 123–128; Palmer 1953: 130 ff.). They reveal methods of terror, which were applied by the Communists to their political enemies prior to 1949 and which continued to be applied after the spread of Communist power.

The idea of making political enemies work, instead of killing them off, was suggested as early as January 1948 in the Northeast: "We should regard the 'landlords' and 'rich peasants' as the country's labor force and compel them to seek self-redemption through work" (see Wu 1955: 138). It appears to have been put into effect first on a major scale in the oldest "liberated" area, Manchuria. Eye-witnesses relate that in this area, which is closest to the U. S. S. R., the Chinese Communists, from 1948 on, compelled prisoners to do all manner of industrial work (P'ei 1954: passim). The principle of corrective labor was officially announced for the whole of mainland China in October 1949. The first large corrective labor camp south of the Great Wall, the Ching-ho farm, near Peiping, was set up in the spring of 1950. The earliest regulations dealing with corrective labor seem to have been the directives for the suppression of counterrevolutionary activities issued jointly, on July 23, 1950, by the State Administration Council and the Supreme People's Court (Li 1955: 21; Jen-min Jih-pao, November 3, 1951).

In his 1949 statement, Mao named as those who must be forced to correct themselves through labor, landloards, bureaucratic capitalists and "the reactionary clique of the Kuomintang." And the common program spoke of "counterrevolutionary elements, feudal landlords, and bureaucratic capitalists in general."

Indeed military and civilian representatives of the Nationalist Government and the bureaucratic capitalists were the primary targets; and wherever land reform got under way, landlords were singled out as dangerous economic and social enemies. This is clear from the provisional regulations governing the punishment of lawbreaking landlords issued first in East China and then in Central and South China, in September and November 1950, respectively. The two sets of regulations prescribed forced labor as a major form of punishment (Li 1955: 22–23; Su 1954: 27–32).

The persecution of counterrevolutionaries who, actually or allegedly, were hindering the Communist campaign in Korea resulted in February 1951 in regulations for the punishment of counterrevolutionaries. The fight against corrupt and deviating members of the new bureaucracy and against "criminal" businessmen resulted in the 3-anti and the 5-anti drives. Again corrective labor was expressedly mentioned as one of the main types of punishment (Jen-min Jih-pao, March 12, 1952; NCNA, March 24 and 30, 1952).

In order to break the partial grain-delivery strike of the peasants in 1953 (see Wittfogel 1955: 9 ff.), the government, on November 19, adopted new regulations for the punishment of counterrevolutionaries. On December 16, 1953, the central committee of the CCP passed a resolution ordering cooperativization (collectivization) on a large scale. And in the summer of 1954, when Chou En-lai was predicting that in 3 years' time "over half of the cultivated land will be pooled in cooperatives" (op. cit.: 15), the government institutionalized its policy of terror-by-law and terror-by-corrective labor by issuing detailed regulations enacted in the People's Republic of China concerning reform through labor (for regulations see UNESC: 177–189).

These regulations, together with provisional measures concerning the release of prisoners, were adopted on August 26. Accompanied by the report of the Minister of Public Security, Lo Jui-ching, and an explanatory editorial in Jen-min Jih-pao, they were published on September 7, 1954.

The regulations of August 1954, which were prepared with the assistance of Soviet legal experts (Lo 1954), were a convenient means for intimidating and paralyzing businessmen who were upset by the rapidly advancing nationalization. They became a powerful weapon for subduing workers who were reluctant to accept the increasingly heavy yoke of a semimilitary labor discipline. Primarily, however, they enabled the Communist government to take care of the new counterrevolutionaries, the recalcitrant peasants—those who still tilled their land individually and those who had already joined the producers' cooperatives (regulations). These regulations and the policy underlying them have been systematically examined by Li T'ien-min (Li 1955: passim), by the Chinese delegation to the United Nations (UNESC: 46–102), and by the International Commission Against Concentration Camp Practices (UNESC: 126–148; see also the Monthly Information Bulletin of this organization, especially Nos. 1 and 2, 1955).

(*c*) *The changing composition of the corrective labor force.*—Thus, step by step, corrective labor was extended to all classes of mainland China, including the ruling party and its bureaucracy. For obvious reasons the Communists are careful not to publish statistics about this matter. But the available official and unofficial data are sufficient to sketch in the main features.

During the first years of Communist rule many officers and officials of the Nationalist regime (Su 1954: 13 ff.; Cheng 1952: 79 ff.), former political functionaries, and members of the KMT Youth Organization (Cheng 1952: 80), and, of course, many landlords (op. cit. 76; also Hua-chiao Jih-pao, Hongkong, January 7 and March 25, 1953) were sent to corrective labor institutions. In 1952 the 3-anti and 5-anti drives led to the arrest of considerable numbers of businessmen and corrupt and "deviating" officials (see UNESC: 92), many of whom, according to the law, were sentenced to corrective labor.

Soon after the defeat of the Nationalists, Communists who had been purged for one reason or another were confined to prisons and camps (P'ei 1954: 89, 180). And the three-anti campaign also netted numerous high-ranking Communists (Jen-min Jih-pao, January 5, 7, 17, 18, 19, March 20). Sentences against corrupt or deviant Communists continued to be meted out after the three-anti campaign was over (see Jen-min Jih-pao, April 22, 1952, and April 7, 1955). It

is safe to assume that most of these Communist criminals were also included in the corrective labor force.

In addition, this force includes Communist soldiers (P'ei 1954: 89), particularly deserters (Cheng 1952: 89), students (loc. cit.), and other educated persons (UNESC: 256 ff.; P'ei 1954: 124), as well as engineers (Huang-ming Jih-pao, July 18, 1955) and workers (Kung-jen Jih-pao, January 21, 1955). Members of distrusted religious organizations, especially Taoists, are frequently persecuted (Jen-min Jih-pao, November 28, 1950, December 22, 1950). The sentencing of Catholics (Palmer 1953: 290) and members of secret societies (Jen-min Jih-pao, November 10, 1954) to forced labor is reliably documented.

And then there are the peasants. Although the official spokesmen try to obscure the social status of the new rural counterrevolutionaries, they admit—and on occasion even emphasize—that the regime's punitive organs are working overtime to put down unrest in the countryside. Tung-Pi-wu, President of the Supreme People's Court, reported on July 22, 1955, that the people's courts were punishing criminals for "ensnaring agricultural production and social transformation of agriculture." And in this context he singles out three kinds of crimes: sabotaging production, disturbing mutual aid teams, and disturbing cooperatives (Jen-min Jih-pao, July 23, 1955). In 1954, in Shansi Province, "cases of undermining agricultural producers' cooperatives increased twofold." In the first quarter of 1955, cases of murder for the purpose of economic sabotage rose by 27.4 percent over the last quarter of 1954; and cases of arson for this same purpose increased 90 percent. "The number of cases of undermining economic construction dealt with in Hopei during 1954 was 160 percent higher than 1953; of these, cases of sabotage by counterrevolutionaries were 165 percent higher than 1953; and cases of sabotage by lawbreaking capitalists and other criminals were 106 percent higher than 1953" (speech by Shih Liang, Minister of Justice, delivered on July 29, 1955). In 1954, "over 560 important cases involving the sabotage of agricultural producers' cooperatives occurred in Shansi alone" (report by Chang Ting-cheng, chief prosecutor of the Supreme People's Prosecutorate, given on July 22, 1955). This latter figure suggests that in the various provinces of the Chinese mainland taken together there may have been some 10,000 serious crimes against producers' cooperatives. The chief prosecutor placed the cases involving economic counterrevolutionary activities in the year 1954–55 around 255,000. Since most known cases of this kind involve several persons and since the new economic crime wave spread particularly in the countryside, the number of counterrevolutionary peasants in the corrective labor institutions must by now be very substantial.

The Chinese Communists are trying to uphold the fiction that, in addition to unspecified "counterrevolutionaries," the rural criminals are largely "unreformed elements of landlord and rich peasant status" (Chang Ting-cheng). But the landlords were crushed years ago; and according to the Communists' own statements, the rich peasants never were a significant factor in China. This then leaves as the main perpetrators of the new types of rural crime the Counterrevolutionaries Anonymous—the peasants—most of whom are "old" and "new" middle peasants. Chang Pien-tse, who in May 1955 was sentenced to 8 years' imprisonment, was not a landlord or a kulak. The papers admit that, under the Communist regime, he was "the head of the labor team" (NCNA, May 19, 1955. For further details about the punishment of the new rural counterrevolutionaries, see also Peking Huang-ming Jih-pao, May 21, 1955, and the speech made by Liu Wen-hui before the National People's Congress, July 28, 1955).

Of course, in Communist China too, there are nonpolitical criminals. As in the Soviet Union, they are the ready tools of the prison and camp authorities against the political prisoners (P'ei 1954: 151 ff.). However, official statements concerning forced labor generally mention the political criminals first, and often they mention them only. It is safe to say that in Communist China, as in other Communist countries, political criminals constitute the core of the corrective labor force.

(*d*) *Main subdivisions of the corrective labor force.*—In 1952 the Chinese Communists introduced a punishment called "organizational control," which they defined as follows: "Persons placed under organizational control continue to work in the same organization without any position and without political rights, but are given the opportunity to reform and assured of basic subsistence" (PCWSBD: 165). No doubt this punishment was inspired by the system of "corrective labor without deprivation of liberty" developed in the Soviet Union (UNRFL: 467 ff.) and adopted by most of the eastern satellite countries:

Bulgaria in 1948, Czechoslovakia and Hungary in 1950, and Poland in 1951 (op. cit.: 204, 231, 284, 309). Apparently it was not adopted in Communist Albania and East Germany (see op. cit.: 6 ff.; UNRFL: 258 ff.) where special conditions seem to make such a penal method inadvisable.

Special conditions also may have influenced the Chinese Communists to discontinue their system of "organizational control." The regulations of 1954 do not mention it. Some of the underlying ideas, however, find expression in the internal labor rules for state-owned enterprises, adopted on May 6, 1954. And the search for a milder form of forced labor may have affected article 8 of the regulations of 1954, which says: "If commitment to a reformatory labor corps is inexpedient, a prisoner sentenced to imprisonment for less than 2 years may be committed to a house of detention." The houses of detention also harbor "prisoners under investigation and awaiting trial" (Lo 1954, referring to art. 9 of regulations).

Delinquents from 13 to 18 years of age are placed in houses of correction for young prisoners. They are required "to undertake light labor under conditions favorable to their physical development" (regulations, art. 22).

The mass of the adult prisoners is divided into two major groups: Counter-revolutionary and other major criminals "unfit for labor outside the prison" are made to work under strict supervision in jail (op. cit.: art. 13); "convicted counterrevolutionaries and other criminals," who are "fit for labor outside the prison," are put under the jurisdiction of corrective labor corps. (The regulations avoid the words "camp" and "colony" customary in the Soviet penal literature.) "The reformatory labor corps shall organize prisoners for systematic productive work in agriculture, industry, and reconstruction programs and shall impart political education in coordination with productive labor" (op. cit.; art. 18). Lo Jui-ching stressed the importance of this category by calling it "the main type and most appropriate form of organized production by criminal labor" (Lo 1954).

The divisions established in the regulations of 1954 are similar to those established in the penal system of the Soviet Union. But the Chinese Communists keep major criminals in prison, whereas the Soviet Government exiles them to remote areas (UNRFL: 467, 470 ff.). The latter system was introduced in 1930 when, after the enforced collectivization, large numbers of "counter-revolutionaries" were arrested. The Soviet author, Utevski, stated the issue clearly: "The importance of exile as a punishment increased in the reconstruction period when the accentuated opposition of class-hostile elements to socialist construction made it necessary to find new ways of countering such opposition." (UNRFL: 470). It remains to be seen whether in Communist China, too, the resistance against the enforced collectivization will also produce "new ways of countering such opposition."

4. The economic aspect of slave labor

Obviously then corrective labor is a highly important institution on the Chinese mainland. The Communists publicly announced its inception. They publicly discuss its problems. And they speak with pride about its economic accomplishments. How significant are these accomplishments? And how justified is the Communist pride in them?

(*a*) *Surplus produced by slave labor.*—Among the earliest large economic enterprises of corrective labor in Communist China is the Ching-ho Farm, which first "broke ground in March 1950" (NCNA, October 18, 1951), and which is said to have done a stupendous job of land reclamation, ditchdigging, farming and animal raising, plus all kinds of supplementary industrial work.

Early economic successes with corrective labor are reported also for central China. In July 1951 a conference on reformatory labor in the central-south area appraised the achievements of corrective labor in that area as follows: "In the central-south area, most of the convicted prisoners at present engaged in reformatory labor are employed in agriculture and in handicrafts such as the weaving of jute bags and socks, the making of shoe soles, sewing, cigarette-rolling, printing, iron forging, limestone burning and the making of bricks and tiles. A small number are being used for construction work and in transportation. The reformatory labor corps in Ch'ungyang and Huangp'i districts in Hupei have become partly or entirely self-sufficient after 8 months of work. A reformatory labor corps in a certain area of the Wuchang-Hankow municipality reaped a good harvest of wheat after having reclaimed a stretch of wasteland last year" (Yangtze Daily, July 22, 1951, quoted in UNESC: 224).

Later in the same year, a Communist paper published a glowing account of the achievements of corrective labor in the Canton area: Bricks and lime were made. Houses were built and repaired. Stones were crushed and iron, wood, and textiles were processed. Land was cultivated, animals were raised, and trees planted. "Production in all the fields mentioned above is being gradually expanded" (Wen-wei Pao, Hongkong, December 15, 1951).

Thus, when the authors of the 1954 regulations directed that the reformatory labor corps organize their prisoners "for systematic productive work in agriculture, indutry and reconstruction programs" (art. 18), they were only giving legal recognition to something that was already well established. Said Lo Jui-ching in his accompanying report: "During the past 4 years, many reformatory labor farms have been set up, some of the larger farms having an area of over 10,000 mou. A number of industrial plants have also been established under this program. In addition, numerous labor corps have been organized for public works such as water conservation, railway construction, lumber collection, and house building" (Lo 1954).

Lo's report gave instructive details about the work done by the corrective laborers. "Production under the reformatory labor program has contributed significantly to the supply of commodities to meet the requirements of basic national development as well as the people's needs for consumer's goods. For example, in regard to building materials, over 2,000 million bricks and over 770 million tiles were produced last year, directly contributing to the basic construction work of the nation. The Reformatory Labour Hosiery Works of Peking produced 714,000 dozen socks and stockings last year, thus adding to the supply of consumer's goods for the people. The Tientsin Steelworks produced over 1,700,000 units of connecting parts for heating equipment last year; the products being considered above standard, a long-term contract has been signed with the Anshan Steelworks to supply the latter with this item. The farms, industrial plants, mines, ceramic works, and other production enterprises now in operation have laid a firm foundation for the future work of reforming criminals through labor" (loc. cit.). According to an article on the same subject, published on October 16, 1954 in the Jen-min Jih-pao, the hosiery works of the Peking prison alone made "32 percent of all socks produced in the whole North China region."

Such data explain the Communists' boasts about the achievements of their corrective labor system. In the just cited report, Lo acclaims the system for accomplishing "substantial savings for the state" and for "directly contributing to the development of national reconstruction." By doing this, the corrective labor enterprises are "creating a large amount of national wealth."

How is this possible? The various corrective labor enterprises must have required a considerable investment. How could they have produced in a brief 4 years "a large amount of national wealth"?

Lo's report of August 1954 indirectly answers this question by saying that, at the end of the first 4 years, after deducting the living expenses of the prisoners and other expenditures necessitated by the corrective labor program, "the amount of fixed assets and liquid capital thus accumulated is approximately equal to the total sum allocated by the state for this program" (Lo 1954). The statement is involved, but it obviously means that the criminals production rapidly amortized the investments, so rapidly indeed that in 1954 Lo expected the entire receipts and expenditures to balance out at the end of the fifth fiscal year. Thus in 1954, the Minister of Public Security was demanding an increase in production which in a year would cover the living expenses of the prisoners and other necessary costs. Similar conditions being maintained, the corrective labor enterprises will probably produce at least this surplus in the sixth year.

What is happening here? A technocrat may consider any increase in production a gain. But the student of social conditions will recall that the classical economists, whom Marx followed, viewed the economic process not as a relation between things, but as a relation between human beings dealing with things and with each other. What are the human relations inherent in the Communist system of corrective labor?

The question is important beyond the sector in which it emerges. Obviously the criminal laborer is neither a manorial serf nor a member of a state corvee team. In both these cases the toiler to some extent has a life of his own; and this fact also colors his commandeered activities. The criminal laborer is personally unfree, and even though he may not be serving a life term, the conditions under which he works are essentially those of a slave. Institutionally speaking, the

system of corrective labor, which in mainland China and other Communist countries assumed major proportions, is a modern form of slave labor.

Compared with the private ownership of slaves, Communist state slavery has conspicuous advantages. The bureaucratic masters of the economy do not have to purchase their slave laborers, and they need not pay any wages. True, the cost of guarding the prisoners may be considerable. But the history of chattel slavery, old and recent, shows that, well arranged, this system may produce a surplus, even when the slaves are purchased at a high price and the costs of guarding them are great. Manifestly, other conditions being equal, the surplus will be the larger the less is spent for food, clothing, and shelter, and, of course, the longer the slaves are kept toiling.

By making slaves work to the point of exhaustion—observed the classical writer on slave economy, Columella—the master also reduces their opportunity for doing mischief. Xenophon recommended food bonuses for better work.

The way in which the Chinese Communists provide their criminal laborers with clothing and shelter fits well the three purposes of the system: Punishment, labor, and education. It punishes the prisoners, it keeps their labor cheap, and it so softens their power of resistance that most of them are ready to be remade in the Communist image.

(*b*) *Food.*—Reports given by former prisoners generally stress the poor quality and scantiness of the food they received in the Communist prisons and camps (see P'ei 1954: 18, 58, 89, 117, 129, 131, 174; Su 1954: 80 ff.). The author of an affidavit submitted to the U. N. by the Government of the United States of America notes that in the agricultural camp, east China Farm, the "prisoners were constantly on the brink of starvation" (UNESC: 258). Another former inmate relates that "owing to the heavy work and the cold weather, they always felt hungry" (P'ei 1954: 162).

(*c*) *Clothing.*—Ex-prisoners describe the clothing of the corrective laborers as inadequate to protect them against bad weather, especially cold. In some places, they are given an outfit which they wear until it falls to shread (P'ei 1954: 161, 183). In other places "the inmates wear summer clothes" (UNESC: 260; Cheng 1952: 83). The administration saves expenses by permitting the prisoners to receive clothes from outside (P'ei 1954: 160).

Occasionally the Communist press mentions a detail that reveals more than is intended. An account of the Ching-ho Farm tells of prisoners who, in freezing weather, "stood barefooted on the ice to excavate dirt in defiance of the severe cold." Some of them excavated a record of 34 cubic meters per day (NCNA, October 18, 1951). A regime which boasts of such a feat under such conditions is certainly doing its best to produce a surplus at a minimum of expense to itself and a maximum of sacrifice from its slave laborers.

(*d*) *Shelter.*—According to former inmates, the jails of Communist China are generally overcrowded and unsanitary. The prisoners are brutally treated and spied upon (Palmer 1953: 131 ff., 281 ff., 284 ff., 288, 296; Cheng 1952: 82; P'ei 1954: 100). Apparently and by regulation, the time permitted for attending to one's natural needs is unreasonably restricted. The unavoidable consequences contribute further to the dirtiness of the prisoners and prisons (Palmer 1954: 287; P'ei 1954: 59–64; Cheng 1952: 82).

The statement, "the camp was filthy, prisoners slept on planks (UNESC: 257) describes most of the camps about which we have critical information.

(*e*) *A trend toward less inhuman living conditions.*—The information cited so far pertains essentially to the first years of the Chinese People's Republic. Are there indications that conditions have somewhat improved, as they are reported to have done recently in the U. S. S. R. and Eastern Europe?

During World War II the Soviet Union and the states of Eastern Europe suffered great losses in manpower. The ruthless mining of the corrective labor forces must, therefore, have created a serious replacement problem (UNESC: 343). Perhaps stimulated by this problem, the Soviet administrators seem to have produced some improvements that were likely to increase the output of the corrective labor camps.

The International League for the Rights of Man asserts that, from mid-1952 on, a drive was made for more incentives and greater efficiency, first in the Soviet Union, and soon also in the eastern European countries. "Food, though minimally appetizing, became generally sufficient in caloric value to sustain the type of activity performed. Canteens or commissaries were installed in camps, and the privilege of purchase was tied to overproduction norms. Significantly, the introduction of wages became universal and after customary

deductions for housing and other expenses, the forced laborer was generally allowed to retain from 10 to 25 percent of his wages" (UNESC: 343).

The Peiping regulations of August 26, 1954, include certain features of the "rationalized" Soviet policy, such as stress on sanitary measures (art. 53) and the provision to set up "supply centers" where the prisoners may buy "supplementary food" (Art. 51). The first idea may have been influenced by the new Soviet regulations, and the second, although not unknown, may well have been generalized under that influence. However, the Chinese regulations of 1954 are vague with regard to food and shelter. They show little desire to improve existing conditions.

Nor do the regulations introduce wages. On the contrary, occasional earlier experiments with the payment of a small wage (UNESC: 258) were discontinued. Says the commentary in Jen-min Jih-pao of September 7, 1954: Corrective labor is "compulsory and without remuneration."

Being advised by Soviet experts, the authors of the regulations of August 1954 certainly were familiar with the recent changes in the corrective labor policy of the U. S. S. R. and Eastern Europe. They accepted some of them. But by and large, they saw no reason to introduce costly improvements when they could drawn on an almost unlimited labor supply.

(*f*). *Methods and conditions of work.*—Work hours were long during the first years of Communist rule (P'ei 1954: 94; UNESC 262 ff.). The 1954 regulations prescribe that the labor day shall "as a rule," last from 9 to 10 hours and "in seasonal production * * * up to 12 hours" (art. 52). For the poorly kept corrective laborers a work day of 10 to 12 hours seems painfully long. The clause "as a rule" permits the overseers to make it still longer.

The prisoners work under harsh disclipline. The corrective labor force is divided in divisions, regiments, battalions, companies, and platoons (Cheng 1952: 75 ff.; P'ei 1954: 89 ff.; regulations, art. 20). Small units are organized under a "system of mutual guaranty and mutual punishment so that no prisoner dared to escape for fear of making his fellows suffer" (UNESC: 258 and 67). The author of this account continues: "They were marched to work under strict discipline and were beaten if they infringed any rules" (op. cit.: 258). Almost without exception ex-prisoners complain about beatings suffered during and after work (P'ei 1954: 48, 148 f.; Teng 1952: 15 and passim; Palmer 1953; 131, 132, 283, 285, 290). At the east China farm, in which the laborers were "simply worked like draft animals * * * each plough was drawn by 4 to 6 men and laggards were whipped" (UNESC: 258; Cheng 1952: 83).

Article 46 of the regulations of 1954 mentions "instruments of restraint," which the guards use with the commander's permission "as precaution against possible escape, violence, or other dangerous acts on the part of a prisoner." The directive obviously refers to iron chains and cuffs which are employed freely in the prison and camps of Mao's China (Palmer 1953; 282 ff., 295; UNESC: 258, 363).

A Communist account of stupendous labor feats accomplished by prisoners who worked barefoot on ice concludes: "Obviously these results could by no means be achieved by compulsion alone" (NCNA, October 18, 1951). Indeed there are other incentives too. Their nature becomes apparent when we examine the three main subdivisions of the corrective labor force.

As noted above, the large middle group, composed of prisoners serving terms from 2 years upward but less than life, work in camps. Besides engaging in competitive contests (P'ei 1945: 84; Cheng 1952: 83; Teng 1952, 63 ff.) and voluntarily asking for longer work hours, which may yield special awards to the initiators (P'ei 1954: 93), the prisoners have a chance to earn a "material award" or to shorten their sentences if they consistently observe labor discipline and fulfill or exceed the production norms (regulations, art 68).

These incentives apparently operate also in the two types of prisons. But there they are accompanied, and perhaps overshadowed, by incentives of a different kind. In the houses of detention, prisoners with short sentences are placed with prisoners awaiting trial. To improve their chance of acquittal or a light sentence, these latter may be expected to toil unsparingly. The sentenced prisoners, if they do not wish to be considered shirkers and saboteurs, have to keep up with them.

In the hard labor prisons, those who have been given suspended death sentences are the pacemakers. While prisoners awaiting trial work for their freedom, prisoners with suspended sentences work for their lives. The prisoners with life sentences have no other choice but to match these desperate fellows, whose feelings only a Dostoevsky can properly describe.

77294—56——19

One of the few independent foreigners permitted to visit a Peiping prison, the British trade-union leader, H. Earnshaw, saw there prisoners who had been sentenced to short terms, life terms, and suspended death penalities. The members of the last group, he was told, can "redeem themselves through labor. They were to be executed, however, if their work did not give satisfaction." All prisoners "were working at full stretch for 9 hours a day." And they worked madly. Earnshaw was stunned, watching what in some cases must have been a marathon against death. "We have never seen human beings working at such a pace" (UNESC: 264 ff.).

(*g*) *Miscellaneous details.*—The Chinese Communists, who admit learning from the Soviet penal administration (UNESC: 193, 235), apparently also learned from the U. S. S. R. the art of creating Potemkin show places and, of course, the art of the guided tour. The New China News Agency of March 30, 1955, boasts that, from September 1952 to February 1955, the Communist government permitted 403 visitors from 49 countries to "visit our prisoners, and all had received very good impressions."

Earnshaw's report indicates that not all visitors reacted favorably. But since persons of critical mind are rarely given such opportunities, the great majority of visitors saw indeed what the Communists wanted them to see. (For laudatory comments, see NCNA, December 21, 1954, and March 30, 1955.) In Communist China, as in the U. S. S. R., the show prisons are kept clean (see Jen-min Jih-pao, April 1, 1955). Earnshaw's failure to comment on any conspicuous filth indirectly supports the official contention.

The corrective labor force also includes women. Some are being held because they themselves are criminals, others because they are related to criminals. A former inmate of a camp near Canton, which had 5,000 prisoners, tells that "one of the teams consisted of some 300 women, who either grew vegetables or did carpentry or masonry work" (UNESC: 263). A prisoner from another camp says the following: "In the 'reform through labor' camps there are also many women, relatives of those whom the Communists describe as reactionary elements. They live under the same conditions as the men, the only difference being in the type of work they do: spinning, weaving, and making canvas shoes, stockings, etc. The women have to complete the day's tasks set for them by the Communist agents. There are about 1,500 of them in the camp, enough to form a main group. The women's group includes both elderly women and girls" (UNESC: 261).

These two reports refer to the formative period of the corrective labor system. The regulations of 1954, which standardized the earlier practices, also standardized the treatment of female prisoners (arts. 37–39). Juvenile prisoners are given 1 rest day a week (art. 52); adult convicts "1 rest day every half month" (art. 52). The female inmates of the Peiping prison are said to have been given a day off on March 8, 1955, the Communist International Women's Day (Jen-min Jih-pao, April 1, 1955); but apparently they get no more regular rest days than men. That is, they too have something like a 14-day work "week."

Silence is a concomitant of labor. Many former inmates of prisons and camps remember with bitterness that they were forbidden to talk to one another, during working hours and often also at other times (Palmer 1953: 283; P'ei 1954: 123).

To this there is one major exception. The prisoners are encouraged to speak publicly at the end of the day, when they are assembled in "study groups to discuss their life, labor, and learning" for at least an hour (Regulations, articles 26 and 52). Weakened by exhausting labor, they now must learn the Communist doctrine. But first of all they must discuss themselves. In an unending process of group criticism and self-criticism they must belabor and condemn their earlier deeds and thoughts, until they have rejected all positions that displease their Communist masters.

The percentage of those who surrender unconditionally in the "struggle" seems to be extremely high. An open crisis may reveal that many of the "reformed" ex-prisoners are still, in the depth of their being, unreconstructed. But for all practical purposes the "corrective" treatment seems to brainwash the great majority of those who emerge as "free" persons from the penal institutions of Communist China.

5. Numerical dimension and political effect

"Those who emerge." I use this clause advisedly. It has obvious—and serious—numerical implications; and it has less obvious—and still more serious—political implications. How many persons have worked in corrective labor institutions? How many of them died there? And how many were released? Assum-

ing that tentative answers can be found to all, or some of these questions, what do they mean in terms of Chinese Communist society as a whole?

Deaths are frequent in the prisons and camps; how frequent it is hard to say. Food is probably somewhat better in the camps (UNESC: 265) where the prisoners work mostly in the open air; and this ought to reduce the death rate. But the strenuousness of the labor and the lack of protection against inclement weather probably balances the scales. Out of 360 prisoners employed on a land reclamation project at 45° below zero, 7 are reported to have died of exposure, 27 to have been crippled by frost (Cheng 1952: 83; see also Su 1954: 80). Even with such extreme conditions, feebler inmates succumb to overwork and neglect. In the east China farm, "prisoners became very weak from starvation, lack of sleep, and overwork. They succumbed to paralysis, fever, dysentery, tuberculosis, hernia, etc. They were given no medical attention and seriously ill prisoners were buried alive. Those who were disposed of in this way were said to have been shot and a prefabricated reason for the execution was given to the public" (UNESC: 259).

In some cases, death occurred as a consequence of "questioning." Prisoners who at night were fetched for this purpose were "beaten to death or shot." Those who survived the beating were forced to work the next day: "no greater torture can be imagined" (UNESC: 262).

Not infrequently, prisoners died while participating in "competition" drives. In a Manchurian coal mine, in which they had to carry the coal to the surface, "the laborers were required to run. Some vomited blood and some dropped dead." During a Red flag competition, "a mine collapsed killing 31 people and injuring 7" (P'ei 1954: 89ff.).

Ex-prisoners who were able to escape from Communist China understandably stress the horrors they experienced. The prudent analyst will be reluctant to draw numerical conclusions from isolated experiences. But he will also remember that in the cases of the U. S. S. R. and Hitler-Germany postwar evidence substantially confirms the gruesome stories told by ex-prisoners about life in the slave labor camps.

Ex-prisoners who stay in Communist China, and, of course, this is the great majority, do not talk. But just as no one is allowed to mention deaths caused by accidents (op. cit.: 93 ff.), so no one will speak of acts of violence observed in a prison or camp. This, however, does not lessen the numerical or political significance of the discharges.

Here, as elsewhere, general statistics are lacking. But we have some figures on discharges from the large agricultural camp, the Ching-ho farm. According to a statement made in 1955 by the director of this institution, "more than two-thirds of all criminals were released by the People's Government on or even before the expiring of their original prison terms" (NCNA, Apr. 13, 1955). To be sure, not all released prisoners move freely after their "discharge." According to article 62 of the 1954 Regulations, a corrective labor institution may "register" any ex-prisoners for work if, at the time of their release, they "elect to remain with the corps," or are "homeless and without any prospect of employment," or had been confined "in sparsely populated areas, where their settlement is possible." Members of the second and third groups are thus kept on whether they like it or not; members of the first group stay because they are afraid to go home. In 1954 not less than 27 percent of all persons released from the Ching-ho farm got jobs in or near the camps. In such cases their families could join them (Lo 1954). But the majority of all released prisoners do go home, adjusting as best they can and, of course, taking care not to talk about their harrowing experiences.

An estimate made by the Chinese delegation to the U. N. suggests that up to the winter of 1954–5 about 14 million persons had been sentenced to corrective labor (UNESC: 95). The figure includes 1.5 million workers sent abroad, a group about which little is known; but it does not include the many new "counter-revolutionaries" who, as a result of the stepped-up collectivization, were penalized in the critical year 1955. Taking this 14 million as a maximum (which, I believe, to be a conservative estimate) and assuming an increase in 1955 of only 1 million persons (certainly too low) or 6 million (probably not too high), we can say that after 6 years of Communist rule in China, between 15 and 20 million persons out of a total population of ca. 600 million have been in the regime's prisons or camps, for the most part under corrective labor. This implies that about 1 out of every 30 to 40 persons has suffered this condition. If half

of them go home after being discharged, 1 out of every 70 to 80 persons persons is a constant fear-inspiring reminder of the regime's terror-by-law policy.

Thus corrective labor is the core of a gigantic process which starts long before confinement to prisons and camps. Official and unofficial denunciations, mass meetings and public accusations, searches and arrests, unexplained disappearances and trials, all serve as a prelude to reeducation and reform. In the initial operation, the totalitarian Behemoth seizes its victims. In the second, it uses them ruthlessly as work slaves. In the third, it disgorges those who have been successfully "remade" for all to see and be forewarned.

6. Perspectives

The economist may focus his attention on the material results of the new slave economy, which are remarkable indeed. The political analyst will be concerned with the human conditions and the psychological results of this monstrous enterprise.

And he will also be oncerned with its perspectives. An editorial in Jen-min Jih-pao of April 1955, classes the state farms operated with military labor and the corrective labor farms as "socialist" enterprises. These enterprises are large. They are mechanized. And they practice "a clear-cut management policy"—that is, a completely authoritarian procedure which fixes the production quotas with no concessions to "small-peasant thought." The author of this editorial considers the state farms, which, I repeat, are partly operated with military and civilian forced labor more advanced than the relations of the "semisocialist" producers' cooperatives, which still permit some survivals of private property and freedom.

But the difference between the "socialist" and "semisocialist" enterprises will not continue indefinitely. The above editorial leaves the details of the development open, but it directs that the "state farms should absorb into them the experienced farmers of the locality." If this would become the dominant trend, the "socialist" farms with their military or quasi-military methods of labor would eventually absorb the less "socialist" units.

And what about industry? In the state-operated large industrial enterprises, and this is rapidly coming to mean the bulk of all modern plants, labor is not as thoroughly disciplined as in the "socialist" military and corrective farms. But the socialization of labor is advancing fast. The Kung-jen Jih-pao (Workers' Daily) reported in 1955 that "punishment of workers had become the principal method to consolidate labor discipline and the Outline of Labor Regulations in State-owned Enterprises has been made the legal basis for punishing the workers." Sometimes the managers go too far: "It happens that the workers are punished too frequently and improperly," and, of course, "punitivism" as the method of developing labor discipline must be avoided. But the management's basic attitude is sound: When individuals violate labor discipline, "disciplinary action of varying degree, as the case may require, should be taken, for otherwise it would be backward compromising 'tailism' with no principal whatsoever."

The new regulations give the managers an almost unlimited authority. Under its whip, the workers are confused and often desperate. They accuse themselves of crimes they did not commit. They cry and are "scared to death" (Kung-jen Jih-pao, January 21, 1955. The government vigorously condemns such excesses on the part of the management, but it is careful not to withdraw the punitive power which, consistently applied, will transform the regulated labor force of mainland China into an army of forced laborers.

To be sure, as long as man is able to retain some inner autonomy, there will be "counter-revolutionary" rebels who, if caught and not killed, will be sent to penal institutions. But when the disciplinary and corrective functions, which today are most thoroughly fulfilled by the corrective labor administration, become part of all government enterprises, then corrective labor as a major institution will be superfluous. It will be superfluous, not because the state slave economy has withered away, but because it has become universal.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Agrarian China. Selected Source Materials from Chinese Authors, compiled and trans. by * * * Institute of Pacific Relations. With an introduction by R. H. Tawney. Chicago. Preface dated 1938.

Balázs, Stefan. 1931. "Beiträge zur Wirtschaftsgeschichte de T'ang-Zeit (618–906)," *Mitteilungen des Seminars für Orientalische Sprachen zu Berlin* 34:1–92, 1931.

Biot, Edouard. 1837. "Mémoire sur la conditions des esclaves et des serviteurs gagés en Chine," *Journal Asiatique*, 3d ser., 3 : 246–299.
Boulais, Guy. 1924. *Manuel du Code Chinois.* Shanghai.
CCWHTK. *Ch'ing-ch'ao wen-hsieh t'ung-k'ao.* Commercial Press, Shanghai.
Chang Kia-ngau. 1943. *China's Struggle for Railroad Development.* New York.
Chen Huan-chang. 1911. *The Economic Principles of Confucius and His School.* 2 vols.
Cheng Chu-yüan. 1952. *Chung-kung ti nu-kung chih-tu.*——(The slave system of the Chinese Communists). Freedom Press, Hongkong.
Chi Lu Chin. *Chi Lu Chin San Sheng Lu-cheng k'ai kuang.* (The highway Construction and Administration in the Three Provinces), ed. Kuo Hsien-ch'ing ——, ms., no date.
Chin Shih Ts'ui Pien. By Wang Ch'ang ——. —— ed., 1805.
China Press. Shanghai.
China Year Book. 1932. —— edited by H. G. W. Woodhead. Shanghai.
Ch'ing Shih Kao. 1927.
Chiu Wu Tai Shih. Commercial Press ed.
Chungking Daily News. Quoted in Li 1955.
Chungking Hsin-hua Jih-pao. Quoted in Li 1955.
Eberhard, Wolfram. 1949. *Das Toba-Reich Nord Chinas.* Leiden.
Epstein, Israel. 1949. *Notes on Labor Problems in Nationalist China.* With a Supplement by Julian R. Friedman. Institute of Pacific Relations. New York.
Fei, Hsiao-tung and Chang, Chih-i. 1945. *Earthbound China.* Rev. English ed. prepared in collaboration with Paul Cooper and Margaret Park Redfield. Chicago.
Fried, Morton H. 1953. *Fabric of Chinese Society.* New York.
Han Chiu I. —— by Wei Hung ——. 1885 edition.
Han Shu. Commercial Press ed.
Hankow Yangtze Daily News. Quoted in Li 1955.
Hongkong Ta Kung Pao. Quoted in Li 1955.
Hou Han Shu. Commercial Press ed.
Hsi Han Hui Yao. Commercial Press ed.
Hua-chiao Jih-pao. Hongkong.
Huang-ming Jih-pao. Peking. Quoted in Li 1955.
HWHTK. *Hsu wen-hsien t'ung-k'ao.* Commercial Press ed.
International Commission against Concentration Camp Practices, *Monthly Information Bulletin* of de Jaegher, Raymond J., and Kuhn, Irene Corbally. 1952. *The Enemy Within.* New York.
Jen-min Jih-pao. Peking.
Kuang-ming Jih-pao.
Kung-jen Jih-pao.
Kuo-wen Chou-pao. National News Weekly.
Lamson, Herbert Day. 1935. *Social Pathology in China.* Shanghai.
League of Nations. Slavery. Report of the Advisory Committee of Experts. Fifth (Extraordinary) Session of the Committee, held in Geneva, March 31st to April 5th, 1938. *Series of League of Nations Publications.* VI. B. Slavery. 1938. VI. B. 1.
Legge, James. CC. *The Chinese Classics.* Vol. IV : *The She King.*
Li T'ien-min. 1955. *Wu-nien-lai chung-kung p'o-hai jen-ch'üan chi-shih.* (The Facts of the Chinese Communist Suppression of Human Rights during the Last Five Years), pub. by Association of the Chinese Comrades of the United Nations. Tai-pei.
Liang Ch'i-ch'ao. 1925. "Chung-kuo li-tai nu-pei chi-tu" (Slavery system in different Chinese dynasties), *Tsing-hua hsüeh-pao* II, no. 2 : 527–535.
Liu Fa Nui-pien. Chungking, 1943.
Lo Jui-ching. 1954. Report of, at the 222d meeting of the State Administration Council, on 26 August 1954 (NCNA, Peking, 7 September 1954) in UNESC : 190–4.
Lü Shih Ch'un-ch'iu. ——. in *Ssŭ-pu Ts-ung-k'an* ——, Commercial Press.
Matthaei, Friedrich. 1885. *Die Wirthschaftlichen Hülfsquelle Russlands.* Vol. II. Dresden.
Ming Hui-yao. Yung-huei t'ang ——, 1887.
Ming Shih. Commercial Press ed.
MKFKTC. *Chung-hua min-kuo fa-kuei ta-ch'üan* (Statutes and Regulations of Republic of China). Commercial Press, Shanghai, 1935.

NCNA. New China News Agency.
NTFKHP. *Nung ts'un ching-chi chin-jung fa-kuei hui-pien* (Compilation of laws and regulations of rural economy and finance). Chungking, 1942.
Palmer, Gretta. 1953. *God's Underground in Asia.* New York.
P'ei Yu-ming. 1954. *Wo lai-tzu tung-pei nu-kung-ying* (I came from the Northeast Slave Camp). Asiatic Press, Hongkong.
Pei Shih. Commeercial Press ed.
PCWSBD. Provisions laid down by the Economy Practice Investigation Committee of the Central People's Government for the disposal of cases of corruption and waste and for the suppression of bureaucratic deviations. March 8, 1952 (NCNA, March 11, 1952), in UNESC: 163–168.
Pippon, Toni. 1936. "Beitrag zum Chinesischen Sklavensystem" (translation of Chung-kno nu-pei chih-tu by Wang Shih Chieh), *Deutsche Gesellschaft für Natur- und Volkerkunde Ostasiens* 29: Teil B. Tokyo.
Regulations. Regulations Enacted in the People's Republic of China Governing Reform through Labour. Adopted 26 August 1954 (NCNA, Peking, 7 September 1954), in UNESC: 177–189.
Rostow, W. W., in collaboration with Richard W. Hatch, Frank A. Kierman, Jr., Alexander Eckstein. 1954. *The Prospects for Communist China*, pub. by Technology Press of MIT and John Wiley & Sons, New York.
Shanghai Chieh-fang Jih-pao.
Shih Chi. Commercial Press ed.
Sian Ch'ün-chung Jih-pao. Quoted in Li 1955.
Su Wei-ch'üan. 1954. *Shen-pei nu-kung-ying* (The slave camps in Northern Shensi). Asiatic Press, Hongkong.
Sui Shu. Commercial Press ed.
Sung Shih. Commercial Press ed.
Ta-Ch'ing Hui-tien.
T'ang Ch'i-yü. 1947. *Li-tai t'un-k'en yen chiu* (A study of colonization in all dynasties). Chungking.
T'ang Hui-yao. Commercial Press ed., 1935.
Teng Jen-chuan. 1952. *Chung-kung tsen-yang tsui-t'ai ch'an-fu* (How did the Chinese Communists treat the prisoners of war?). Freedom Press, Hongkong.
T'ung Tien. Commercial Press ed.
UNESC. *Forced Labour.* Report by the Secretary-General of the United Nations and the Director-General of the International Labour Office. United Nations Economic and Social Council. E/2815, 15 December, 1955.
UNRFL. *Report of the Ad Hoc Committee on Forced Labor.* Supplement No. 13 in the Official Records of the Sixteenth Session of the Economic and Social Council and No. 36 in the Studies and Reports (New Series) of the International Labour Office. United Nations. Geneva, 1953.
UNRRA, OAP. *Operational Analysis Papers* of United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration. No. 52: "Agricultural Rehabilitation in China," 1948. No. 53: "UNRRA in China, 1945–1947," 1948.
Wang Shih-chieh. 1925. "Chung-kuo nu-pei chih-tu" (The Chinese slavery system). *Social Science Quarterly*, Peking University, III, no. 3: 303–328.
Wei Shu. Commercial Press ed.
Wen-wei Pao. Hongkong. Quoted in UNESC: 230–232.
WHTK. *Wen-hsieh t'ung-k'ao.*
Wilbur, C. Martin. 1943. *Slavery in China during the Former Han Dynasty.* Chicago.
Willcocks, W. 1889. *Egyptian Irrigation*, with an introduction by Lt. Col. J. C. Ross. London and New York.
Williamson, H. R. 1935. *Wang An Shih*, A Chinese Statesman and Educationalist of the Sung Dynasty. Vol. I. London.
Wittfogel, Karl A.
1931. *Wirtschaft und Gesellschaft Chinas. Erster Teil, Productivekräfte, Produktions und Zirkulationsprozess.* Leipzig.
1949. "General Introduction," *History of Chinese Society, Liao:* 1–35. Philadelphia and New York.
1955. *Mao Tse-tung, Liberator or Destroyer of the Chinese Peasants?* Free Trade Union Committee, American Federation of Labor, New York.
Wittfogel, Karl A., and Fêng, Chia-shêng. 1949. *History of Chinese Society, Liao.* Transaction of the American Philosophical Society 36, Philadelphia.
Wu, Yüan-li. 1955. *An Economic Survey of Communist China.* New York.

Yakhontoff, Victor A. 1934. *The Chinese Soviets.* New York.
Yangtze Daily. Quoted in UNESC : 224.
Yü-hai. Edition of 1883.
Yüan Shih. Commercial Press ed.
Yünnan T'ung Chih. Edition of 1736.

[From the New York Times, April 29, 1956]

FORCED LABOR FIASCO

Forced labor is high on the agenda of the International Labor Organization. It will attract worldwide attention at the ILO meeting next June. In the meanwhile the Secretariat has been busy preparing for this important international event. Several months ago each member country received a questionnaire to find out in advance if it will or will not favor an anti-forced-labor ILO convention. The Soviet Union, which has been one of the worst offenders, has said it will—as have 46 other countries. But the United States, where forced labor has long been outlawed, has not deigned to answer.

The State Department has now revealed the reason why. In a letter introduced at a hearing on Senator Humphrey's resolution favoring a convention, Assistant Secretary of State Hill says the Department agrees with the objective of stamping out forced labor, but not with the method proposed for doing so. Mr. Dulles, he says, does not believe that treaties should, or lawfully can, be used "as a device to circumvent constitutional procedures" in relation to "matters of domestic concern."

This argument is hard enough for us to understand. It will be much more so for the rest of the world. The United States Constitution already prohibits involuntary servitude—see the 13th amendment. How could an anti-forced-labor ILO convention "circumvent" it in any conceivable way? Then, too, such conventions are not binding on countries whose ILO delegates vote for them unless they are formally ratified later by their governments—in our case by the President and the Senate. Furthermore, under the ILO constitution federal governments have the option of referring such matters for approval to their several states.

To explain to the world why the United States will not back an anti-forced-labor convention is a good deal to ask of our delegates to next June's meeting of the ILO. Perhaps Senator Bricker should be invited to take on this assignment. We suspect, however, that even he would hardly relish it.

[From the New York Times, May 1, 1956]

REDS' SLAVE LABOR CONDEMNED BY UNITED STATES

UNITED NATIONS, NEW YORK, April 30.—The United States deplored and denounced before the Economic and Social Council today the system of forced labor officially in operation especially in Communist China and Albania. It urged the Council to condemn such practices and appealed for support of efforts by the International Labor Organization for their eventual abolition.

The attack drew from Arkady A. Sobolev, Soviet delegate, a countercharge of various types of malpractice in the United States.

Dr. John C. Baker, speaker of the United States delegation, cited extensive findings in a report by the Forced Labor Committee of the Labor Organization, with particular reference to new material submitted on mainland China and Albania. In each instance the conclusions reached were based on information obtained from official Government sources.

The findings clearly indicated that the equivalent system in the Soviet Union provided both the pattern and the legal basis for the forced labor camps described, Dr. Baker said.

[From the New York Times, Wednesday, May 2, 1956]

ARE WE FOR OR AGAINST IT?

Yesterday the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations passed a resolution which condemns forced labor wherever it exists, commends the International Labor Organization for the efforts already made to combat it, and expresses the council's interest in further action by the ILO. The United States

was a joint sponsor of the resolution and our delegate to the Council, Dr. John C. Baker, spoke strongly in its support. The vote was 13 in favor and 2—the U. S. S. R. and Czechoslovakia—opposed.

At the ILO meeting last June Secretary of Labor Mitchell, speaking on behalf of the United States Government, said, "The ILO should take advantage of every power, every resource, and every facility at its command to assure effective action is taken against this form of bondage. * * * I can assure you that the United States which, for almost a hundred years, has had a constitutional provision outlawing slavery, would vigorously support such an action program."

At the ILO meeting next June forced labor will again be one of the most widely publicized items on its agenda. Forty-nine nations—including the U. S. S. R. and all the other great powers—have now said, in reply to an advance query to all ILO members, that they favor a convention on the subject. If ratified by the Governments which sign it, this would commit them to action against forced labor within their boundaries. The United States has not done the ILO the honor of an answer—which is shocking enough. But a letter from Assistant Secretary of State Hill, recently revealed at a Senate subcommittee hearing, shows that the State Department agrees with the objective, but is opposed to any such convention.

Apparently our intragovernmental communications system has broken down. We hope that the commitments of Dr. Baker and Secretary Mitchell to United States Government support of effective ILO action against forced labor will somehow be made known to Mr. Dulles—and that he will honor them. To do otherwise will put the United States in the position of opposing forced labor in words but not in deeds—doubly ridiculous because the deeds have long since been done.

INTERNATIONAL UNION OF ELECTRICAL, RADIO, AND MACHINE WORKERS,
Washington 6, D. C., February 28, 1956.

Senator LISTER HILL,
Senate Labor Committee, United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR HILL: I wish to take this opportunity on behalf of International Union of Electrical, Radio and Machine Workers, AFL–CIO to urge enactment of Senate Joint Resolutions 97 and 117. The membership of International Union of Electrical, Radio and Machine Workers, AFL–CIO both as laboring people and, in their larger identity, as citizens of the United States, are vitally interested in the passage of both measures.

Senate Joint Resolution 97 which provides for an increase in the existing ceiling in United States contributions to the ILO from $1,750,000 to $3,000,000, will enable this country to make its contributions to this agency more consistent with those to the United Nations and its other specialized agencies. Through its participation in the ILO, the United States has been able to give some measure of aid and leadership to other democratic nations and to give hope to the millions of people caught under the iron heel of totalitarianism.

The efforts of ILO to foster and protect a free and responsible labor movement in the various nations is a laudable one which should be encouraged. The presence in ILO of representatives from the U. S. S. R. and from other nations which surpass their labor groups makes United States participation more imperative. Rather than leave the field to these dictatorships, the United States would do better to redouble its efforts in helping ILO continue to fight those practices which, by destroying free trade unionism and imposing substandard working conditions, perpetuate totalitarianism and substandard living conditions.

Of equal importance with Senate Joint Resolution 97 is Senate Joint Resolution 117, the condemnation of forced labor. It would be a tragic paradox for the United States of America, with its proud record of freedom for its citizens and its long tradition of opposition to slave labor, to decline to ratify this convention while the U. S. S. R. signs it. The never-ending campaign of the United States of America to fight forced labor compels its ratification of this convention. We cannot, in good faith, decry the practice of forced labor behind the Iron Curtain and, at the same time, refuse to join in an international condemnation of this practice. The convention stands as an indictment of those countries which impose forced labor on their citizens. The principles we have long enunciated are before us. We cannot refuse to endorse them.

The speedy approval of both of these Senate joint resolutions will demonstrate the good faith of the United States and its unflagging desire fully to participate in those international councils the fruits of which give some hope of a better

tomorrow. We are winning our battle in the peaceful forums now available to us. We should not allow ourselves to be deprived of such forums merely because totalitarian countries have been compelled, by world opinion, to participate in them. The violation of international conventions by these totalitarian nations becomes all the more heinous when viewed in terms of the hypocritical lipservice which we pay to them. Our refusal to endorse principles which we publicly espouse will be viewed either as a repudiation of them or a fear that we are not in a position to proclaim their truth. Neither is true. The opportunity to demonstrate our good faith is at hand. I trust that it will not be ignored.

Very truly yours,

JAMES B. CAREY, *President.*

MARYLAND STATE AND DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA FEDERATION OF LABOR,
Washington, D. C., February 27, 1956.

Hon. LISTER HILL,
Chairman, Labor and Welfare Committee,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR HILL: The Maryland State and District of Columbia Federation of Labor respectfully requests that you support Senate Joint Resolution 97, which provides for an increase in the existing ceiling on the United States contribution to the International Labor Organization from $1,750,000 to $3,000,000; also Senate Joint Resolution 117, which calls upon the United States Government, in cooperation with other nations, to assume leadership in the campaign to abolish the use of forced labor and to support the adoption of a convention on forced labor at the 1956 convention of the International Labor Organization.

Respectfully yours,

J. C. TURNER, *Secretary.*

CALIFORNIA STATE FEDERATION OF LABOR, AFL,
San Francisco, February 21, 1956.

Senator LISTER HILL,
Chairman, Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR HILL: The California State Federation of Labor, representing more than a million and a quarter organized workers in the State, wishes to convey to the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare our full and unqualified support of the International Labor Organization (ILO) and of United States membership and active participation therein.

Organized labor believes that the failure of the United States Government to support the ILO both morally and financially would weaken the forces of freedom and democracy within the ILO and throughout the world, and that on the other hand, active and energetic leadership would demonstrate to the aspiring peoples of the world that America represents mankind's best hope on earth. We, therefore, urge the Congress of the United States to enact immediately Senate Joint Resolutions 97 and 117.

Senate Joint Resolution 97, which provides for an increase in the existing ceiling on the United States contribution to the ILO from $1,750,000 to $3 million, will serve to bring the United States contribution more nearly in line with contributions to the United Nations itself as well as to other specialized agencies of the United Nations.

Senate Joint Resolution 117 calls upon the United States, in cooperation with other nations, to assume leadership in the campaign to abolish the use of forced labor and to support the adoption of a convention on forced labor at the 1956 conference of the ILO. Contrary to the reported position of the United States Government, we do not believe that representatives of America at the ILO should refuse to endorse conventions of the ILO which vigorously condemn such inhuman practices as forced labor. To do so will place the freedom loving people of America in an embarrassing and untrue position of being the only member nation of the ILO which refuses to condemn such slavery out of hand through the strongest weapon available to the ILO—the convention against forced labor.

Confident of your careful consideration of these matters, I am,

Sincerely yours,

C. J. HAGGERTY, *Secretary-Treasurer.*

GRAND LODGE,
BROTHERHOOD OF RAILWAY AND STEAMSHIP CLERKS,
FREIGHT HANDLERS, EXPRESS AND STATION EMPLOYES,
Cincinnati, Ohio, February 20, 1956.

Subject: Acts of Congress, Senate Joint Resolutions 97 and 117.

Hon. LISTER HILL,
Chairman, Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR HILL: I respectfully urge on behalf of the Brotherhood of Railway and Steamship Clerks, Freight Handlers, Express and Station Employes that your committee give a favorable consideration to Senate Joint Resolution No. 97 which provides for an increase in the existing ceiling on the United States' contribution to the ILO from $1,750,000 to $3,000,000.

In addition, we also urge that your committee give favorable consideration to Senate Joint Resolution No. 117 which calls upon the United States Government, in cooperation with other nations, to assume leadership in the campaign to abolish the use of forced labor and to support the adoption of a convention on forced labor at the 1956 Conference of the ILO.

We regard the ILO as a vital forum through which to promote the cause of freedom and democracy in the world and we hope that your committee will support these resolutions in order that the ILO may effectively carry on its programs and activities.

Yours very truly,

GEO. M. HARRISON,
Grand President.

KANSAS CITY, MO., *February 21, 1956.*

CHAIRMAN, SENATE LABOR COMMITTEE,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.:

It is respectfully urged that your committee accord favorable consideration to Senate Joint Resolutions 97 and 117. The proposed raising of the financial ceiling of our Nation's contribution to the International Labor Office from $1,750,000 to $3,000,000 and assuming a position of leadership against tyrannical forced labor as proposed by the resolutions is worthy of the energetic support of every American citizen.

WILLIAM A. CALVIN,
International President, International Brotherhood of Boilermakers, Iron Shipbuilders, Blacksmiths, Forgers, and Helpers.

NEW YORK, N. Y., *February 21, 1956.*

Senator LISTER HILL,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.:

On behalf of 400,000 members of Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America, AFL–CIO, I strongly urge passage of Senate Joint Resolutions 97 and 117, providing for increased United States support for ILO and for United States participation in ILO convention on forced labor. Support of ILO activities and leadership in efforts to stamp out forced labor are essential to worldwide leadership in struggle against totalitarian imperialism and to our goal of preserving peace and freedom.

JACOB S. POTOFSKY,
General President.

WASHINGTON, D. C., *February 17, 1956.*

CHAIRMAN, SENATE LABOR COMMITTEE,
Washington, D. C.:

On behalf of the members of the International Association of Fire Fighters we urge your favorable consideration of Senate Joint Resolution No. 97 and Senate Joint Resolution No. 117. We believe the failure of the United States Government to support the ILO morally and financially would surely weaken the forces of freedom and democracy everywhere. We urge your continued support of the United States Government's participation in the work of the ILO.

GEORGE J. RICHARDSON,
Secretary-Treasurer.

INTERNATIONAL BROTHERHOOD OF ELECTRICAL WORKERS,
Washington, D. C., February 20, 1956.

Hon. LISTER HILL,
Chairman, Senate Labor Committee,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR HILL: At a recent meeting of the executive council of the American Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organizations, the council adopted a resolution dealing with the International Labor Organization.

On behalf of the International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers, we urge you to support Senate Joint Resolution No. 97 and Senate Joint Resolution No. 117.

Very truly yours,

GORDON M. FREEMAN,
International President.
JOSEPH D. KEENAN,
International Secretary.

WASHINGTON, D. C., *February 20, 1956.*

Hon. LISTER HILL,
Chairman, Committee on Labor and Public Welfare,
United States Senate:

On behalf of nationwide membership and as one who has witnessed ignoble and degrading aspects of slave labor respectfully urge Senate approval of Senate Joint Resolution 117. Leadership in adoption of a convention on forced labor at 1956 conference of ILO not only will provide needed moral support to democratic and freedom loving people worldwide but will effectively explode propoganda myth of Soviets that America refuses to condemn slavery.

WILLIAM C. DOHERTY,
President, National Association of Letter Carriers.

UNITED STEELWORKERS OF AMERICA,
Pittsburgh 22, Pa., March 16, 1956.

SENATE LABOR COMMITTEE,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

MR. CHAIRMAN: We are urging favorable consideration for Senate Joint Resolution 97 and Senate Joint Resolution 117 dealing with the International Labor Organization. We regard the ILO as an essential weapon in worldwide promotion of peace and democracy and which should receive the continuous and substantial support of the United States Government.

Sincerly yours,

I. W. ABEL,
Secretary-Treasurer.

AMERICAN CIVIL LIBERTIES UNION, INC.,
New York, N. Y., May 8, 1956.

Hon. LISTER HILL,
Chairman, Committee on Labor and Public Welfare,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR HILL: We address you as chairman of the Senate Labor and Public Welfare Committee in favor of the resolution on American support of a Forced Labor Convention to be considered by the International Labor Organization at Geneva in June.

We note that Senator Humphrey has introduced three resolutions; Senate Joint Resolution 117, Senate Concurrent Resolution 75, and Senate Resolution 248. Any of these would accomplish the purpose of putting the United States in the position of backing up what it has so long favored in principle.

We trust that your committee will report one or other of the resolutions favorably and promptly.

Sincerely yours,

ROGER N. BALDWIN.

×