

LABOR ACTION

Independent Socialist Weekly

JUNE 30, 1952

FIVE CENTS

PRAYERS AND POLICEMEN:
The Eucharistic Congress in Spain

... page 6

I. F. STONE'S HIDDEN WAR

... page 3

The Russian CP — A Study

... page 7

Detroit Vigilantes May Be Cooled Off by Ruling

By WALTER JASON

DETROIT, June 21 — The long-awaited decision on the discharge of two suspected Stalinists from the Chrysler Corporation was announced this week by the umpire designated under the UAW-CIO Chrysler contract.

Both minor officials involved were ordered reinstated by David Wolff, the umpire, in deciding on a grievance filed by the UAW-CIO in behalf of the two persons.

The two individuals were Paul Henley, a chief steward at the Dodge Nine Mile plant, and Edith Van Horn, chief steward at the Dodge main plant. Henley was the object of a walkout and demonstration during the week of hys-

teria created by the House Un-American Activities Committee. He and Edith Van Horn were named as active members of the Communist Party that week.

UAW MAY STIFFEN

Chrysler ostensibly fired them that week for passing out literature in their plants. Van Horn did pass out a leaflet blasting the House Committee and defending herself.

The charge against Henley was pure fabrication, as testimony showed. He wasn't even in the plant when the leaflets were being distributed. As a result, he was reinstated with back pay to March 3, the day he was discharged.

(Continued from page 3)

ON THE SECOND ANNIVERSARY OF THE KOREAN WAR—

U.S. Threats to Extend War Arouse Allies' Fears

By L. G. SMITH

The stepping up of military action by the United States on the second anniversary of the war in Korea indicates that the American government has adopted a new policy in the conflict. They are seeking to force a rapid conclusion of a truce on their own terms through the application of large-scale military pressure, accompanied by the virtually open threat that if no truce is concluded the United States stands prepared to extend the war—to the territory of Stalinist China. This is clearly the interpretation placed on the most recent events by sources close to the administration, and by both major parties in Britain.

On the eve of the second anniversary of the fighting in Korea, the American forces launched the most concentrated air attacks of the war on power plants directly across from the Manchurian border. These plants supply

Manchuria with much of its electric power. At the same time, ground troops launched one of the strongest limited offensives since the truce negotiations stabilized the front in Korea. These military

actions were accompanied by a series of statements by high military and civilian officials which can only be described as threats that unless a truce settlement is arrived at, the United States is prepared to resume large-scale fighting, and to extend the war to Chinese territory.

The strong Allied reaction to the massed bombing of the electric plants was used by Secretary of Defense Robert A. Lovett as the occasion to clearly inform the Stalinists, the American people and the allied governments that the United States assumes the authority, and will use it, to launch air attacks across the Manchurian border in the event of "an emergency." Lovett went on to say that in the event of such an emergency, the United States would not have to consult with other UN governments involved in the war before launching such an attack.

Warnings

At the same time both commanding generals of the UN troops in Korea made statements expressing the readiness of their troops to meet any Stalinist offensive. General Mark Clark placed responsibility "for peace or war" solely on the shoulders of the Stalinists, and stated that if the Stalinists should choose war, "we are ready." General Van Fleet, in command of the Eighth Army, has stated earlier that morale among the UN troops is "high—almost to a point of wishing the enemy would attack," and that if the enemy were foolish enough to do this, they would be defeated.

After the new air attack, Van Fleet got even more cocky: "We hope he [the enemy] comes. We would pile him up on the [barbed] wire and maybe end the war."

A-Bomb Coming?

The confidence of the American generals in the military capabilities of their force is based on their possession of tactical atomic weapons which will be brought into play in the event major warfare is resumed. This was disclosed by Marquis Childs in his national column carried in the Los Angeles Daily News on June 11. He wrote that "tactical atomic weapons are ready for almost immediate use in Korea," that a Stalinist attack would be "followed at once by UN bombing of Communist airfields beyond the Yalu river boundary," and that "such bombing would very probably be with the same tactical atomic weapons."

The stepping up of military (Turn to last page)

Koje: Victory for the Stalinist Camp, Symbol of the U.S. Military Mind

By J. M. FENWICK

It would seem to be the fate of even the observer fully aware of the fundamental and inherent limitations of capitalist ideology to be periodically and wearily surprised at the inability of the United States political leadership to exploit even the small but definite opportunities available to it.

The Koje Island prisoner-of-war camp incidents, for example, provided nothing but one resounding political victory after another for world Stalinism.

The ability of the Stalinists to influence the North Korean and Chinese prisoners, and, conversely, the inability of the United States to make any serious inroads among them, rests basically upon the Stalinists' anti-landlordism and their opposition to capitalist imperialism—in sum, their anti-capitalism.

This is, of course, supplemented by a tightly-knit organization chipping away daily among the prisoners and freely employing murder, violence, and intimidation.

Nor is United States prestige bolstered by the living representative of "Western democracy" incorporated in the personal regime of Syngman Rhee, who is currently causing Washington so much

embarrassment. Asia, the State Department set must be tentatively postulating these days, may find something more than a former Princeton man historically necessary.

NO POLITICAL SAVVY

Beyond all this, however, it must be recorded that despite a series of stinging lessons in recent years, neither the military nor the State Department yet really grasps that Stalinism wins primarily on political grounds and has to be contested on that plane. Every new turn of events evokes a new crisis for the U. S. political and military leaders. From this point of view,

for example, the British display a much keener understanding of the nature of the contemporary world.

Stalinist military leaders on all levels from non-coms right up to the topmost staff officers have received a thorough political education which they utilize, for better or for worse, according to their native abilities.

MISFITS

U. S. officers, as a whole, bring to problems only military-technical solutions. Even a more (we cringe while using the adjective) "advanced" type such as Eisenhower daily demonstrates in the campaign for the Republican nomination an abysmal ignorance about political matters of a most elementary factual order—not to speak of questions of a more theoretical nature. It is only the cynicism and charity of a press generally sympathetic to Eisenhower which has prevented his being pulled apart straw by straw and revealed as the limited man he is.

Under such circumstances it is not to be expected that generals detailed to command PW camps, one of the most menial jobs within a system where the direct command of combat troops is the most sought-after post, will exhibit political sensitivity of a high order. In fact, anyone conversant with the sociology of the army brass

knows that it is a near certainty that the generals originally placed in charge of the camps were misfits whom the brass either did not care to assimilate or did not know how to assimilate.

SETTING THE SCENE

That such types could allow the Stalinists to organize the camps themselves is not hard to understand. It was a course which promised to relieve the brass of a lot of administrative detail. Such a policy of laissez-faire is all the more comprehensible since the policy from above was obviously a compound of unawareness, traditional American democracy, and a desire not to provoke unfavorable incidents. In bureaucratic inertia doubtlessly lay the explanation for the continuing existence of large, unwieldy compounds. Other potential sources of trouble lay in the relatively few United States troops available for PW work, and the utilization of trigger-happy South Korean personnel. This set the scene from one side.

The Stalinists, of course, no matter what the situation they find themselves in, are permanently on the alert to create political capital. Their chance came in February of this year when the United States began to screen the captives to separate those who

(Turn to last page)

Police Scandal Still Boiling in Los Angeles

By MALCOLM KIRK

LOS ANGELES, June 20—This week a new development took place in the Los Angeles police-brutality situation. Last March the brutal methods utilized by seemingly large sections of this city's "finest" were given wide publicity because of the Rios-Ulloa case and the unique set of circumstances which surrounded it. The support given this case by labor and liberal organizations made it possible for many other cases of brutality to come to light. LABOR ACTION gave wide coverage to these events in its issues of April 7 and 21.

This week's news involves the most shocking and widely publicized case, the "Bloody Christmas" case, in which seven youths were beaten into insensibility "until the floors were slippery with blood," by over 15 cops; also, the little mentioned case of a GI who died in an army camp in March 1951, "assertedly" due to a beating he took from seven "drunken" police the previous Christmas when he was still a civilian.

Last Tuesday 33 policemen were suspended from the force in connection with the "Bloody Christmas" case. This brings the total to 44 suspensions. Of the last 33, 9 were indefinitely suspended and the rest for periods from 5 to 20 days. A handful more were reprimanded.

Today, eighteen months after the incident, 12 persons including 7 policemen were subpoenaed before the county grand jury in connection with the case of the dead GI. The investigation will begin next week.

WRIST-SLAPPING

These two developments again turn the spotlight on the criminality of Section 202 of the Los Angeles City charter, which LABOR ACTION dragged over the coals in previous articles mentioned above. This section makes it impossible for civilians to take civil-law action against policemen. Instead, if sufficient pressure can be brought against an officer he is investigated and tried by his fellow police. Also, the statute of limitations for policemen is one instead of three years.

This explains the little more than "tsk-tsk judgments" handed down against the 33, and the ironically slow starting of the investigation that is now being prepared by the grand jury. Were it not for the spark supplied by the Rios case the grand jury would never have been called in and no investigation made other than that of the Police Board, whose findings stated that the parents of the soldier had no case because "he got the bruises and black eyes by falling against the bars" of his cell.

CSO ON THE JOB

While public ire at police brutality and disgust with the situation reported here continues, publicity and action against brutality has died down. The labor

movement and liberal organizations that in March were beginning to do a good job in fighting police brutality have gone to sleep and have not created a permanent joint committee for investigating, publicizing, and fighting this brutality, nor for defending its victims. Thus, the community, and particularly the Mexican-American community, is left without adequate defense.

Only the Community Service Organization, headed by Tony Rios, whose primary activity has been civil-defense fights for Mexican-Americans, is on the job, and it is badly in need of a little solidarity from other groups. CSO is now being forced to raise the money that was spent in the defense of Rios last March when it looked as if all the liberals were on the job.

The firm of lawyers who handled the case is what amounts to the "ACLU law firm," and is on

a permanent retainer from the Greater Los Angeles CIO. The lawyer is charging Rios and his co-victims Ulloa one thousand dollars. Roger Baldwin, former national head of the ACLU who previously offered the aid of a national fund that he now represents, seems to be backing down with the excuse that his fund is concerned only with "academic cases."

This situation is the result of the fact that the ranks of the organizations that aided the CSO were never really involved in any action. There is an answer: for CSO to increase its strength tenfold. That can be done, by building on a democratic rank-and-file control basis out of the grassroots elements in the community. Such an organization could take its case to the ranks as well as the leadership of the labor and liberal movements.

THE FIGHT FOR DEMOCRACY on the HOME FRONT

Thurber Hits the Blatherskites; Anniversary of Wartime FEPC

Reinforcement (moral at any rate) for beleaguered civil-liberty forces has come from James Thurber, the renowned humorist, as recorded in an interview with columnist Earl Wilson (June 17).

"Hell," said Thurber, "people are saying American writers' exuberance is gone. The truth is, everybody's scared to death of these blatherskites [congressional investigators et al.]. Who can write where everybody's scared? The end of American comedy is in sight, and the theater's gone to hell, and you can thank a bunch of guys in Congress.

"I hate communism and all the guys who seek refuge in refusing to answer questions, but I happen to be on one of those letterheads with Paul Robeson—and I'm not getting off. I'm not getting off because I'm not letting any congressman scare me to death in the country I love. . . .

"Why, I'd just like to have a congressman say to me, 'I still don't understand your viewpoint, Mr. Thurber.' I'd say to him, 'No, and you never will—but why don't you help elect somebody who can?'"

"But these investigations are down against the 33, and the ironically slow starting of the investigation that is now being prepared by the grand jury. Were it not for the spark supplied by the Rios case the grand jury would never have been called in and no investigation made other than that of the Police Board, whose findings stated that the parents of the soldier had no case because "he got the bruises and black eyes by falling against the bars" of his cell.

RANDOLPH SAID NO

A useful reminder of how the wartime FEPC was squeezed out of Roosevelt is given in a reminiscent article in the Los Angeles Daily News (June 14). This month is the 11th anniversary. J. Robert Smith paints the background of discrimination and then relates:

"... Randolph [Sleeping Car Porters president] organized the March-on-Washington Movement, and staged a historic mass meeting at Madison Square Garden the night of June 16.

"Negroes packed the Garden. . . . 'The nation's newspapers recorded the event the next morning. Two days later Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt, Mayor Fiorello LaGuardia, Randolph, White, Crosswaith and Miss Lane met in the mayor's office at the then first lady's invitation. There both Mrs. Roosevelt and the mayor failed to persuade Randolph to call the march off.

"Returning to Washington, Mrs. Roosevelt promised that she would take the matter up with the president right away. She did. The president invited Randolph and his committee to the White

Jim Crow Violence Also Smolders; NAACP Asks Grand Jury Inquiry

By REX HILL

LOS ANGELES, June 22—Police Chief Parker and his force were the targets of more severe criticism by community organizations this week following a new Jim Crow bomb threat and a new police brutality case. The new developments occurred only a few days after the local body of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People issued a public statement accusing the city police department of gross "indifference" to racist bombings and "other terrorist activities."

Dr. E. I. Robinson, local leader of the NAACP, asked for a grand jury investigation of the bombings

last March 16 and his organization filed a \$100,000 claim against the city on behalf of one of the bomb victims. Robinson also said the police had a list of "suspects." In addition, he registered a strong protest with the police department for its action in removing the special guard from the Dunsmuir Avenue neighborhood where the bombings took place.

BURNING CROSSES

At the same time a labor union blasted the police force. The AFL Lumber and Sawmill Workers union, Local 2288, passed a resolution criticizing police "inaction" and calling on city authorities to "correct this abominable situation." The union pointed out that such terrorist activities aimed at minorities "could easily be directed at the union movement" if not halted immediately.

The new racist threat was revealed on June 17 by Angus Bates who reported that he has been threatened twice since he moved into a home at 1749 West 42 Street, last April 1. Two weeks after he moved in he found a note on his doorstep which warned: "You must realize you have moved into a purely white neighborhood, and they intend to take action unless you move within a reasonable period of time." On June 15 a flaming cross, soaked in kerosene, was tossed into his yard. Bates said that police simply made out a memorandum, thereby forcing him to mount guard in order to provide his own protection for his family.

A few weeks ago, a local Negro candidate for Congress reported that hoodlums burned a cross on his lawn and stoned his windows. New threats by phone and mail are being reported frequently. Not one arrest had been made to date, although the Daily News and sections of the Negro press say the police seem to know some of the terrorist thugs involved. Bailey reported recently that he had received new threats since the bombing attempt on his home.

VISITORS REPELLED

A new case, which the press called "shocking," was added to the cop brutality scandals, even as columnist Doy Aviso criticized the mere suspension of a number of officers implicated in the savage beatings of six youth on Christmas Eve. The new victim was Jack Zanello who told of being kicked or kneed in the groin by one cop while being held by two others. Picked up on a drunk charge, Zanello said the cop used obscenities as he beat him. Zanello begged for medical aid, but he was held for seven hours before he was permitted to enter the hospital, where he is now undergoing treatment for a punctured kidney attributed to Officer William Glenn Adair. The police records tend to refute the police account by the fact that there is no reference to hospitalization! Following the beating at 2:30 a.m., Zanello was booked again at 4:30 for "battery" against the cops and held until 9:30 before he could enter the hospital.

The cop-brutality publicity has given Los Angeles such a bad reputation that letters to newspapers report that people are canceling their intended vacations to this area because they are afraid they might be manhandled by cops under some pretext. To expect such a police force to be interested in rounding up racist terrorists or protecting recipients of threats is to expect the highly improbable.

Other methods were also used. A mobile radio station was threatened with a lawsuit if it permitted Blanshard's "slanders" on the air. At each point there was also a "uniform pattern" of letters and phone calls to people sponsoring Blanshard.



of 13 Jewish state scholarship winners was admitted there. Two Jewish students have not yet been accepted by any New York State medical college although both won state scholarships in 1951. The infamous quota system still flourishes despite the 1948 law which was supposed to wipe it out.

MOTHER WINS

On the plus side, the New York Court of Appeals unanimously reversed a lower-court ruling which would have taken a 6-year-old child away from her mother. The mother, Mrs. Anne Strasser DeCarava, was accused of "neglect and unfitness" on charges of "Communist" activity, failing to bring the girl up in the Jewish faith, and bringing her up in an "undesirable" neighborhood—an interracial area where she lives with her second husband, a Negro. The state high court found that none of these charges was any basis for taking the child away from Mrs. DeCarava.

HOUNDING BLANSHARD

Despite careful organization, efforts to censor Paul Blanshard on his speaking tour through Southern cities earlier this year "failed completely," according to the Church and State Newsletter. The publication is the official organ of the group which sponsored Blanshard's trip, named Protestants and Other Americans United for Separation of Church and State. Blanshard has incurred the enmity of the Catholic hierarchy through his books attacking them.

The group reported that organized attempts were made by Catholic organizations wherever Blanshard appeared to prevent him from speaking in public places. In Nashville, two groups protested Blanshard's forthcoming appearance in the War Memorial Auditorium. Tennessee Governor Browning told the protesting groups that if they believed in free speech they had the right to hire the auditorium for an opposition speaker.

Other methods were also used. A mobile radio station was threatened with a lawsuit if it permitted Blanshard's "slanders" on the air. At each point there was also a "uniform pattern" of letters and phone calls to people sponsoring Blanshard.

NOT IN THE HEADLINES . . .

A year's subscription to LABOR ACTION brings you a living socialist analysis of news and views on labor, socialism, minority groups, national and world politics—\$2 a year.

For living Marxism—read THE NEW INTERNATIONAL

AFTER TWO YEARS OF DEVASTATION — How Much Is Hidden in the Korean War?

By GORDON HASKELL

Just two years ago humanity was startled and horrified by the outbreak of the war in Korea. The cold war had erupted into an active slaughter which threatened to engulf the whole world. Everywhere people were asking themselves: Is this the beginning of the end?

For a whole year the armies of capitalism and Stalinism fought each other up and down the Korean peninsula. For another year, while "truce negotiations" were going on, men were killing each other along the battle lines, while the American air force continued to pound to bits, and both armies to devastate, what little had been left of the country after the first year's massacres and destruction.

Korea as a location of civilized human habitation has almost ceased to exist. It remains as a military and political battlefield, a monument to the barbarism which both capitalism and Stalinism have in store for the whole of humanity if these two systems are permitted to fulfill their destinies without the intervention of another social force which can restrain and eventually defeat them both.

Can't Be Brushed Off

In Korea the conflict has been joined in blood on a small, almost "experimental" scale. All over the world, the propaganda machines of both sides have been trying to use this conflict to win a larger and, in the long run, much more important battle: the battle for the minds, the allegiance of the peoples of the world.

As the first two years of the war in Korea were drawing to a close, a book appeared which is bound to be hotly debated wherever people are sincerely interested in penetrating to the real meaning of the war in Korea. It is Irving F. Stone's *The Hidden History of the Korean War* published on May 5 of this year.*

There can be little doubt that Stone's book will be used by the Stalinists, and even more, by that amorphous group of people who are more accurately described by the word "Stalinoids," to bolster their argument that the war in Korea is simply an American imperialist assault against the freedom of the peoples of Asia. To the extent that it deals with the role of the Russian, Chinese and North Korean Stalinists, it is definitely an apology.

In a word, his implied position on this point is that initially neither the Russians nor the Chinese had anything to do with the North Korean invasion of South Korea, that the Chinese only entered the war when an attack on their own country, or at the very least, on certain electrical installations vital to their own country, was imminent, that they have been repeatedly ready to negotiate peace in Korea.

If this were the chief content of the book, it would justify no more attention than any Stalinist propaganda hack job. However, to begin with, Stone has not been a mere Stalinist hack. He has accepted the broad outlines of Stalinist policy and interpretation of events on many occasions over the years. At the same time, he has repeatedly jumped over the traces to oppose concrete aspects of Stalinist policy and behavior. At worst he can be described as an independent Stalinoid, with the emphasis on the word "independent."

Stone's Analysis

Secondly, he presents a thesis on the bases and development of American policy in the Korean war which is generally consistent with the approach of the various major groupings in the American government to world political problems. He seeks to prove this thesis to the hilt with a most detailed account of both the military operations and the political developments of the past two years.

In itself, this account could only be assailed by a painstaking demonstration that Stone's documented story is a tissue of fabrications or distortions. No such attempt has so far been made seriously.

Stone's thesis is that the war was initially provoked by a clique headed by MacArthur, John Foster Dulles, Syngman Rhee, and Chiang Kai-shek. These gentlemen were united by a desire to reverse the policy of the Truman administration which had, in early 1950, written off Formosa and Korea as strategically and politically no longer essential to American purposes in Asia. Chiang felt that his very existence was at stake. Rhee was determined to unite Korea under his control, one way or the other. MacArthur and Dulles represented the group in America who opposed the administration's concentration on Europe as the vital strategic area, and who advocated and still advocate an aggressive military policy in Asia.

According to this theory of Stone's, the South Korean army launched an attack across the 38th parallel in some force, and then fell back before the North Korean coun-

terattack to prepared positions. The North Koreans, who had been massing their forces near the border for some time, then proceeded to run over the South Korean army and drive it, along with its American reinforcements, down to the Pusan beachhead.

Although the North Korean reaction was unexpectedly powerful, the MacArthur-Rhee clique had accomplished their purpose. Formosa was re-established as an American protectorate. A settlement in Asia with Stalinist China was thereby made virtually impossible. Asia as a whole was restored to the importance which MacArthur and his supporters in the United States wished it to hold. The United Nations was pressured into backing American policy, and MacArthur himself was made supreme commander of UN forces, without any responsibility to that body.

When the tide of war turned, and MacArthur's forces re-entered Seoul, it seemed that the war could be brought to a close. The UN's purpose of repelling aggression from North Korea and re-establishing control of the South Korean government over the whole of its former territory had been accomplished. The question was: Should the UN forces stop short of the 38th parallel and negotiate a peace, or should they advance to the north and try to "unify" the whole country by force of arms.

There is little doubt that most of the other governments involved favored the first alternative. But—we are still summarizing Stone's thesis—the Truman administration was fearful of a settlement in Korea. It was afraid that if the war came to an immediate end, the whole armament program in this country would bog down. Its world orientation of containing Stalinism by superior military force would thus be endangered. A real settlement in Korea would make it necessary for the administration to give heed to the demand of its allies that Stalinist China be recognized as the actual government of China and be admitted to the UN.

MacArthur's Role

Further, the economic consequences for the United States of a sudden relaxation of the armament program could be severe. In any event, with an election in the offing, it might be more expedient to continue the fighting than to lay the administration open to the charge of appeasing Stalinism in Asia through negotiations.

Thus, Stone reasons, Truman was inclined to a policy of neither expanding the war nor concluding a general peace. But MacArthur was determined on a policy of war. Without clear directives to the contrary, he jumped the gun by sending a large South Korean force deep into North Korean territory under the protection of American ships and planes. The rest of the UN forces followed close behind them.

As the UN armies approached the Manchurian border another major political problem confronted the American government. The allies were most fearful of the war spreading to include the Chinese and Russians. Stories of large Chinese concentrations north of the Yalu filled the papers. Small Chinese units crossed the border and deployed in positions to protect the Changjin and Pujon dams from which electric power for Manchuria is generated. The UN allies clearly understood, according to Stone, that the South Koreans alone would proceed to the Yalu, with the remaining UN troops leaving a narrow buffer zone between themselves and the Chinese. As the North Korean army had been virtually destroyed, another possibility for a settlement had been reached.

Here again, MacArthur took the bull by the horns. Ignoring his general directives, he sent forces looking for the Chinese. At the same time, MacArthur headquarters, at this stage, consistently played down the strength of the Chinese in the press. This, according to Stone, was done to prevent the allies from applying too much pressure to the Truman administration which might re-

sult in direct and categorical orders against tangling with the Chinese units at the reservoirs.

Space does not permit a complete summary of Stone's account of MacArthur's political-military maneuvers at each stage of the war. His most daring claim is that the American retreat from the Yalu to some 75 miles south of the 38th parallel, which followed the beginning of the "home by Christmas" offensive on November 26, was not caused by an overwhelming Stalinist military victory, but was a planned retreat without direct military cause. By a detailed analysis of the military dispatches of the time, he purports to prove that the Chinese forces were hardly ever in contact with UN troops during the whole retreat, that Seoul was destroyed and evacuated without military cause, that the demoralization in the UN ranks was a result not of a military disaster but of repeated retreats, the reasons for which were unknown to the American and other soldiers.

(Stone does not deny, incidentally, that the marines had to fight their way out of a trap at the Chingjin reservoir, or that the evacuation of the Tenth Corps was accomplished under military pressure. His claim is that the main UN forces in the west retreated after a battle which lasted from November 26 to December 1, after which there was no serious fighting in this phase of the war.)

Whitewashes Stalinists

What then was the reason for this unprecedented rout without a major battle? Stone's answer is simple. MacArthur wanted to get permission to bomb Manchuria in order to get the big war with China started. He could get permission to do this only if he could panic American public opinion with the prospect of the destruction of the UN army by overwhelming Chinese "hordes." Although Truman and his supporters were set against war with China at this time, and would not give MacArthur the permission he sought, their fear of the consequences of a real settlement, their policy of not wanting World War III but also not wanting peace, permitted MacArthur to keep the initiative. He was removed only when he openly intervened into the domestic political conflict on the side of the Republicans with his famous letter to GOP leader Martin denouncing Truman's policies.

Stone's account of the truce negotiations up till the time his book went to press follows the same pattern. The Stalinists are portrayed as showing willingness to yield on point after point, while the American negotiators, all of them military men who are essentially committed to MacArthur's philosophy (even when they disagree with his methods), sabotaged them at every turn. Their purpose? If the truce talks break down completely, the American government will have no alternative but to resume the war on an expanded scale. As they cannot achieve a military decision in Korea itself, the logic would be to expand operations to include Manchuria. Of course, with the appearance of a major Stalinist air force on the field, even the MacArthurites now concede that this is no longer practical.

The weakness of Stone's thesis does not lie mainly in his account of the political-military motives of the factions on the American side. It lies in his portrayal of the Stalinists as reasonable men of good will who were seeking peace at all times.

The invasion of South Korea by the North Korean army is portrayed as an action of impetuosity rather than premeditation. Here was a part of their own country, with a government which enjoyed little support among its own people . . . a plum ripe to pick. So who could really blame them for trying to pick it? And the Chinese Stalinist intervention, accompanied as it was by repeated boasts over the Peiping radio that the American imperialists would be thrown into the sea, with a national mobilization to accomplish this purpose? Well,

(Turn to last page)

Rovere vs. Stone: Two Brands of Whitewash

To date, I. F. Stone's *The Hidden History of the Korean War* has been getting the silent treatment from virtually all sections of the American press.

The only review we have been able to find so far was written by Richard H. Rovere, in the *New York Post* for May 11.

Rovere spends a good deal of his space lamenting Stone's political decline as a Stalinoid. He then sketches Stone's thesis and seeks to discredit it by citing, as examples of Stone's methods of proof, a couple of the most tenuous and even far-fetched items.

It is quite true that Stone seeks every possible argument or bit of "evidence" to back up his theory, and even a few impossible ones. It is also true that on certain concrete points his conclusions go far beyond what is warranted even by his own evidence. These are some of the weaknesses of his book. But Rovere does not even attempt to grapple with its strong points, except in one case.

He attacks Stone's contention that the Truman administration does not want peace. "This is pure poppycock," he writes. "At any time during the

Korean war, a decent settlement and an end to the bloodshed would have been tremendously advantageous to the administration. If it came today, the Democrats could forget their worries about Eisenhower, the corruption issue, McCarthy, and just about everything else.

"If the administration could end the Korean war, it could put T. Lamar Caudle in the White House next year."

One question is: What, for the Truman administration, would a "decent settlement" look like? Have Nehru and the others, who from time to time have sought to mediate the conflict, been for an "indecent" settlement? And how would Rovere explain the mass bombings of the electrical installations which provide Manchuria with much of its power on June 24 as a contribution toward a "decent" settlement of the war?

If the Truman administration could induce the Stalinists to capitulate completely in Korea, it would be to its political advantage. That is not in the cards. But a negotiated settlement would be dangerous for it politically.

Sooner or later the U. S. may be driven to it by the pressure of its reluctant allies. But in the meantime, "Neither expand the war nor conclude a general peace" is their preferred policy, and it seems to suit the Stalinists too. G. H.

Marxism in the United States
By LEON TROTSKY
35 Cents Order from
Independent Socialist Press
114 West 14 Street
New York 11, N. Y.

*I. F. Stone: *The Hidden History of the Korean War*. Monthly Review Press, New York, 364 pp., \$5.

The ISL Program in Brief

The Independent Socialist League stands for socialist democracy and against the two systems of exploitation which now divide the world: capitalism and Stalinism.

Capitalism cannot be reformed or liberalized, by any Fair Deal or other deal, so as to give the people freedom, abundance, security or peace. It must be abolished and replaced by a new social system, in which the people own and control the basic sectors of the economy, democratically controlling their own economic and political destinies.

Stalinism, in Russia and wherever it holds power, is a brutal totalitarianism—a new form of exploitation. Its agents in every country, the Communist Parties, are unrelenting enemies of socialism and have nothing in common with socialism—which cannot exist without effective democratic control by the people.

These two camps of capitalism and Stalinism are today at each other's throats in a worldwide imperialist rivalry for domination. This struggle can only lead to the most frightful war in history so long as the people leave the capitalist and Stalinist rulers in power. Independent Socialism stands for building and strengthening the Third Camp of the people against both war blocs.

The ISL, as a Marxist movement, looks to the working class and its ever-present struggle as the basic progressive force in society. The ISL is organized to spread the ideas of socialism in the labor movement and among all other sections of the people.

At the same time, Independent Socialists participate actively in every struggle to better the people's lot now—such as the fight for higher living standards, against Jim Crow and anti-Semitism, in defense of civil liberties and the trade-union movement. We seek to join together with all other militants in the labor movement as a left force working for the formation of an independent labor party and other progressive policies.

The fight for democracy and the fight for socialism are inseparable. There can be no lasting and genuine democracy without socialism, and there can be no socialism without democracy. To enroll under this banner, join the Independent Socialist League!

INTERESTED? Get Acquainted

Independent Socialist League
114 West 14 Street
New York 11, New York

- I want more information about the ideas of Independent Socialism and the ISL.
- I want to join the ISL.

NAME
ADDRESS
CITY UONE.....
STATE TEL.....

HANDY WAY TO SUBSCRIBE

LABOR ACTION
114 West 14 Street
New York 11, New York

- Please enter my subscription:
 Six months (26 issues) at \$1.00
 One year (52 issues) at \$2.00
- NEW RENEWAL
 Bill me. Payment enclosed.

NAME
ADDRESS APT.....
CITY
ZONE STATE.....

MARXISM

Of or Pertaining to Some Definitions in Webster's

G. & C. Merriam Company
Springfield, Mass.

Dear Sirs:

Permit me, as an admirer of the Merriam-Webster dictionaries, to make a suggestion for improvement. It concerns your definitions of certain political terms, most particularly the synonyms distinguished under the word "socialist." Naturally, it is difficult, if not impossible, to give definitions for some of these terms which will appear equally adequate to both supporters and opponents of the respective ideologies. I am, therefore, not raising any questions of this order but will concern myself solely with matters of fact.

From this point of view, the definition given for "socialism" is unexceptionable: "A political and economic theory of social organization based on collective or governmental ownership and democratic management of the essential means for the production and distribution of goods." But the discussion under "socialist" is very curious:

"SYN. Collectivist, nationalist, nihilist, anarchist, socialist, communist, Bolshevist. All of these groups are agreed in distrusting capitalist control of industry. The collectivist (or nationalist) would transfer much of that control to existing governments. The other groups object to this, the nihilist on the ground that existing governments are survivals of a bad political tradition, the anarchist because they are supporters of class distinctions and privileges. The Marxist socialist, more specifically, emphasizes the economic evils of capitalistic management, holds that labor creates value, that profit is mostly robbery, and that the proletariat must attain political power to remedy the evil. Communist, in the usual sense of the word, denotes an extreme Marxian socialist, who would abolish property as well as profit. The Bolshevists, a Russian group as revolutionary socialists; after victory they changed their name to communist and tried to propagandize abroad." (From the unabridged edition, 1950.)

COLLECTIVIST TO NIHILIST

I think you will agree that the following comments do not raise any questions of political opinion but are capable of objective factual check.

(1) All the groups listed surely unite in "distrusting" capitalism, as you put it, but if it were a case of mere distrust, the list would have to be a little longer. In point of fact, without exception, they all agree on proposing the abolition of capitalism in one form or another. The evidence for this is to be found in your own definitions of each of the terms in their alphabetical entries.

(2) Collectivist.—This term has a more general meaning than the one you assign to it. Your alphabetical-entry definition, unfortunately, has the same implication as the passage quoted above: "A member of a school of economists which accepts the theories of the socialists, but specifically withholds approval from revolutionary sentiments or measures; a non-revolutionary socialist." In point of fact, however, "collectivist" is freely used as the generic term for any school of thought advocating collective ownership of the means of production and distribution, as opposed to capitalism. As such, it includes (for example) socialist, communist, Bolshevist, Marxist.

While "collectivist" does not, by itself, necessarily carry the connotation "non-revolutionary," there are several other terms which do. One of the most common is "reformist." Your definition of this, in its own entry, is inadequate: "A promoter or supporter of parliamentary reform." As a type of socialist, it means one who expects the goal of socialism to be won through the gradual accretion of social reforms within the capitalist system itself. The same connotation is borne, with slightly different emphases, by: gradualist socialist, parliamentary socialist, Fabian, revisionist, moderate socialist, constitutional socialist.

Incidentally, perhaps the most common pronunciation of "reformist" in socialist circles puts the accent on the first syllable. I prefer yours, on the second syllable, but it should not be the only one given.

(3) Nationalist.—In the sense of "One who favors the nationalizing of industries," this word should be marked *Obsolete*. It was invented by Edward Bellamy, author of *Looking Backward*, and used for the movement he organized in the latter part of the last century. It has not been so used for decades, and is now strictly historical, like "Communist."

(4) Nihilist.—As you define it in its alphabetical entry, nihilism advocates "destruction for its own sake, independent of any constructive program." Very well; and quite apart from its origin by Turgenev or its use by "a Russian party of the 19th and 20th centuries," it is still so used today to convey a similar mood (rather than any set of social or political ideas, incidentally). In any case, it bears no necessary connotation of opposition to existing governments as "survivals of a bad political tradition," unless the very vagueness of this phrase is its defense. The real difficulty in distinguishing "nihilist" from the other terms on the list is that it does not really belong there in the first place, having no very distinct ideology by its very nature.

ANARCHIST TO COMMUNIST

(5) Anarchist.—What distinguishes the anarchist from the others is not at all his opposition to existing governments as "supports of class distinctions and privileges." It is, rather, the fact that they are governments. As your alphabetical-entry definition correctly says, for him "all government is an evil." But this definition, too, then proceeds to mix things up. It continues: "At its best, it [anarchism] stands for a society in which each person produces according to his powers and receives according to his needs." This idea has no special connection with anarchism, though it may also be held by anarchists. It is even better known as Marx's anticipation of the principle of distribution in a communist society.

(6) Marxian socialist.—The notion that "profit is mostly robbery" is not only not held by Marxists but is incompatible with the Marxist economic analysis. I should guess that your writer was moved by a dim memory of the famous dictum of P.-J. Proudhon that "property is theft." As you note in another entry of your excellent dictionary, Proudhon has been called the "Father of Anarchism," certainly no Marxist. In fact, Marx, his contemporary, directed a very scornful polemic against him on this score. In *Capital*, Marx denounces a stand to arguing that the source of profit can not be found in fraud or cheating, but that in fact, by and large, a commodity sells at its real value; and that a worker does get paid wages, how profit nevertheless arises, according to Marx, may be concisely read in 18 words if you turn to your definition of "surplus value" (q. v.).

This last definition is a happier one than the blunder committed under "labor value theory," which says: "The assumption that labor is the sole rightful source of value." Assumption or not (and at least as far as the Marxist labor theory of value is concerned), labor is not the sole "source" of value; nature is the other. And the insertion of "rightful" is quite nonsensical from the economic point of view; it converts a scientific theory into a moral judgment. The theory at this point is not at all concerned with what is "rightful" but with what objectively determines the value of a commodity quite apart from subjective wishes.

(7) Communist.—Whether by "the usual sense of the word" you mean any "extreme Marxian socialist" or a follower of Lenin or a follower of Stalin, or in fact any meaning ever given to "communist" whatsoever, it does not mean one who "would abolish property as well as profit." In fact, it is hard to imagine what is intended by "abolish property." Perhaps you mean "abolish private property." This would be nearer correct if qualified: "abolish private property in the essential means of production and distribution," but in this case the formulation would not apply only to communists but to any type of socialists. Actually your lexicographer at this point was not thinking of any kind of Marxist at all, "extreme" or otherwise, but of earlier and more primitive "communist" notions. His phrase would not describe these very well, either, but we needn't go into that.

Unlike the unabridged, the abridged New Collegiate omits the entire discussion under "socialist." The motivation may have been to save space but it really was an improvement. I trust that these notes may be helpful in any contemplated revision.
Philip COBEN

READING from LEFT to RIGHT

WHAT MAKES COMMUNISTS? by Vera Micheles Dean.—Foreign Policy Bulletin of the Foreign Policy Association, July 1.

"One answer [to the question posed in the title, writes V. M. Dean] has been given by the independent French monthly *Realités*, which conducted a poll this year to find out why more than 5 million Frenchmen vote Communist. Its conclusion is that these 5 million vote Communist essentially because they want a qualified and energetic champion of their interests who will help them to improve their material condition. A majority of the French Communist voters are attached to parliamentary institutions and democratic liberties. . . . The USSR irritates them somewhat although they feel a vague sympathy for it. . . . They are rather anti-American. . . . The majority of Communist voters prefer the way of reforms to revolution." "A similar interpretation of why many Italians vote Communist was given in the liberal Catholic magazine *The Commonweal* in July

1951. A distinction, said this analysis, is drawn by Italians between what they call 'social communism' and 'political communism.'"

She quotes *Commonweal*: "Social communism arises from chronic misery and demoralizing unemployment. It expresses the longing for a change, whatever it may be, among people living in conditions which could not be worse. They have nothing to lose and everything to win. . . . The great majority of Italian Communists are 'social Communists' and will remain so as long as there are 2 million permanently unemployed." ". . . *Realités*, on the basis of its poll, reaches the conclusion that even if Communists should be disappointed in Russia and persuaded of 'internal contradictions' among their local leaders, it is not certain that this would suffice to make them vote differently if at the same time they did not see elsewhere a better chance of having their interests defended and their situation improved."

WORLD POLITICS

SPOTLIGHTING A VALUABLE STUDY OF CZECHOSLOVAKIA

By HAL DRAPER

We have not, in LABOR ACTION, referred often enough to one of the most interesting (if not the most interesting) of the several publications in Europe devoted to following and exposing the development of events behind the Iron Curtain. This is *Masses-Information*, subtitled "A Monthly Collection of Texts and Documents," published in Paris by a group of political writers including Paul Barton, Robert Loukota, Albert Weil and others.

The very title of the periodical is perhaps forbidding, it is mimeographed, and the articles are solid pieces of research and analysis without pretense to "popularity," all of which does not make for wide appeal; but its content continues to be uniformly informative and thought-provoking. Its biggest drawback is that it deals exclusively with Czechoslovakia; but on second thought this is also a source of part of its value—

for anyone who wants not merely "expose" material or squibs but raw material for trying to understand the basic social forces in the newly Stalinized states. For it should be remembered that Czechoslovakia is the most industrialized and "Western" of the Stalinist satellites, and a close examination of this country alone may be of more long-term value in understanding Stalinism than a sketchy acquaintance with the whole region.

BARTON'S THESIS

This testimonial, while mended, is perhaps brought on by a reminder that we should have made LABOR ACTION readers acquainted with the exceedingly interesting analysis given by *Masses-Information* on the downfall of Slansky. Many theories about that shake-up appeared in the American press; none were as authoritative and detailed, solidly documented, as that of Paul Barton. And this is said without necessarily agreeing with his thesis (or with any other) about the causes of that important event.

The thesis, to put it very briefly and no doubt inadequately, was that the fall of Slansky and the ascendancy of Gottwald represented the victory of the Stalinist apparatus of the government bureaucracy over the Stalinist apparatus of the party. Barton drew conclusions and consequences, as well as presenting the evidence for the hypothesis, and traced its ramifications. One of these implied tendencies toward greater independence from mechanical Russian control. The whole was much more impressive than the above couple of sentences might indicate.

The present reminder is the current issue of *Masses-Information* (May) with an article by Robert Loukota which amounts to a follow-up footnote on that thesis. As in the case of the original article, whether the conclusions are right or wrong, the ma-

supported; the schools which the Russians denounce as bourgeois formalism and counter-revolutionary are objectively discussed. Works of art are discussed without reference to their political or ideological content (a heresy).

TITOISM?

Nezval, "the bard of Gottwald, of Stalin and of Peace" (as Loukota describes him), writes of an ex-cubist, Filla: "I do not want to make myself the advocate either of cubism or of Filla. They do not need it."

Another critic writes of the impressionist Jiranek: "It was often said that Jiranek helped to open the windows on Europe. . . . We have to watch out that they are not closed uselessly and that no one tries even to close the shutters."

HERESIES

This spring a general shake-up took place in the Czech press. *Tvorba*, theoretical weekly of the CP, was suppressed and its readers received the *Cominform* journal instead. On the cultural field, *Lidove Noviny*, the daily published by the Czechoslovak Writers Association, gave way to the new *Literarni Noviny*. The editors of the latter crowd. Writes Loukota:

"The disappearance of *Tvorba* marks for them a victory over the spokesmen of the party apparatus in the field of literary and artistic criticism who, entrenched in the theoretical magazine of the CP, had created an unbreathable atmosphere in our cultural institutions, in the schools and elsewhere. . . . In fact, a hidden struggle between two 'schools' of art critics was thus resolved: the one which favored the rapid and unconditional sovietization of Czech plastic arts was beaten; the other, which preached intelligent choice amid the Czech artistic heritage and the creation of a specifically Czech kind of socialist realism, won out."

From the pens of the newly installed arbiters of the Czech cultural world, Loukota quotes at large numerous expressions of views which seem like provocations to the Russian masters. The views, of course, are thickly enscathed in expressions of esteem and loyalty for "our Soviet brethren," and the writers take pains to derive (or seem to derive) their opinions from the Russian "teachers" themselves; but this is of secondary consequence. Views which the now defunct *Tvorba* had bitterly attacked as deviations from the "socialist-realist" model, and writers who had expressed them, raise their heads triumphantly. Modern (Western-style) art is no longer consigned out of hand to the scrapheap; it is put forward as a valuable part of the artistic heritage; even cubism is openly

Readers Take the Floor . . .

Comments on the Kristol Article

The article "The Anti-Anti-Witchhunters: A Study in Totalitarian Liberalism," by Hal Draper, in our June 16 issue, was sent to the persons (on both sides of the question) who were mentioned in the article or who had expressed their opinion in *Commentary*. The following notes were received. None holding Kristol's viewpoint, including Kristol, sent any comment.—Ed.

CHAFEE

To the Editor:
Thank you for yours of the 13th and the copy of your reply to Kristol. I have been too busy to say anything about him myself, but I am pleased that you found time to polish him off.
Zechariah CHAFEE, Jr.

COMMAGER

To the Editor:
Thank you for sending me a copy of LABOR ACTION with the reply to Kristol. I have thought it best not to reply to this article, but—like you—I am astonished that so many otherwise sound and intelligent men appear to be taken in by its specious reasoning. I think your rebuttal a very good one.
Henry COMMAGER

LYNN

To the Editor:
Kristol's "new" position for liberals required the meticulous dismemberment perpetrated by Hal Draper. It is unfortunate that the Draper piece cannot receive the same kind of distribution being afforded the Kristol opus. (Incidentally, it is rumored that Kristol only signed his name. Some higher person in the *Commentary* hierarchy is said to have laid down the basic outline for the article.)
Particularly was it necessary to nail the snide statements about radicals gaining heaven by losing their jobs for beliefs. Kristol, however, has set the tone and there will in all likelihood be very few of the intelligentsia in the future who will defend unpopular causes. Not only is there a loss of faith in democratic capitalism. There is also a pervasive skepticism about viable alternatives.
Conrad J. LYNN

ROVERE

To the Editor:
Thank you for sending me Mr. Draper's article, which I found enlightening if not always, from my viewpoint, enlightened. He made, by the way, a minor error in quoting me. In his footnote on page 7, he had me expressing agreement with Mr. Kristol on the Smith Act, whereas I was really agreeing, as a proper reading of the antecedents would have shown, with Mr. Barth.
Richard H. ROVERE

The minor error in the footnote had, however, no bearing on the sense, since all three agree on the point involved (which, by the way, was not the Smith Act but the McCarran internment-camp provision.)—Ed.

Strange Behavior Of the French PCI

To the Editor:
Readers of LABOR ACTION may be interested in the following item, translated from *Le Libérateur*, Paris, May 30:
"Vérité [organ of the orthodox Trotskyist PCI] of May 22 publishes large extracts from the leaflet 'To the Assassins,' which *Le Libérateur* reproduced in full last week. You remember that this leaflet, protesting against the exhibition in Paris of the paintings of Siqueiros, organizer of the first attempt on Trotsky's life, was signed by several revolutionary groupings, including the PCI, the Anarchist Federation, and the Surrealist Movement was its initiator.
"It was already astonishing, to say the least, that the initiative for such a protest did not come from the PCI. It becomes scandalous for *Vérité*, organ of this party, to content itself with publishing it in a fragmentary manner, at the bottom of page two, preceded by a note which presents it as a 'protest of the Anarchist Federation and the Surrealist Movement,' without even mentioning the Trotskyist signature.
"For our strange comrades of the 'Fourth International' it is of course a question of not cutting the bridges that lead to the Kremlin (even if they pass over Trotsky's corpse). By this cowardly action, by this implicit disavowal of their signature, the PCI definitively discredits itself in the eyes of all revolutionaries."
Saul BERG

Los Angeles.
Scott BYER

Detroit Vigilantes —

(Continued from page 1)
In the Van Horn case, the umpire ruled that she had violated the company rules regarding distribution of literature within the plant, but that the discharge was too severe a penalty. She was reinstated without back pay.

The effect of this verdict should be to cool off the corporation and the would-be vigilantes in the plants. It serves to put backbone in the official position of the UAW-CIO, for umpire's rulings are considered a bible of conduct for union officials.

Another recent aftermath of the House hearings failed to get the attention it deserved, since it was somewhat embarrassing to the UAW-CIO leadership, which kept silent during the hearings.

At the recent annual dinner of the Detroit Bar Association, William T. Gossett,

Doesn't Like Tone On 4th International

To the Editor:
It is not often that the tone of an article in LABOR ACTION is so incorrect that comment and criticism becomes necessary. The tone and style of Philip Coben's article in the June 2 LABOR ACTION, on the entry of the parties of the 4th International into the Communist Party is so unastute that criticism of tone cannot be called much ado about nothing. The article takes the flippant and polemic tone that was in vogue at the time that the ISL split from the SWP. That style was not correct then, but was understandable because the polarization of persons to the two groups was so complete neither side expected to affect the other by what was said. A number of years have passed since the split and the discussions surrounding it took place. (Discussions whose tone had a bad effect on anyone who came near us). The friends of the ISL had a hard time understanding the reason for this tone then. For them to understand it now is impossible.

More important and to put it mildly, the effect that the article has had and will have upon members and friends of parties affiliated with the 4th is not a good one. For those among them who comprehend to any degree the significance of CP entry, it is a time of mourning and sadness. They see before them the death of an organization that they have given much of their lives and energies to. The ISL should try to affect these people politically, toward the ISL. But Coben's tone puts an almost insurmountable obstacle in front of the effect of what the ISL has to say that is political.

Many publications are written solely for the readers' entertainment, but LABOR ACTION isn't one of them. It has a much larger and more important job cut out for it. LABOR ACTION carries and should carry more entertaining articles. Coben authors some of the better ones that have appeared. In the article I am commenting upon his humor and sarcasm is poor because it is misapplied and untimely.

Scott BYER
Los Angeles.

"THE CASE OF COMRADE TULAYEV"

A Novel of Modern Russia

by VICTOR SERGE

\$3.00

Order from:

LABOR ACTION BOOK SERVICE
114 W. 14th St., New York 11, N. Y.

Amid Prayers and Policemen:

A Report from Barcelona on the Eucharistic Congress under Franco

By A CORRESPONDENT of LA BATALLA

BARCELONA, June—We do not know what the foreign newspapers are saying about the course of the Eucharistic Congress at Barcelona, but if they have any illusions about the sympathy which it aroused among the people they are very much in error. The hostility of the Barcelonense, and mainly of the workers, is evident, and no small number of the foreign pilgrims have had to take note of it. It is enough just to keep eyes and ears open.

As on similar occasions the weapon most often used is the joke. The congress is called such things as the "Black Olympics" and such labels are very popular, but it is not worthwhile to go through the profusion of anecdotes which circulate in abundance. Whenever possible, the people simply make an empty space around the innumerable rallies.

Some innocents may believe that the audiences, which are sometimes of substantial size, come from the Barcelona population itself. There is nothing more deceptive. Among the pilgrims, who are not as numerous as was officially hoped, the general mobilization of the church and the Falange [Franco's fascist movement] from all over Spain, and some thousands of Catholics from the capital, old amen-sayers, are enough to create the illusory notion that there was a spontaneous and deep mobilization of the Barcelonense.

The reality is otherwise. The people think that the selection of Barcelona as the seat of the congress was a deeply calculated provocation by the regime—a political provocation which tried to demonstrate the popularity of the dictatorship and the dictator in a capital which, everybody knows, is one of the vital centers of the resistance. It is an economic provocation too, for the ostentatious display of the millions of pesetas which the congress cost is in sharp contrast with the terrible scarcity and dearth of the necessities of life.

Sinister Farce

And finally, the people in Barcelona know very well the preventive measures taken by the police to assure the tranquillity of the ceremonies. Arrests have been numerous. The actions especially directed against the POUM have taken on a more serious character; they are outside the framework of mere preventive arrests.

Furthermore, the most noted anti-fascists have been called to the central police office to be warned that any acts of hostility against the régime during the celebration of the congress would bring about the most severe reprisals. Every possible means of coercion has been brought into play to assure that the marching pilgrims remain satisfied and convinced that Barcelona is an emporium behind the Caudillo. Which is a sinister farce.

It would be useful to note some specific things about

Undoubtedly the ecclesiastical authorities organized the welcome for Msgr. Tedeschini with a masterful hand and with the evident intention of making a differentiation between the church and the official representative of the regime. This aim coincided, although not for the same reasons, with the intuitive feeling of the people to show their hostility toward the dictatorship.

The People's Way

It is well known that in times of totalitarian terror the people in Spain indicate their sentiments in whatever manner they can, even through ball games and bull fights. And, as the occasion allowed, this time it was done through the pompous arrivals. Fanatic Catholics, lukewarm and indifferent, greeted the cardinal with applause, and turned their backs when the dictator "disembarked" at the Puerta de la Paz.

Today many are asking themselves, and asking us, why the church evidences this sudden desire for "keeping its distance"

from Franco. In a way it is very prudent of them, certainly, but there has been enough of it for everybody to take notice.

Let us begin by indicating our skepticism. The differences are not and cannot be basic but only a matter of shading. If it were otherwise, the church would not have permitted the congress to be organized under the Franco regime, much less in Barcelona, for, on the international arena, this amounts more or less to a certain propaganda in favor of Francoism.

Speculations

It is evident that some Catholics think the contrary. It is precisely because the bishop of Barcelona knows the sentiments of the people, they say, that he has gone out of his way to mark the differences. They insist, furthermore, on recalling the attitude of the bishop during the strikes of last year, when, sincerely or not, he was indisputably instrumental in limiting the political and economic repressions against the strikes.

And they go still further. They assert that a part of the church is conscious of the fact that Franco is finding difficulty in maintaining himself in spite of appearances, that he is still far from having consolidated himself internally and internationally. Franco will end up in collapse together with his regime; a part of the church takes account of this reality and is prudently pre-

paring for the future. In a way—to put it in our Marxist language—they are working with an historical perspective. Hence their interest in giving people the impression of being "standoffish" from the present regime.

It is possible that these Catholics, who we suppose are in good faith, are in earnest. But it would be useless to enter into exaggerated speculations about this attitude, which furthermore can go on indefinitely. The advantages gained by the church thanks to the Franco regime are so important that only with difficulty could it disentangle itself from the regime in any radical and definitive way.

On the other hand, if the internal and international pressure mounts against Franco, if the foreign Catholics themselves who are hostile to the regime (and their number is legion) continue to demonstrate their disagreement, then it is much more likely that the Spanish church, or its cleverer sections, will move further away from the government. What else can they do if they are not to lose everything?

"Social Peace"

P.S.—"Social Peace Day" has just been celebrated: a curious and angrier spectacle. To make the ceremonies look better, the plants and shops closed their doors. By official order, of course. Various workers' delegations, led by their bosses and [fascist] union heads, filed by coldly, without enthusiasm. One could see their attendance was compulsory just by looking at the way they walked.

The leaders of the corporative unions had to do some pretty sweating to get some of the delegations down there. Most of them used coercion, threats of fines and dismissal. Others, who do much talking about the atmosphere among the workers, held forth with approximately the following line of argumentation: "What can you expect? We have to go even though you are against this masquerade. Our attendance will serve as a moral argument to insist on an increase in wages."

We don't believe that anyone took such cynical arguments seriously. In the minds of the union delegates, it doubtless seemed to be piece of great political cleverness. In reality it shows how much they fear the general discontent.

(Translated from La Batalla, June 10.)

Next — A Labor Party!

by Jack Ranger

A Hard-Hitting, Meaty
Presentation of the Need
for an

Independent Labor Party

25 cents Order from:
Labor Action Book Service
114 West 14 Street
New York 11, N. Y.

Don't miss a single week of

LABOR ACTION

A sub is only \$2 a year!

Deproletarianization Through Purges — THE COMPOSITION OF THE RUSSIAN CP

By Vs. FELIX

Just before World War II, the All-Union Communist Party was thoroughly renewed; through a series of purges, a membership faithful to the "general line" of Stalin's Politbureau was selected.

Stalin's CP has lived through three great purges which were directly connected with the changes in the political course of "building socialism in one country." With the liquidation of the New Economic Policy (NEP) in 1928, well over 100,000 party members were cleaned out. In 1933, as a result of the collectivization of agriculture, about a half million party members were purged. These figures were given by L. Kaganovich at the plenum of the Central Committee in January 1933; they were also mentioned by S. Kirov in *Pravda* for January 22, 1933.

This purge reached its greatest scope in the Ukraine as a result of the famine of 1932. Thus, in 1933, out of the 600,000 members of the Communist Party of the Ukraine, there remained only one-half that number in the party. The same thing happened in the Ukrainian Komsomol (Young Communist League): in 1932 there were 1,300,000 members; in 1933 there remained 700,000; and in 1934 only 450,000 were left.

The third purge of the party took place in the years of the so-called "Thermidor," 1936-1938, in the period when the Stalinist bureaucracy definitively took over power not only in the party but also in all fields of political, social and economic life in the country. The definite figure of purged members is not known for this period. But it is known that in 1934 the membership of the party amounted to 1,872,488, whereas in 1939 it was only 1,588,852. This means that in the "Thermidor" period at least 300,000 party members were purged.¹

The purged rank-and-file members were replaced by newly selected members. From the following data we can see who these new members of the All-Union CP were.

Already in 1930, almost half of the party membership consisted of elements from non-proletarian professions: 45.3 per cent of the party members were employees [*sluzhachshchiye*], officials, army officers, students, etc.²

"Rejuvenation"

In the following years, undoubtedly, the same process of deproletarianization continued in the CP. Party members who were workers "in origin" but who, in the course of two or three decades, continuously and uninterrupted fulfilled bureaucratic functions undoubtedly lost contact with the class from which they had come, during such a long time. There are no official data on the social origins of the party members after 1930 (at least, we have not found any). But the following data still show that the process was indeed going on in the direction of deproletarianization of the CP.

The reports of the credential committees of the party congresses show, for instance, that among the delegates to the 16th Congress (July 1930—the congress of "victorious industrialization") there were 65 per cent who were workers "in origin," but only one-fifth of them were working in industry as actual workers at that time. Among the delegates to the 17th Congress (1934) already only 9.3 per cent were workers. At the 18th Congress (1939) no such breakdown was made at all.

In addition, the 18th Congress changed the party statutes by deleting the paragraphs which spoke of the proletarian origin of members of the CP. In this way the Stalinist party ceased to be a proletarian party even officially.

Side by side with the process of deproletarianization of the party, there was another process going on—"rejuvenation" of the party. In the purges the first to die were the "Old Guard," the old Bolsheviks who had participated in the revolution. Their place in the party was taken by the young "Stalin generation." This process

(1) Data and figures from *Politychnyi Slovnyk*, Politvydav, Kiev, 1940, pp. 99 and 556.
(2) Data from *Bolshaya Sovetskaya Entsiklopedia*, Vol. XI, page 533.

Translated from *Vpered*, the organ of the Ukrainian Revolutionary Democratic Party, No. 1-2, 1951.

can be seen from the following data.

In 1918 the membership of the party amounted to 270,000, the majority being young people. In 1939, out of 1,589,000 members, only 1.3 per cent had belonged to the party since 1917—about 20,000 members. It would seem that a natural mortality rate, even the greatest, could not have taken away such a number of the old party members in the course of 20 years. One might assume that they died during the civil war, but there are figures which directly contradict such an assumption. The party census for 1927 stated that at that time there were 773,220 members in the party; among these were 34 per cent (243,030) who dated their membership from 1920—that is, they had survived the civil war.

Bureaucratic Ballast

Thus it is clear that in 1939 at least 180-200,000 of the old Bolsheviks should have still been alive. Where then did they disappear to? We have already given the figure of 300,000 members purged in the "Thermidor" years: among them is precisely this Old Guard.³

Here is another brief illustration on the same subject. The party length of service (*stazh*) of the delegates to the party congresses shows the same trend. In the pre-"Thermidorean" 17th Congress, 80 per cent of the members dated from 1919 and earlier; those who dated from 1929 constituted 2.6 per cent. In the post-"Thermidorean" 18th Congress, there were 14.8 and 43 per cent in the same categories respectively. This means that the old Bolsheviks—the members dating from 1919—were reduced by 65 per cent, whereas the "new Bolsheviks," the Stalinists—members dating from 1929, after the destruction of the Trotskyist opposition—increased numerically by 40 per cent. The CP was "rejuvenated" . . .⁴

The All-Union CP, renewed qualitatively and quantitatively, with a membership in 1940 of 3,399,975 people, was placed before an historic test of vitality by Hitler's invasion of the USSR.

Just as the war began, some very interesting changes took place in the CP. The decision of the Central Committee on August 19, 1941 immediately opened the doors for new people; and entrance conditions for the new people were made easier. A candidate to the CP now needed only the recommendations of three party members who had been members for one year. The decision of December 9, 1941 cut down the length of the candidacies to three months only.⁵ Such new conditions for membership resulted in an increase in the number of party members. Many soldiers and many officers entered the party. Nobody checked the theoretical and political knowledge of these new members. In the more rearward areas of the country, the majority of new members entering the party were from the bureaucracy. Definite statistical data, of course, do not exist, but there are significant hints indicating the fact. For example, in the Cheliabinsk region (the Ural) at the end of 1941 and during the first two months of 1942, 600 workers, 289 collective farmers, and 2,035 employees entered the party (*Pravda*, April 22, 1942). Among those who completed their candidacies at that time there were 909 workers, 399 kolkhoz farmers, and 3,515 employees (*ibid.*). These figures clearly say that the bureaucracy constituted at least 70 per cent of the new party members.

The growth of party membership during the war was really tremendous. In 1942 alone, about 1,340,000 new members entered the party.⁶ At

(3) Data from the stenographic reports of the party congresses, *Politychnyi Slovnyk*, page 597, and *Bolshaya Sovetskaya Entsiklopedia*, Vol. XI, page 538.

(4) Data from reports of credential committees of the 17th and 18th Congresses.

(5) For each decision, cf. *Partynaya Zhizn*, No. 20, 1947.

(6) *Bolshevik*, No. 20, 1947, page 37.

the first organizational conference of the Cominform in Poland, in September 1947, the representative of the All-Union CP, Malenkov, gave the following figures for the membership of the CP: in 1940—3,399,975; in 1945—5,760,369; in 1947—6,300,000. About half of these people entered the party during the war.

Immediately after the war the doors of entry into the party were closed again. The main effort was directed toward the "digestion" of the new members from the war years. At the above-mentioned Cominform conference, Malenkov again gave out the slogan that "quality is more important than quantity." The majority of new members had a very low level of political education, and it would take a long time to teach them. The bureaucrats littered the party to such an extent that, in post-war propaganda, a special field had to be designated for the fight against bureaucratism. However, in spite of the increase of this "ballast" in the party, no large-scale purges were undertaken during the first five post-war years. Only in the former Nazi-occupied regions was there a local purge in 1946. It seems that this "ballast" was not purged out of the party simply because it did not represent any significant danger to the party bureaucracy; the "ballast" was not very political-minded and not at all independent in its thinking. The bureaucratized party could co-exist with it peacefully.

The Intelligentsia

No other significant changes took place in the CP during this period. The relationship between the party apparatus and the rank-and-file members was still what it was before the war. In the party publications, too often one finds criticisms of the rank and file but no criticism of the party apparatus. The rank-and-file members are always being accused of lack of discipline, of a low level in political education, weakness in activity, etc. . . .

The permanent demand for increasing the political education of the party members, apparently, is not bound up exclusively with the entrance of new members during the war. A general characteristic is the low level of education among the party members. In 1947, of the six million party members, only 400,000 had a university education, while 1,300,000 had a secondary-school education and 1,500,000 had seven-year schooling. The rest, almost half the membership, had little or no school education.⁷

We mentioned above the question of workers' membership in the CP. Not better is the case of intellectuals (*trudovaya intelligentsiya*). In 1947, the CP had only 148,000 engineers, 24,000 agronomists and other agricultural professionals, 40,000 physicians and 80,000 teachers.⁸ Unfortunately we do not have the statistical data on the total number of workers of these professions for the same year. But obviously this number should be well above the figures for 1937. And in 1937 there were, altogether in the USSR, 250,000 engineers, 176,000 agronomists, 132,000 physicians and 969,000 teachers. A comparison of these figures shows that the participation of the intelligentsia in the CP is not very great.⁹

No important changes took place in the composition of the Politbureau of the All-Union CP in this period. Some personnel changes occurred, but apparently they were not very important. In 1939 the Politbureau consisted of Stalin, Molotov, Voroshilov, Kaganovich, Mikoyan, Andreyev, Zhdanov, Kalinin and Khrushchev. The candidates to the Politbureau were Shvernik and Berya. Kalinin died in 1946, Zhdanov in 1948. In 1941 a "new star," Malenkov, became a member. In the same year Voznesensky became a candidate to the Politbureau. In 1947 Voznesensky and Berya became members; and in the same year Bulganin and Kosygin became candidates. In March 1949 Voznesensky suddenly disappeared from the scene. Thus in 1949 the Politbureau consisted of Stalin, Molotov, Malenkov, Berya, Kaganovich, Andreyev, Mikoyan, Voroshilov and Khrushchev. The candidates were Shvernik, Bulganin and Kosygin. But by 1950 the Politbureau was again enlarged to the original size of 11 members: Bulganin and Kosygin became full members, and only Shvernik remained a candidate.

The Orgbureau of the CP consisted in 1946 of Stalin, Zhdanov, Malenkov, Mekhlis, Mikhaylov, Bulganin, Popov, Patolichev, Kuznetsov, Suslov, Andrianov, Aleksandrov, Rodionov and Shtalin. The Politbureau and the Orgbureau interlock through the members who enter both institutions. In their hands they hold the whole party, and through the party they hold the whole state.

(7) *Partynaya Zhizn*, No. 20, 1947.

(8) *ibid.*

(9) Data for 1937 from speech by V. Molotov at the 18th party congress.

Stone: How Much Is Hidden? —

(Continued from page 3)

what would you do if a Russian MacArthur were approaching the Mexican side of the Rio Grande? Thus Stone.

Gem of Hypocrisy

And the Russians—what was their role? Stone says that at the beginning of the war the American ambassador in Moscow was instructed to make representations to the Russian government to call off their satellite in Korea. The Russians replied that in the first place the war had been started by the South Koreans, and in the second that the Russian government had withdrawn its troops from Korea earlier than the American government and had "thereby confirmed its traditional principle of non-interference in the internal affairs of other states. And now as well the Soviet government adheres to the principle of the impermissibility of interference by foreign powers in the internal affairs of Korea."

Stone quotes this gem of hypocrisy without comment, and in a context which praises the Russian government for its mildness and forbearance at the provocative and

"humiliating" tone of the American note, while chiding it for not making "some concrete proposal" by which to open the way for peace talks.

It is true that no one has yet been able to give concrete evidence of the role of the Russian government in launching the Korean war. It is clear from Stone's own account, however, that at this stage, when the North Koreans were winning, the Russians confined themselves to warning the United States against intervention. That they, like the American government, were not prepared to turn Korea into the beginning of World War III does not need demonstration. Stone, however, seeks to absolve them from any responsibility for the actions of their puppet government.

Wide Open to Attack

Stone's whole method in dealing with the Stalinists in the war in Korea is analogous to the method of our liberals in dealing with their own government. Like them, he sees mistakes, stupidities, and confusions in the policy of the government which he is defending. But he does not see that Stalinism is impelled by its

very nature to pursue a policy which is imperialist in character, and in the end makes war inevitable.

This aspect of the Hidden History of the Korean War will permit the apologists for the American government to attack it without grappling with its thesis on the role of MacArthur and the Truman administration. It is that, however, which, regardless of the motives of the author, demands attention, discussion, and investigation on its own merits.

I. F. Stone's book cannot be accepted as a full history of the war in Korea. Such a history can be written only by a person who is concerned with the social and political forces and motives which keeps the cold war going on both sides. War has a way of sharpening and concentrating the expression of these forces, and laying the motives bare for all those who want to see. The tragedy of the Korean people offers an opportunity for all of us to see our future as it is being shaped by the forces of Stalinist and American imperialism. Only the most conscious and vigorous intervention of the peoples, of the third camp, can prevent this tragedy from engulfing all of us.

U.S. Threats to Extend War — —

(Continued from page 1)

operations in Korea has also been accompanied by repeated "warnings" by military commanders in the field that the Stalinists are preparing an all-out offensive. It is difficult to see just what they could possibly hope to gain at the present time by doing so. The Stalinists have just won a major political battle, the battle of Kojé Island. The tenacity of the prisoners in the face of military operations against them has gone far to undermine the position of prisoner exchange taken by the UN representatives at the Panmunjom negotiations.

CONVENIENT

The warnings of an imminent Stalinist offensive, on the other

hand, are a convenient explanation for the increased military pressure which the American commanders are applying and for preparations to extend the area of the war.

An article by *Times* military expert Hanson Baldwin (June 26) made clear that the air attack was a "politico-military decision of Washington." The air force, he relates, had had previous plans for bombing the same objectives, but "by direct orders of Washington, he [General O'Donnell] was never allowed to carry out these plans. The Supung (Suiho) dam and generators came to be viewed primarily as a political, rather than a military, target."

He continues: "There were some doubts about this plan. Most important was whether the destruc-

tion of these generators would have the desired political effects. Judging from the first enemy reactions, it is quite possible the Chinese attitude may become tougher to match our increased toughness."

He adds still another political consideration, by implication. He points out that the operation "was a sufficient answer to those who contend we have lost air superiority in Korea," referring to Taft and other Republicans. Is he hinting that the "politico-military decision" was made partly because of home politics in this presidential election year?

In contrast with this analysis, the State Department told the press that the attack was "considered entirely a military decision." Anyone who grants this statement to be honest must con-

clude that those responsible are stupid, since the consequences have been far from purely military, especially with relation to the reaction of Europe.

The bombings on the Yalu river border, and the statements by Lovett that the commanding general in Korea has the right to extend such bombings to Manchuria without prior consultation with Allied governments, raised a storm of protest by the Labor Party members in the British Parliament. The important thing to note is that in answering these protests, Prime Minister Churchill has admitted that the British government was not informed of the plan to launch this attack, and that he believes that as far as Korea is concerned "we are in great difficulty there."

BEVAN ATTACKS

A London dispatch to the *New York Times* dated June 24 states that "the inferences that a good many of his [Churchill's] hearers on both sides of the House drew from his remark was that he did not like the situation much better than did the critics of the extension of the air attacks at a time when a truce was still believed here to be not impossible."

Both Bevan and Attlee demanded to know whether the stepping up of operations in Korea were the result of a new policy decision, Churchill replied that "there is no change in policy so far as the government is concerned." Bevan quoted a Pentagon spokesman as having said that "the best way of breaking the deadlock at Panmunjom is to hit the enemy with all the force at our command" and that the bombings of the power stations were "part of a get-tough policy in the military as well as the political field." When Churchill sought to defend the attack as a matter within the discretion of the military commander in the field, Bevan shouted:

"If you want to go to war, why not say so?"

We do not claim to know what are the plans of the Truman administration and its military hierarchy; but the general tendency of the American government to solve the most knotty problems of foreign policy by a display of military force, however, is nothing new. The very least that is indicated politically in this country is the mobilization of opinion against the possibility of the expansion of the war by our government.

LONDON LETTER

Bevan and the Laborite Youth

By ALLAN VAUGHAN

LONDON, June 17 — The choice of Aneurin Bevan as the main speaker at the Labor Party rally at the Filey holiday camp, this week, was of considerable significance. The ovation he received after being introduced by Harry Earnshaw, the chairman of the party National Executive, was such that any right-wingers must have found themselves in an awkward position.

Bevan's speech at the rally yesterday was preceded by a competent speech outlining the dishonesty of Tory promises, delivered by Mrs. Irene White, another member of the National Executive. The only note struck by Bevan in the course of his eloquent speech which bore upon the party struggle was his reference to the NEC's opposition to West German rearmament before elections have been held in West Germany and if possible in all Germany. It seems clear that Bevan was warning the parliamentary Labor caucus of the decision of the NEC on this matter—which decision Attlee has obviously violated. To many, it seemed at the

rally that Aneurin Bevan was the leader of the Labor Party in all but name.

Before the Labor Party rally itself was held, the Labor Party League of Youth held its second annual conference. Unlike last year, when the party's bureaucratic handling of the youth league was half-supported by the National Consultative Committee (NCC) of the league, the league conference found itself solidly behind the NCC on most of the important issues facing the organization.

The most important issues are: (1) the refusal of the party NEC to allow political issues to be discussed at the conference; (2) the refusal of the party NEC to allow League of Youth representation on the NEC, as it does in the case of the Women's Section of the party; (3) the decision to hold the league conference in the middle of the Filey rally without prior consultation with the NCC of the league; (4) the undemocratic nature of the editor's position with respect to *Socialist Advance*, the league's paper.

On all these issues the NCC accepted the resolutions which dealt with the matters outlined

above. The League of Youth conference also discussed Youth and Education, Youth and Employment, and Youth and Recreation. The next move is now with the party NEC. Will the latter grant the demands of the league or not?

I am of the opinion that the next stage of the League of Youth's development will be bound up with the much larger and more important struggle within the movement against the right-wing "Old Guard" (in the bad sense of the term). The Labor Party must be transformed from within before the league can secure its rights within the party. This implies a close linkage between the two struggles—the one between the League of Youth and the right-wing leadership of the party, the other between the Bevan group and the same right wing. This the Bevanites appreciate, for they know that the League of Youth is wholly behind them, and that the younger age brackets can help to give them the necessary dynamic to win out.

In English for the First Time!

Rosa Luxemburg's THE ACCUMULATION OF CAPITAL

Yale University Press • 475 pages • \$5

LABOR ACTION BOOK SERVICE
114 West 14 Street, New York City

WEEK by WEEK . . .

LABOR ACTION screens and analyzes the week's news, discusses the current problems of labor and socialism.

A sub is only \$2 a year!

Koje: Victory for — —

(Continued from page 1)

wanted to be repatriated from those who did not.

The action was one which the Stalinists could not afford to let pass, for it threatened their assiduously disseminated propaganda as to the popularity of the North Korean and Chinese regimes. There is also no reason to assume that the Stalinists were also not reacting to the open and veiled intimidation by the United States and other UN personnel.

DEBACLE

Their campaign of inner consolidation of the camps and external campaign directed against the camp administration culminated in the kidnaping of the camp commandant. The statement dictated by the PW leadership and released by the new commandant that there would be no more "bloodshed and violence," "forced screening," and "rearming of prisoners" was a piece of *sans froid* matched only by the cowardice and the political and perhaps more general stupidity of the generals involved. If the expression "losing face" is more than journalistic cant United States prestige can be said to have sunk to a new low at the foregoing juncture, not only in the East but in the West, and among friendly as well as enemy nations.

All that remained was to complete the debacle. The statement issued by the camp commandant was torn up. An entire regiment of paratroopers was rushed in.

Armed to the teeth and backed by tanks and flamethrowers they crashed into the compounds and began breaking them up into what are referred to as "manageable" units, killing many of the almost completely helpless prisoners in the process.

The cynical Stalinist leadership could hardly have asked for a happier denouement.

FINISHING TOUCH

To round off the whole grisly business only a touch of the absurd was needed, and it was thoughtfully provided by a major general who returned to the West Coast from Korea during the final phases of the Kojé struggle.

Interviewed by newspapermen on the over-all Korean picture he stated—almost as if it were a current banality—that he doubted if the UN forces could withstand a Chinese offensive. If the handling of the Kojé campaign is an example of what to expect he may well be right. He added, further, that he was unclear, really, as to just what the United States forces were doing in Korea at all. This is also a legitimate query, the answer to which has not yet been satisfactorily given even in the capitalists' own terms.

The general was, as the routine provides, duly and mildly reprimanded by his commanding officer.

It is, one sees, still a free country, certainly for generals.