

LABOR ACTION

Independent Socialist Weekly

JANUARY 12, 1953

FIVE CENTS

Why the Vincent Case Gets Special Treatment

By GORDON HASKELL

President Truman has authorized the creation of a special board to review the case of John Carter Vincent, career diplomat. Vincent had been suspended from his job by the State Department on December 15, following a finding by the Loyalty Review Board, highest agency in the government's screening machinery, that a "reasonable doubt" exists as to his loyalty.

On the surface this would seem to indicate a most solicitous regard by the government for the rights of one of its employees.

Vincent had already received the "benefit" of all the procedures available to a public official who has been charged with disloyalty to the government (by Senator McCarthy, among others). His case had been reviewed repeatedly. He had appeared personally to defend himself before the State Department's own "loyalty" board. Although this board had found that there was no evidence against protection of the accused, had him a review by the highest body, created presumably for the found against him.

But now, just to make doubly sure, another panel of experts, both in the law and in the problems and procedures of the Foreign Service, are to go over all the records in the case before final action will be taken.

The fact is, however, that this unusual step is not being taken primarily to ensure that Vincent receives justice. It is being taken PRIMARILY because the nature of the "evidence" adduced against him, and accepted by the Loyalty Review Board, is considered dangerous to the efficient operation

of the Foreign Service itself.

An article in the December 29 issue of LABOR ACTION pointed out that the New York Times had editorialized against the LRB's ruling precisely on the grounds that it endangers the State Department's morale. This attitude toward the case was given further emphasis in an article in the *Foreign Service Journal*, official publication of the Foreign Service Association, which charged that the LRB had handled Vincent in the same manner as the "wretched men of the Kremlin" handle prisoners at their mock trials, and that the board's ruling is causing "bewilderment and misgiving" in the ranks of the Foreign Service.

True, a comparison of the treatment given Vincent with that of the victims of Stalinist frame-up trials is an exaggeration. He has not been tortured and bulldozed into confessing complicity in a plot to murder Truman and the joint behest of Molotov and Ben-

(Turn to last page)

TAX CUT OR BALANCED BUDGET?

Ike's Bureaucracy as a School For Unreconstructed Capitalists

By L. G. SMITH

The organization of the 83rd Congress is following the pattern marked out for it. Senator Taft and his co-thinkers are in control of both Houses, with the Southern Democrats dominating the minority posts.

As the Congress was being organized, the newspapers began to speculate on the legislative program which the new administration would sponsor. One day the headlines proclaimed that the first bill to be introduced by a Republican would call for a major cut in taxes. Next day the papers quoted allegedly responsible Republican leaders to the effect that although such a bill might be introduced, there is no reason to believe that it will be passed.

The main thing, they said, was to balance the budget, and until this is done no major tax reductions can be contemplated. At the moment the best they can hope to do is to find ways and means to reduce budgetary expenditures. After that . . . we'll see about taxes.

These are the very same Republicans, you will remember, who for years have been screaming at "confiscatory" taxes as a knife in the vitals of the "free enterprise" system.

They were not talking, of course, about the taxes which confiscate the steaks from the tables of the workers, but rather of those which "confiscate" yachts and butlers from the family budgets of the junior executives of large corporations.

They have been saying that un-

less business is relieved of this burden of taxation incentive will be killed, expansion stopped, and the whole country dropped into the sack of the "creeping socialists" like an overripe persimmon.

But now that they have the power in their hands, our Republicans are beginning to modify their tune just a little.

As far as their representatives in Congress are concerned, this is not particularly unusual. Every man who wants to be elected to office is against high taxes. Every Democratic congressman, and most Republicans, are for cutting expenditures only in areas which have nothing to do with their own constituencies.

Thus we have the repeated spectacle of screams against the high cost of government (which in our era means chiefly the high cost of armaments), coupled with

far more caution in making actual cuts in the budget.

But perhaps the flock of big-business executives who are being put in complete charge of the executive and administrative sides of the government will be more consistent than "politicians" in carrying out the program of big business for America?

TO SING NEW TUNE

After all, it may be thought, they do not have to seek re-election in a few years. And further, they are all men who rose in the business world because of their ability and intelligence, otherwise why would Eisenhower have appointed them? In our two-party system a professional politician has to serve many interests. He cannot afford to be consistent, either as to his program (campaign speeches) or his actions. But a businessman does not have to be divided in his loyalties. He can devote himself solely to the "interests of the country." Of course, in his mind it is quite natural that the interest of the country appear to be identical with the interests of business, for hasn't he said and heard a million times during his life that "what helps business helps you"?

We have a right to expect, however, that even these gentlemen will soon be singing tunes which will quickly come into discord with those previously chanted by the United States Chamber of Commerce. (Turn to last page)

99 Years: Another Legal Lynching in Texas

By REBECCA REED

America has before it a new case of Jim Crow terror and frame-up; a new scandal of national (and in these days, of international) significance to rival the Groveland case, the case of the Trenton Six and the Scottsboro case of the '30s.

Above all, it has a new test of whether there are sufficient unterrorized forces of liberal protest left in the country to stop as blatant a legal lynching as any seen in many a year.

An all-white jury in Brown County, Texas, has convicted 19-year-old John Taft Roseborough of rape, solely on the basis of a confession extorted from him by force.

He has been sentenced to 99 years in prison.

The alleged victim of the crime, which occurred two months before Roseborough was arrested, told the jury that she could not identify her assailant.

Roseborough was evidently chosen more or less at random by two police officers who went to a Negro restaurant in search of a scape-

goat after two months of failure to solve the case.

He was arrested and held four days without arraignment and without a lawyer.

During this time he was beaten, threatened, and told that he could save his life by admitting his guilt or accusing someone else. He signed a confession.

In a pamphlet called *99 Years* the National Association for the

Advancement of Colored People has published excerpts from John Roseborough's testimony at the trial and from his statement to U. Simpson Tate, Southwest Regional Counsel of the NAACP Legal Defense and Educational Fund. Roseborough's account is eloquent:

"On the night of December 19, 1951, after I came out of the movies at about 11:15, I went to the Paradise Inn. . . . That is a colored restaurant. I saw Mr. Hinkle Boyd and Mr. Cecil Turner there that night. They are policemen from the City Hall. They arrested me at about five minutes after twelve o'clock that night and took me to the police station. Then they took me off to Mr. Roy Jackson's office [Chief of City Detective Bureau] and when we got there, the room was dark, and I refused to go in, and they pushed me in.

"Then they made me sit down and turned a light on over my head. There were two more officers there. They went and called

two more officers and said, 'We've got him.' They turned a light on over my face, and Mr. Hinkle Boyd pulled my arms behind me and said, 'You were peeping in the window.' I told him I was not down there. When I said that, he then bent my head back. The other officers were standing around there and he said, 'You are the boy that was peeping in that window.' Then he said, 'You are the boy that raped that woman,' and then he beat me around the face and hurt my left leg. . . .

THIRD DEGREE

"The officer said, 'You call me a lie?' and he slapped me in the face another officer picked up my left leg and kicked me three times. . . . I don't know the name of the officer that did that, but I know him when I see him. I didn't say anything when they did that, except I started crying, and one officer caught the jacket that I had on and said, 'Look here boy, if you do not tell us you raped that woman, we will kill you and I will do the killing.'

"I started to cry again and then they picked me up and pushed me out. It was Mr. Hinkle Boyd that picked me up from the chair and shoved me out the door, and at that time somebody hit me behind the head and knocked me clear away from the door.

"Then I went to the police desk, and they took me back to Roy Jackson's office and asked me if I made up my mind yet, and I didn't make up my mind and they put me in jail then. They threatened me several times at the jail. Mr. Hinkle Boyd told me if I said anything about what they had done that night he would kill me. . . ."

On the second day of his imprisonment Roseborough still had not been told of his right to legal counsel. He was given a truth serum and further threatened. On the third day there were more threats. On the fourth day he was allowed to see his grandmother who had inquired for him at the jail before and been told that he was not (Continued on page 2)

'Michigan Catholic' Warns Reuther—but on What?

By BEN HALL

In a recent issue of LABOR ACTION we pointed out that the New York chapter of the Association of Catholic Trade Unionists (ACTU) was less than overjoyed at Reuther's election to the CIO presidency. "While Reuther may be graduating into the type of leader Samuel Gompers and Sidney Hillman were, he was schooled in the socialist classroom and even if he no longer is doctrinaire himself, some of his disciples and agents are still motivated in their thinking by socialist prejudices and platforms," wrote the Labor Leader, its publication.

The same annoying problem occupies the attention of a writer for the Michigan Catholic who, it seems, was inspired to reread *The UAW and Walter Reuther* (by Irving Howe and B. J. Widick) upon his return from the CIO Atlantic City convention: He sums up what is bothering him and his readers in the question: "Is Walter Reuther basically a socialist at heart?"

And he answers, categorically enough, "Our own opinion is that Reuther has long since abandoned his former socialist faith and that the added responsibility of presiding over the affairs of the national CIO will have the sobering effect of dampening, if not completely extinguishing, his interest in a socialist labor party."

This reply tells us more about the author's peculiar line of thinking than it does about Reuther.

CLUE

The question itself is rather singular. Every literate person should know that Reuther is not a socialist; then why ask the question?

We find a clue in the peculiar use of the phrase "socialist labor party." If Reuther has long since abandoned socialism, how could anything "dampen, if not completely extinguish" his "interest in a socialist labor party"? It seems totally incomprehensible until we realize that the author is identifying the advocacy of a labor party with socialism. Hence, he who ad-

vocates a labor party expresses a continuing interest in socialism.

But that is not the end of the studied confusion packed into this answer to a simple question. Reuther is no socialist, but neither does he advocate the formation of a labor party.

It is true that he and the United Auto Workers have, on occasion, called for a "new political realignment" and even for the formation of a "new progressive party." We report this not to defend him from some "charge"—we think that his failure to propose a labor party and his unwillingness to press for his own political policy is a terrible shortcoming—but to reveal the state of mind of some of his conservative critics.

TRANSLATION

The Michigan Catholic writer is constructing an ingenious chain of innuendos: the distinctive UAW policy is linked to labor-partyism, labor-partyism is identified with socialism. Let us then translate the question which opened this discussion in accordance with contemporary political reality and it reads: "Will Reuther push for the UAW political line inside the CIO?"

And with this translation we begin to understand what the Michigan Catholic is driving at. Wherever it mentions "socialism" you must read "Reutherism."

"Reuther will not be doctrinaire," it continues. "He will not look to political action as a panacea and certainly will not attempt to identify the good name of the

CIO with the socialist ideology. If he does, it would be safe to prophesy that his term of office will be very stormy and very brief, for the membership of the CIO is almost unanimously anti-socialist." The same not-so-subtle threat is repeated: "If... he dissipates his enormous energies on a doctrinaire political approach to the problems of labor and industry he will be written off as a disappointing failure."

In their book, Howe and Widick analyzed the composition of the radical wing of the old Reuther caucus, referring to it as "a heterogeneous assortment of socialists, semi-socialists, and militant unionists." And the Michigan Catholic writes:

"We ourselves would express the earnest hope—which is undoubtedly shared by the majority of CIO members—that Reuther, for the good of the CIO as well as for his own reputation as one of the most intelligent labor leaders in the United States, will disassociate himself from this heterogeneous assortment of doctrinaire (and sometimes anti-religious) reformers. If they latch on to his coattails in his new role as president of the CIO, they can cause him a lot of serious trouble."

It is indeed a touching display of selfless charity; Reuther gains guidance and advice on how to stay out of serious trouble. The ACTU, the Michigan Catholic and their ideological co-thinkers are not quite ready to attack Reuther but they hope to exercise what influence they have to push him in a conservative direction.

Their first gingerly criticism is tested out not against him but against Reutherites. They optimistically press him to abandon Reutherism and demand that he cut off his own closest supporters as a token of good will.

For the guidance of those who would not offend these critics we list the following misdemeanors which are to be shunned, avoided, eschewed and abjured: socialist labor-partyism; secular liberalism; tendencies to be doctrinaire, or anti-religious; ADAism; and above all, socialism, which is all the others collectively and separately.

Chicago Anti-Franco Comm. Gets into Active Work

By SCOTT AARON

CHICAGO, Jan. 5—After some period of time the Chicago Committee to Defend Labor Victims of France is taking shape.

Though still an "organizing group," the committee has been in existence since last fall. It originally was formed by 14 locally prominent non-Stalinist trade-unionists and liberals, including Henry B. Anderson, Joseph Brumberg, Lewis Corey, Kermit Eby, Prof. Robert Havighurst, Francis Heister, Carl Sanzone, Prof. Bert Hoselitz, Seymour Kahan, Sidney Lens, A. A. Liveright, Frank McAlister, Prof. Vic Obenhaus, Robert W. Swanson.

There has been a resurgence of interest, however, and the committee is moving forward now by broadening its representation and activity.

The present composition of the committee reflects its increased vitality. A sizable number of liberal groups and labor unions are regularly represented and many have endorsed it or will soon do so. The most important endorsement secured to date is that of the local office of the CIO—which ensures, at least, formal support and recognition from additional Chicago-area unions.

The rest of the committee is made up of assorted individuals (workers, students, professors, etc.) of varying shades of liberal and socialist opinion.

GROUNDWORK LAID

The basic aim of the committee, which is affiliated to the national body in New York City of which Norman Thomas is chairman and Rowland Watts secretary, is to furnish any aid possible to the labor victims of fascist Spain, regardless of the possible political beliefs or affiliations of the victims. The group is clear in its opposition to all forms of totalitarianism—Stalinist as well as fascist—as was demonstrated at tonight's meeting when 2 veterans of the Stalinist Lincoln Brigade attended as "observers."

In reply to their questions it was made clear to them that although the committee was interested in all labor victims of Franco, and that any individual could join the committee, or submit information to it, the group was hostile to the principles and program of the totalitarian Stalinist

party and its myriad "front" organizations. At the end of the meeting the gentlemen left without joining the committee.

The committee represents one of the most serious attempts in recent years to establish a permanent liberal-labor-socialist alliance on a common issue in the Midwest. If it succeeds in doing so, the groundwork will be laid for similar cooperation on other, even more vital, common issues. If only for this consideration it is essential to mobilize every serious liberal and socialist in the Chicago area for support of the committee and its activities. Naturally, the Chicago branch of the Independent Socialist League and the Socialist Youth League are participating in this work along with others.

PLAN RALLY

Arrangements are now under way for a mass meeting, set for February 4, in the downtown section of Chicago. The functions of the meeting are to raise funds for the committee's work, and at the same time establish it as a permanent organization. Norman Thomas is one of the principal speakers scheduled.

Emil Mazey, a national leader of the CIO United Auto Workers, had also agreed to speak but has since notified the committee that because of union business he will be unable to do so. He promised an able substitute to represent him.

An intensive city-wide publicity campaign is planned to begin as soon as the speakers list is complete, and campus support is being organized at both Roosevelt College and the University of Chicago. The final arrangements are nearly made and will be reported in LABOR ACTION in the near future.

Labor Action PACKETS

LABOR ACTION'S business office now has available a number of packets of back issues containing material on special topics. In each case the price is less than the cost of purchasing back issues individually (10 cents per copy). Order from Labor Action, 114 West 14 Street, New York 11.

The number in parenthesis is the number of back issues for each packet listed.

Civil Liberties

- The Witchhit in America (7) \$0.50
- The 'Poll of Fear' & N. Y. Post (6) .25
- Civil Liberties Today (4) .25
- Civil Liberties & Totalitarians (3) .25

Stalinism

- Stalinism I (3) \$0.25
- Stalinism II (5) .25
- Czechoslovakia (4) .30
- Poland (4) .30
- Yugoslavia, Titoism (4) .25
- Titoism—1950 series by Draper (20) 1.50

Colonial Struggles

- Africa (5) \$0.25
- Middle East (7) .50
- India (2) .15
- Asia (3) .20

Israel & Zionism

- The Triple Crisis of Zionism (2) \$0.15
- Israel & Zionism, incl. above (6) .35
- Israel's Problems (1951) (4) .25

Foreign Policy

- Korea \$0.25
- Spain & Franco .25
- Point Four (4) .25

99 Years: Texas Case

(Continued from page 1)

there. A bondsman also talked to him on the fourth day, telling him that if he would confess to house-peeping he could get out on bond.

DECEIVED

On the fifth day Roseborough signed the confession without ever having legal counsel. His own words explain the circumstances:

"Mr. Affleck [the bondsman] came back the next day, I guess about 2:30. He told me that I had lied to him and said, 'Now, junior, I told your mother and father I would help you and you are lying to me,' and I told him that I was not lying. He said, 'You want to get out of jail, don't you? Or do you want in jail or out?' And I said, 'I want out of jail.' And he said, 'O.K., I will help you,' and he left and went to the courthouse and then he came back and had me taken out of my cell again and he said, 'Junior, what else do they have on you?' and I told him I didn't know but they had said rape.

"He said, 'That's what they have on you, they have a rape charge against you,' and I told him that I didn't do that. Then he told me if I would come along and put the finger on the others

he could get me out and I told him I didn't know who the others were, that I wasn't gonna do any lying. . . .

"He said, 'Junior, if you don't know who did it, then you did it.' Then he said, 'If that's all you are going to say, I will have to tell your mother and father there is nothing to be done for you.'

"... I didn't know his name up to that time; I thought he was a friend. I thought he worked for the city, because he had a gun in his pocket; and I thought he would get me out.

"I saw him again that same evening. Mr. Hinkle Boyd came and took me over to the courthouse, to the District Attorney's office. When I got in the room Mr. Joe Foy was sitting behind a desk. Mr. Joe Foy was typewriting at the time and when Mr. Joe Foy finished typewriting he handed me the paper to sign and said he had warned me and I signed the paper he handed me and then my dad came in. . . .

"My dad looked at the paper and asked me if I did that, and I told him no. Then he said, 'Why did you sign the paper? I was going to tell him that if I said I didn't they would kill me, but they were taking me out and the district attorney told me, he said, 'You tell your

daddy you did it' and they took me back to jail that night.

"On the way back to the jail my daddy didn't say anything. I signed that statement because they told me that if I didn't sign it they would kill me; and this man Mr. Affleck told me that if I would say that I did it, he would get me out of jail. He said he couldn't promise me anything if I didn't sign it because they had said they would kill me if I didn't, and I was in fear of my life."

At 8:30 the same evening the first complaint against John Taft Roseborough was filed in the Justice of the Peace Court and sworn to by Hinkle Boyd, assistant chief of police.

RAILROADED

Ten character witnesses testified at Roseborough's trial. All agreed that he was a quiet, even timid boy. He had been hard of hearing from early childhood and perhaps for this reason was not particularly good at school,

though he made passing marks. He held the same job for over three years, attended church, and did not drink or "carouse around."

The proprietor of the theater which John Roseborough said he had attended on the night of his arrest, the night when he was supposedly "house-peeping," remembered talking to him on that occasion about his church dues and other church affairs.

The victim of the crime told the jury that it had been too dark to see her assailant. She knew only that he was a Negro.

No evidence was produced to connect Roseborough with the crime except his confession, which he testified in court had been extracted from him by force. Yet he was convicted and sentenced to 99 years, another victim of legal lynching in the South. Attorneys for the NAACP are filing an appeal in the Supreme Court of Texas and will, if necessary, carry the case to the United States Supreme Court.

But it is not the Supreme Court which need have the last word in such a case. The NAACP needs, and is asking for, contributions toward the legal defense; but it also needs behind it the indignant outcry of outraged people to tell the Texas lynchers that they can't get away with it again.

Don't miss a single week of LABOR ACTION A sub is only \$2 a year!

LONDON LETTER

The Coronation and the Monarchy

By DAVID ALEXANDER

LONDON, Jan. 1 — Many people here are already looking on 1953 as "Coronation Year." Schoolboys think of a day's holiday from school; shops regard it as a year for great profits; hotel-keepers are beginning to spruce up for their share of the racket. But to regard the coronation and the monarchy as a commercial racket is a misunderstanding and an oversimplification.

One cannot deny indeed that there was widespread affection and warmth toward the royal family, particularly among the petty bourgeoisie. Every single daily newspaper (except the insignificant *Daily Worker*) is full of gossip and talk about their every action and movement. Two of the worst offenders in this respect are the *Labor Daily Mirror* and *Daily Herald*.

Having all the press on your side does help to get a good write-up. Even if the rest of the royal family are comparative nonentities, the Duke of Edinburgh is a personality who has added considerable prestige to the monarchy. Also responsible for their widespread popularity is the fact that all the attitudes toward them are taught to children from their very earliest days in school.

Socialists often complain of the expense of keeping a royal family, but it has been pointed out that it amounts to a farthing (a quarter of a cent) per head of the population per year. This is probably considerably less than the cost of the ballyhoo for Eisenhower or for Stalin.

If then Socialists think it necessary to abolish the monarchy, on what grounds do they base their case?

ROYAL FUNCTION

I think the main objection to this comparatively innocuous institution lies in its symbolic importance and its relations. The king and queen have always to be at the top of a social scale, which depends upon their existence. They are the example and personification of all that capitalist reactionaries find socially and politically desirable.

They perform the normal caucocratic functions—of varying degrees of necessity—such as are accorded to the office of president in the U.S.; they spend a major part of their publicized time setting examples. Thus, they go to church regularly, they attend horse-racing, they go partridge-shooting, etc.

At a time when a country is struggling to keep on its feet, examples of such idleness cannot help to make it economically solvent. Even if many of these sports were not of the same nature, the fact that they are often indulged in during "working" hours is not to the credit of their participants.

In the democratic society which we are trying to build, hereditary titles and property would, of course, have no place. Nevertheless, today, even among the Labor Party, there are many titles which were awarded by the Labor government. Their holders have an interest in perpetuating the monarchy.

KEIR HARDIE'S VIEW

The most common reason given by Labor for its support of retention of the monarchy is that it "binds the commonwealth together." Were this an association of equal and free peoples, that might

have a point, though one might then ask why an association of free and equal peoples needs a monarch to "bind them together." However, as the existence of the commonwealth depends on the unfair exploitation of many of its members by others, we view it with suspicion. Furthermore, the monarchy represents the part which is doing the exploiting.

In contradistinction with the present-day Labor Party, the great Keir Hardie had different views on the Coronation.

"The Coronation," he said in the *PIONEER* in 1910, "with its pomp and show, its make-believe, its glorification of militarism, and its mockery of the solemnities of religion, is an affront to all that is true and self-respecting in our national life... If we cannot set our heel upon the thing, we can at least show our contempt for it and preserve our own self-respect by refusing to participate in any of the foolery connected with this Coronation."

While the Coronation festivities may bring extra profits to some and circus-doings to many, the economic situation in Britain does not look brighter.

Certainly food prices are higher than ever before, and the position becomes increasingly difficult for the pensioners and salaried people. On the other hand, the Conservative government's policy of deflation, by causing money to be scarce, has produced a sharp fall in prices in many household utili-

ties. Similarly clothes are cheaper than they have been for a long time.

The Conservatives have been working on the theory that if hundreds of millions a year are spent by people on cigarettes at 43 cents for 20, on expensive beer, and by 15 million football-pool gamblers every week, they will be able to spare that little extra for food, bread, eggs, milk, etc., which have been subsidized at the rate of \$1,000,000,000 per year—a subsidy which has now been cut to \$700,000,000.

DEFLATION

This theory might work very well if it had not been for two painful facts. One of these is that the small wage and salary earners, especially the old-age pensioners living on \$4.50 per week (basic rate), have never spent much on entertainments, football pools, cigarettes and other luxuries. In effect, the better-paid workers had previously been subsidizing their food.

The other unfortunate thing is that the cost of basic articles of food determines, by the previous mechanism, the wages of all the lower-paid workers. They have therefore increasingly demanded increased wages upon each successive price rise.

A policy of deflation is intended to lower the standard of living of certain sections of the community, bring down public demand for goods, and by that means to balance imports and exports. During the last year this policy has been coupled with restrictions on im-

ports of many foreign goods. Also acting in favor of Britain is that the price of machinery and fabricated goods has begun to rise in some small degree, after the calamitous increase in prices of raw materials last year.

Thus toward the end of the year, at the expense of a slight fall in living standards, the Conservatives will have probably managed to achieve a temporary balance of payments. This likelihood is, however, jeopardized in the future by the cutting of imports from Britain, which some countries are doing to counter the effect of Britain's having cut their imports.

The Labor movement is at present taking its second wind—working on a new policy. Unless the Conservatives make a major new blunder, their achievement of balance in the economy will be very much in their favor in the eyes of the electorate.

The whole left wing of the Labor Party is now trying to exert its maximum influence to see that it presents an intelligent, imaginative new and coherent policy for the next election; this may not be before 1956. It must see that it is not merely a body of bureaucrats claiming to run the bureaucracy more efficiently than the present governors.

The year 1953 will be a year of challenge to the Labor Party. Above all, it must not degenerate into the Outs versus the Ins but continue the struggle for a basic transformation in the economy and in society.

Berkeley Board OKs School for Rosenberg Rally

By JACK WALKER

BERKELEY, Calif., Dec. 27—The city's Board of Education has approved a request by the local "Committee to Secure Justice for the Rosenbergs" to use a school auditorium for their meeting.

This has been an issue here since the City Council denied the committee the right to set up a petition table at Sather Gate, as reported in *LABOR ACTION* for Dec. 29. The Board of Education's decision was by a 3-2 vote, the sole issue being "freedom of speech and freedom of petition," as one board member said.

The decision was immediately attacked by the state commander of the American Legion, who happens to live in Berkeley: "I urge every loyal American in Berkeley to do everything in his power to aid in canceling the shameful rally," he said, in words which could be interpreted as a call to violence.

This outcome, of course, would not exactly be deplored by the local Stalinists, who wouldn't mind seeing efforts to break up the scheduled meeting physically, since they could fry to channel the resultant justified indignation into their own ditches.

Meanwhile, however, on the single issue of the right of a group like the Rosenberg committee simply to hold a meeting, the Board of Education's vote represents a rebuke to the anti-democratic action of the City Council.

This Is 'Psychological Warfare'

By BERNARD CRAMER.

The U. S. army is waging "psychological warfare" in Korea besides using its regulation weapons, and we are not the only ones who are curious about just what the army thinks psychological warfare is. The *U. S. News & World Report* set itself to find out about the newfangled thing from its chief, Brigadier General Robert A. McClure. The current (January 2) issue carries an interview with the general.

Something called PW was also tried out in the Second World War, against the German army, but it is of course the Stalinist successes with propaganda which has focused attention on it even more. It's coming up in the world.

General McClure is frank enough to define it as "propaganda," adding "propaganda in its proper sense," to differentiate it from the term "propaganda" which is used as a dirty word by witchhunters at home. What is the army's "propaganda" in Korea? The word raises ideas of a political appeal to the soldiers of the other side, especially in view of claims by American statesmen that they have something with which to make an appeal: the concepts of democracy as against Stalinist totalitarianism and the magnetism of the American Way of Life. This might be the suggested connotation also because the Stalinist appeal to be counteracted is indubitably on a political and social plane.

PSYCHOLOGY IN BRASS

The first thing we find out from General McClure is that his propagandists in Korea make little or no ideological appeal at all.

At one point he describes his "psychological warfare" as "the combination of force, the threat of force, hardship, persuasion, etc."

He gets more specific later. The main technique, he explains, consists of loud-speaker teams at the front, plus mass airdrops of leaflets, and the interviewer asks: "What sort of message would that

[loud-speaker] team broadcast?"

"They might point out the impossible tactical situation in which the enemy unit found itself. They could point out that the particular position they were in was subject to direct fire and give them this opportunity to surrender and come out, adding that they knew that these particular enemy troops did not subscribe to the Communist doctrine and that they had two minutes to come out. Following that, if they don't come out, they drop a box barrage on them and say: 'Now that's just a sample. Here's another opportunity.' Occasionally they'll say, 'We know that your Communist leaders would shoot you in the back if you started toward us. Here's a smokescreen under which you can come out.'"

This is "persuasion," you see, as the military mind knows it. The "psychology" in American psychological warfare is as subtle as a block-buster. Not that we are poohpoohing it as a military accessory—that's their business. What we are noting is that this psychological-warfare chief does not pay much attention to the speechmaking of the Western statesmen about countering the Stalinists' political appeal.

SLIGHT OMISSION

In Korea, says McClure, the method works with "individuals primarily," not with larger units.

What do you offer the civilians? asked the interviewer. "You can offer them nothing tangible, except the ultimate hope of liberation," answers the psychological warrior. Meanwhile the demagogic appeal of the Stalinists (to the South Koreans, of course, not the GIs) is the promise of land to the peasants and an end to the dictatorship of the Rhee-landlord clique.

There is a big to-do in the interview about the leaflet drops: The big fact is that 2½ million leaflets a day are spread over North Korea. We learn the physical size of the leaflet sheet, the kind of bomb used for the drop,

and other very vital details, but there is one thing that the interviewer forgets to ask in this connection: what the leaflets say. It seems to be the least important part of the discussion, and the oversight is not repaired.

But the PW chief also directs radio broadcasts at North Korea and this time he is asked their "general content":

"Straight news, commentary, some of the Voice of America programs, some programs that are especially designed for the Chinese and the Koreans," he replies.

"What kind of themes are used?"—"Nostalgia themes, anti-Communist themes."

MIRROR FOR U. S.

This is the first mention of something that reminds us of Acheson's speeches about attacking Stalinism "politically." What "anti-Communist themes" are, as handled by the army, one may guess, but in any case even this is enough to cause difficulties. For it is apparent from a later question-and-answer that even plain "anti-Communist themes" are delicate ground. McClure is explaining that there are always possibilities of disagreement among the allies in the UN army:

"... Are the United Nations forces in Korea fighting Communism, or are they fighting Communist aggression? In the latter case, all the United Nations would say Yes, they are fighting Communist aggression. But if you were to say that they are fighting Communism per se, then some of them wouldn't recognize that."

It is safer to limit the propaganda to "Come out or we'll blow you to bits."

On a small scale, the Korean "psychological warfare" division reproduces the fundamental characteristics of U. S. and Western capitalist foreign policy in the world: reliance on military force, without any political program to meet the challenge of Stalinism to the peoples of the world.

In the context of the interview,

the following exchange becomes positively grotesque:

McClure: "... My contemporaries have the idea that the best way of avoiding a war is to be reasonably well prepared so that you can't be taken by surprise and at the same time have a counter-threat that would deter anyone from starting one."

Q: "How much weight do you attach to the idea of a physical force so large as to act as a threat? How does the other side react to the threat? Aren't they more apt to react by saying, 'We'd better prepare too?'"

A: "Probably, and you might have an endless arms race."

Q: "And yet you can't avoid preparing?"

A: "I don't see how you can."

Q: "And particularly now with two ideologies making up a two-way distrust—"

A: "I think you can effect a certain military containment which will give you time enough to keep away at this ideological offensive...."

This in an interview on "psychological warfare" in which the discussion of the ideology in the "ideological offensive" is as absent as it is from McClure's loud-speaker threats.

It is not the brigadier general who is up the tree of course, but the whole political and social machine behind him, which has no democratic program for the world as an answer to Stalinist totalitarianism.

THE FIGHT FOR SOCIALISM

by

MAX SHACHTMAN

A Basic Primer!

\$1.00

Cloth \$2.00

MARXISM for TODAY

The Times Propounds a Puzzle

By PHILIP COHEN

It is not often that the N. Y. Times prints a news story with no news whatsoever in it, not even in the reporter's opinion. Unless it was the headline which was supposed to be the news: "West German Resurgence Offers Puzzle to Marxists."

The unfamiliar spectacle of a polemic against Marxism in the guise of a foreign dispatch from Bonn came on December 30. The correspondent was M. S. Handler, late of the Times bureau in Belgrade, where he learned all about Marxism straight from the Yugoslavs' press handouts.

The puzzler for Marxists propounded by Handler lies in the post-war reconstruction of West German economy. It has achieved a post-war production peak—a point which would have been more impressive if Handler had been able to claim that it had been able to rise to the levels it once was able to achieve. It has "approached" full employment. It has maintained "relative" price stability. It has become "a force to be reckoned with in world markets." What did surpass pre-war levels, he says, was "retail sales." Recovery, in other words.

Now it is not the purpose of this column to discuss the German economy, but to comment on his "puzzle" on the assumption that the euphoric picture of that economy which he presents is just as valid as he seems to believe on arrival in the country.

The German achievements, he claims, must confound "Marxists of all schools, whether Stalinist, Yugoslav or Second Internationalist" because they "seem to contradict the view held by all Marxists that capitalism has passed its apogee of historic and social usefulness and, torn by its internal contradictions, will pass into the limbo of history in the foreseeable future."

Since his argument consists solely of pointing to Germany, we must conclude that the deep understanding of Marxism, which his stay with the Titoist theoreticians conferred upon him, taught him that Marxism excluded any possibility of post-war economy recovery, even of the "relative" sort he points to. It would, of course, be possible to end this column right here by pointing out the simple fact that this is not so.

As a matter of fact, Handler's big puzzle quite unconsciously assumes that it isn't so, since there is a country closer to home which offers the picture of a booming capitalist economy in the midst of the decline of world capitalism as a whole. That is the United States. In fact, why Handler has to jump on Germany as the example is a bigger puzzle than the one he propounds.

And we assume that Handler is quite ignorant of the fact that the Marxists spoke equally decisively about the "decline of world capitalism" in the post-World War I period when that system looked a good deal better than it does now. If he ever finds it out, he might want to go back to Belgrade and ask his tutors what the decline of world capitalism meant then.

Riddle-in-One-Country

But the arrogant ignorance of this expert on Marxism need not be enlightened only by a lecture on the rise and decline of capitalism as a world system. While his argument is no puzzle for Marxists, it is a puzzle for him. For the reasons he gives for German economic recovery apply 200 per cent to Britain, and he leaves himself with no ground at all to account for the wobbling economies of either that country or of France and Italy.

In fact, he would find out that the resurgence of Germany as "a force to be reckoned with in world markets" is precisely one of the reasons why British economy is endangered; he would find out that this resurgence is one of the things that dismay the French capitalists about their own prospects. That, in other words, in a system which is dying on a world scale, not even all of the advanced countries can go forward triumphantly (as they once did when capitalism was younger and healthy) but that one or another can make even temporary recoveries only at the expense of the other national units.

But most of all, the emptiness of his challenge becomes evident when he ventures a word on the prospects before even his model capitalists.

"... the rate of expansion will continue," he actually writes, "unless there is an unexpected upheaval or a world-wide recession." (My emphasis.)

He does not even suspect that he has hit unawares on the point: the inability of a stronger sector of capitalism to survive in the midst of a world system which is sliding down hill. He writes as if a "world-wide recession" would be an act of God; and (stranger still) he writes as if an "upheaval" would be "unexpected," when not a few capitalist economists are far more puzzled than any Marxists about how to hold it off.

Most fundamentally, then, he thinks capitalism can be healthy in one country; and this he learnt well, no doubt, from "Marxists" who are trying to build "socialism"-in-one-country. The Yugoslavs can't complain too loudly about their pupil.

Not in the Headlines

Unions Made Men Out of Them

The Harvard Business Review carries a study of the secondary (unpaid) union leaders who head up locals, trying to assess their common characteristics. Written by George Strauss and Leonard R. Sayles, it comes up with the discovery that such union leadership is not composed of the sore-heads and gripers in the plants.

"Even those who are not actually in supervisory position have attained a high level of job competency," it informs the businessmen. "A very large percentage of union officers are on the top of their promotional ladders. In one large local, for example, 13 of the 17 active leaders are receiving the highest wages in their departments."

They're smarter too. Union activity is an "intellectual outlet" for them; say the authors. "It gives the leaders a chance to use their imaginations and intelligence in a manner never required by their plant jobs..."

Or as one of them is quoted as saying, "The union made a man out of me."

Dividends Up

Corporations in the United States paid out more than \$6.5 billion in dividends to stockholders during the first 11 months of the past year, the Department of Commerce reports. This is an increase of 3 per cent over the same period of 1951.

Wants to Soak The Bribers

Federal Trade Commissioner S. J. Spingarn has been making speeches about the other side of the government-corruption scandal and not succeeding in getting much publicity. He has the unorthodox view that the matter of ethics which the newspapers editorialize about is a "two-way street."

"There is something basically wrong," he declared, "with a conception of law and ethics that holds that Albert B. Fall, the former secretary of the interior, was guilty of accepting a bribe from Edward L. Doheny, but that Mr. Doheny was innocent of offering a bribe to Albert B. Fall."

He was referring to the Teapot Dome oil scandal during the Harding administration, but the words apply closer to home.

The meeting of board commissioners which he addressed agreed that Congress should consider punishing the bribers too, namely, the capitalists who corrupt the government officials.

Child Labor

The National Child Labor Committee, in its December report, charged that the flouting of child-labor laws was widespread. Two million American boys and girls are illegally employed in industry and agriculture, and little is being done about it.

Violations were found in nearly 10 per cent of the 33,000 inspections made by the federal Wage-Hour Division of the Labor Department in the year. Of 7310 miners illegally employed, 2592 were under 14 and 821 were under the age of 8.

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!

YOU and SCIENCE

That Green Monster, Chlorophyll

By CARL DARTON

The perversion of science in the interests of nationalism and war gnaws at the heart of all of us. Just as oppressive but not always as spectacular is the prostitution of industrial science in the interests of the profit motive. Science serves every day to strengthen and lubricate the industrial machine which provides the basic profits of the American social system.

Great as these profits are, it seems that business, or a certain segment of business, periodically becomes impatient and seeks means of making the dollars roll in at an even faster pace. One of the greatest opportunities for this exists in the drug and cosmetic fields, which provide fertile ground for playing upon the foibles and pseudo-scientific tendencies of the "literate" public.

These industries, as well as many others, are ever on the alert to latch on to a "gimmick" which, with the wild imagination of the ad-men, can give a scientific twist to their product and sales pitch. It is no effort at all for the bright boys of the agencies to blow up a little half-scientific fact into a great fallacy which swells sales, with little regard for the true value of the product involved.

Several years ago it was the anti-histamine rage. This year it is the chlorophyll monster which has appeared, and the admen have never had it so good. In fact, it was actually an advertising man from a New York agency who took chlorophyll out of the laboratory and exploited it into the million-dollar industry and racket it is today.

At first the idea of adding chlorophyll derivatives to any and all products as an anti-odor factor was laughed at by the pharmaceutical manufacturers to whom it was presented. But the advertising value of such a gimmick, regardless of the fact that its efficacy was little or none, became so great that the manufacturers quickly got on the bandwagon.

Deodorizing The Chlorophyll Racket

Today there is apparently no end to the use of the green stuff, no matter how ridiculous the case. From the use of chlorophyll products in salves and ointments, from which some small benefits may occur, it has spread to mouthwashes and tablets, toothpaste, candy, bubble-bath, cigarettes, clothing, toilet paper, bedding, cleaning materials, and almost anything which can be colored green. It has even been purveyed as a means of canine birth control.

Industrial scientists and chemists are usually not too skittish about application of their knowledge to profits. In fact, it is usually their ambition to share in the feast. However, the rankness of the hoodwinking of the public on chlorophyll has become too much even for them.

Speaking before the American Pharmaceutical Association last summer, Dr. J. C. Munch, medical director of Strong, Cobb & Co., Cleveland, a leading chlorophyll producer, stated that many products containing chlorophyll were worthless, even though they normally might have some beneficial results, because the quantity used was very low. Dr. Munch pleaded to take chlorophyll out of the domain of the admen, and put it back in the hands of the scientists. Perhaps this request for restraint was prompted by the fear that claims for chlorophyll have become so ridiculous that the green bubble may break overnight. Or maybe he was just interested in increasing the amount used.

More recently there has been presented evidence that chlorophyll derivatives are not only worthless but also can be downright harmful. Speaking before the New York section of the American Chemical Society on December 5, Dr. A. H. Corwin of John Hopkins University, Baltimore, advised that if effective amounts of chlorophyll derivatives reached the perspiration centers of the body by means of the bloodstream, human beings could become extremely light-sensitive and accidents could result.

That these have not occurred is testimony to the fact that effective amounts of ingested chlorophyll are not getting into the bloodstream to act as deodorizing agents. Even more dangerous, according to Dr. Corwin, is the possibility of impurities in chlorophyll compounds, which introduce excessive copper into the liver, with resulting damage to that organ.

Scientific Lying

We have it on good advice that following the above talk Dr. Corwin was besieged with threats and intimidation from widespread sources to retract his statements lest they have an adverse effect on the sale of chlorophyll products. This is further evidence that American industry is interested more in profits than in protecting the health of the consumer. Rather than fully investigate the harmful effects of new drugs and devices it prefers to market them quickly at large profit.

If they are finally restrained in the public interest they can always turn to a new gimmick until it in turn becomes sour. Government attempts to regulate through the Food and Drug Administration and the Federal Trade Commission always run late by a considerable amount of time, and millions of dollars in profit.

Such exploitation of new fads has become an established part of 20th-century business dealings. It is a sad commentary on the superficiality of the scientific knowledge of the general public that they fall for such foolishness when it is served up with a thin scientific veneer. But little more can be expected from an educational system, controlled largely by the American businessman, which is not interested in basic scientific understanding getting through to the people. Sugar-coated science as paraded by the drug ads is much more profitable.

The chlorophyll myth is further evidence, if more is needed, that American culture under capitalism is daily degenerating to ever lower levels. We have become so accustomed to commercialized lying that only the most hard-headed of us can resist buying the latest trinket or potion which "nine out of ten scientists" declare has proved to be better than all other brands. Business has given the scientist social status but stripped him of his dignity.

FOR A SOCIALIST EDUCATION

Get it EVERY week!

A subscription to LABOR ACTION is only \$2.00 for a year



LABOR ACTION

Independent Socialist Weekly

Vol. 17, No. 2

January 12, 1953

Published weekly by the Labor Action Publishing Company, 114 West 14 Street, New York City 11, N. Y. Send all communications to general editorial and business offices of LABOR ACTION at that address. Telephone: WATKINS 4-4222. Subscription rate: \$2.00 a year; \$1.00 for six months. (\$2.25 and \$1.15 for Canada and Foreign.) Re-entered as second-class matter May 24, 1940, at the Post Office at New York, N. Y., under the act of March 3, 1879.

Editor: HAL DRAPER

Assistant Editors: MARY BELL, BEN HALL, GORDON HASKELL
Business Manager: L. G. SMITH

Opinions and policies expressed in the course of signed articles by contributors do not necessarily represent the views of Labor Action, which are given in editorial statements.

WORLD POLITICS

From the STALINIST JUNGLE

Uruguay's Socialists Protest Road to Dictatorship

LABOR ACTION has already (issue of Nov. 24) noted the situation in Uruguay, which is widely regarded by liberal Americans as the "most democratic country in Latin America." Below are excerpts from a recent statement of the national committee of the Socialist Party of Uruguay, denouncing the anti-democratic trend in the land. In addition, the organ of the International Confederation of Free Trade Unions has pointed the finger in an article entitled "A Democracy in Danger."

The Republic of Uruguay is being through difficult times on all levels of its activity. . .

When in 1951 the big traditional parties drew up the Reform of the Constitution, proposing—among other things—to make the one-man Executive into a collegiate executive, our party stated its position with complete clarity.

Although we were in favour of the collegiate solution, we put up a definite opposition to the Reform, because we saw in it an attempt by the two big parties to divide the country between themselves, thus guaranteeing—by constitutional measures—a series of privileges which gave them a predominant position in the sphere of government for an indefinite period.

But we said something else as well. We stated that this political pact was the result of an obvious process at work within the great traditional forces

Up to that time—although it had a popular basis—Batllismo had been acting as the typical representative of the industrial bourgeoisie, while "herrerismo" had turned into the standard-bearer of the cattle-breeding interests. However, after a period of clashing interests, there came the point where men from the National Party went into industry and men from the ranks of Batllismo made their fortunes as breeders.

This stage of mutual interdependence and close links in various economic activities brought about a process of political merger of such magnitude that at the present time, apart from the rot of traditionalism, there is little difference to be discovered between the two parties.

Thus all the demagogic manifestations of *obrerismo* and the progressive reforms by the exponents of traditionalism have been transformed into a mere farce. By their means they attempt to conceal a growing and increasing tendency toward reaction, which is apparent in both parties as a result of the relentless development of the economic laws which guide the capitalist world.

It is the interests of the great landowners and the industrialists combined which dictates the political orientation of the two parties.

And so we come to a third aspect of the same problem—the necessity which those social classes feel of using all the powers of the state—in line with a totally reactionary policy—in order to crush the workers' movement and destroy social legislation.

The statements made by the Socialist Party in its political campaign in 1951 have unfortunately come true.

Whenever the government began to function, it showed the same tendencies as have been most dramatically displayed in the recent strike. From all the methods of force used—with the support of sectors of the bourgeoisie—and from the legislation which is now announced, such as modification of the Law on Wage Boards and Trade Union Organisation, it is becoming evident that the ruling class has the intention of unloading on to the shoulders of the workers all the weight of the economic crisis which has just begun. . .

economic crisis which has just begun. . .

The ruling cliques of our great traditional parties—in spite of all their outward demonstrations—are not convincingly democratic. Democracy for them is merely a legal formula which they accept, and by which they take care not to hurt the economic interests of the social group which they obey. Hence the complete validity of what the great English theorist, Harold Laski, said: The bourgeoisie is democratic in periods of expansion and becomes anti-democratic in periods of contraction and crisis.

An example of what we are saying is given by the recent internal struggle. With absolute unanimity, the government, the press and the radio—that is to say, all sections of the bourgeoisie, capitalist and landowning—gave themselves over to the task of crushing the working-class movement and destroying the trade union organizations.

Taking as its cue a simple clash—the transport strike—the government set about to destroy the trade union organizations.

The extraordinary measures adopted—prison and confinement for the workers' leaders, the shutting down of trade union branches, the ban on the right to assembly, the limitation of the right to freedom of thought and of the press for the workers while the forces of reaction enjoyed every privilege in order to attack the strikers—all these show that the governing class is ready to use any measures (even setting aside the legal formulae which it claims to defend) in order to deny the just claims of the workers.

There have been attempts to connect our trade union movement with certain foreign forces—particularly Peronism. The government has used this as an easy catchword to penetrate the popular sectors of the nation.

But the falseness of the accusation is its own destruction.

Firstly, it shows that the government has perfectly assimilated the Peronist technique of the lie and repression.

Secondly, a government which is held together by *herrerismo*, a party which during the war was a declared admirer of Nazism and Fascism and which, at the present time, has declared its public solidarity with Peron and Franco, can scarcely set itself up as the standard-bearer in the fight against Peronism. . .

The Kremlin's Secret Press Bulletin

The most unique publication in Russia is the *Press Bulletin of the Central Committee of the Communist Party*. It is described in an article in the *Challenge* (Nov.-Dec.), the organ of the Association of Political Prisoners of Soviet Labor Camps, by S. G-ov, a refugee from behind the Iron Curtain, who writes that he has seen it many times.

The *Press Bulletin* is "a collection of articles by foreign journalists and political leaders about the Soviet Union, the Communist Party, and its leaders. Only articles that are hostile or critical of the USSR are chosen for it. They are translated word for word, without any comments or notes apart from a brief note on the author and the political position of the newspaper or magazine where they appeared. . . After the editor, the first person to read the bulletin in Moscow is Joseph Stalin."

There are detailed regulations on who is allowed to read the bulletin, which is—strange to say—"uncensored" for the simple reason that the censor is not one of the privileged! The permittees are: Central Committee and Party Auditing Commission members and candidates; members of the party committees of the individual republics and regions; ministers and closest assistants; top party officials of the army; heads of the political sections of certain big economic units; staff and students of the top-level party schools directly under the Central Committee.

Further detailed regulations prescribe the method of burning the copy of the bulletin after it is read, plus the form of affidavits of witnesses to prove that this has been done.

Stalinist Line on Science-Fiction

No author so far has written a science-fiction story dealing with the way science-fiction will be written in the future. A tip, however, might be gained from the Polish Stalinists, whose *Nowa Kultura* (Warsaw) for September 28, carried an article on how to write Stalinist science-fiction.

The poor author, Stanislaw Lem, is hard put since neither Stalin nor any other quotable authority has yet considered the matter; however, he finds a lead: Stalin once had a conversation with H. G. Wells, which has been widely published. To be sure, it had nothing to do with science-fiction. The Stalin-Wells dialogue must throw light on what was wrong with Wells; this would serve to explain what was wrong with his science-fiction; and thus, in turn, one would get a clue to the correct principles on the subject. One must admit that the method is as ingenious as many a scheme in *Astounding Stories* for building a space-warp galactic cruiser.

The Stalinist science-fiction author, says Lem, must first imagine the "material base" of his future society, and derive all the rest from this. For example, "He may not—it would offend common sense—populate the sun's surface with salamander-like creatures which feed on atomic fire," decrees Lem.

Nor may he make "any attempt at visualizing the future world along the lines of conflict," for much more obvious reasons.

Nor much reliance can be put on this Lem, however, since he himself is due to be liquidated very soon. This is to be extrapolated from his remark that, though many things will change in the future, "love, friendship, joy, suffering, yearning, hope, sadness, gaiety, and regret will not change even in the distant future. Of this we can be sure." He forgets to give any reasons why suffering, sadness and regret will continue to exist under the happy life which the Stalinists promise for the whole galaxy before the universe expands many more light-years.

Child-Heroes of Patricide

At the Prague trial of Slansky, one of the accused was Ludwig Frejka. The following letter signed by his young son, Thomas Frejka, was addressed to the court:

"I demand that the most severe penalty be given my father: death. Only now do I understand that this creature, who is unworthy to be called human, was my worst enemy. I am an obedient Communist, and I know that the hate I feel for my father will give me new strength in the struggle for the Communist future of our nation. I beg you to send this letter to my father and to give me a chance to tell him with my own voice everything I think of him."

It does not matter, of course, whether one believes that the child wrote this epistle of his own free will. The more general point is that this is the way in which the Stalinist regime builds up juvenile "heroes" and the kind of heroes they create.

Thus, an authentic child-hero of Stalin's Russia is Pavlik Morozov. His portrait hangs in children's clubs and schools. A street in Moscow and another in Sverdlovsk are named after him. And this is his imperishable glory:

Twenty years ago, in a village near Sverdlovsk, the father of 12-year-old Pavlik was president of the village soviet. One night, Pavlik surprised his father in the act of selling a false certificate to a kulak, and denounced him to the local CP functionary. The father was given 10 years in jail. Encouraged by this success, the young Pavlik went on to denounce other villagers who were hiding grain. His inroads on the population of the village became so great that, one day, his grandfather cut his throat. The grandfather was executed, of course, along with other "instigators," but Pavlik became a martyr of the state.

The Party Line on Love

The Stalinization of sex, while not yet as firmly established in Iron Curtain culture as the Lysenko creed, is still in progress. Thus the Budapest *Szabad Ifjusag* (Oct. 26) soberly published a "letter from a reader" which declared: the reason for so many divorces in "socialist" Hungary is "the survival of the concept of love at first sight, a remnant of capitalist society and bourgeois best-seller literature which has no place in socialist society. Courting couples should take as long getting to know one another as the Communist Party takes to prove a candidate fit for membership—two years."

READING from LEFT to RIGHT

WHAT SOUTH KOREANS THINK, by Walter Sullivan.—*Foreign Policy Bulletin*, January 1.

Here, in the publication of the Foreign Policy Association, we find another report on the reasons why even Stalinist rule does not seem so bad an alternative to the South Korean people as it does to those who are fighting the war over their bodies.

Sullivan begins, of course, with Syngman Rhee's dictatorial terror regime. He writes: "in breaking the National Assembly by direct police action Rhee destroyed the only organized opposition facing him in South Korea. His control emerged unchallenged over the police and over those quasi-official organizations through which he exercises his influence."

The "quasi-official organizations" are, in the first place, Rhee's terror squads, not much different from the stormtroops which Hitler used to smash his way to power.

"Nevertheless," he says, "as on similar previous occasions, the United States continued to accept Rhee as a better alternative than the loss of South Korea to the Communists." And also, we might add, as a "better alternative" to encouraging peasant resistance to Rhee from below, for such a challenge to "law and order" is also identified in the minds of capitalist standard-bearers with "Communism."

"In the end," Sullivan continues, "the South Korean leader had his way, but there was an ominous loss of faith in the government.

"The opposition is not left wing," he makes clear, "but rather an alliance of businessmen and others who accuse the government of permitting corruption, maladministration and inflation to strangle free enterprise."

It is the "sagging morale" of the Korean people which "presents the most serious long-range problem." J. Donald Kingsley, head of the United Nations Korean Reconstruction Agency (UNKRA) has said that there is a "mounting spiral of despair" in the countryside. "There is grave danger," he reported to the UN General Assembly, "unless there is prompt and effective assistance in the restoration of the Korean economy and in the development of a more satisfactory life behind the lines, that the United Nations victory may be jeopardized." Regardless of the military outcome, he warned, "United Nations objectives in Korea might be lost."

Sullivan adds: "The roots of the despair lie not in disgust with the tactics of Rhee and his supporters in the capital, of which the peasants are hardly aware. The roots are economic. Since the Korean war began the amount of money in circulation has increased 8.5 times. Between May 1951 and August 1952 the price of 20 litres of rice at Pusan, the provisional capital, rose from 17,500 won to 150,000 won. The fact that prices have gone up even faster than the rate in increase of money is believed by UN experts to reflect a loss of public confidence in the economy."

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.

Discussion in the Ukrainian Forest

A Vignette of the Anti-Stalin Underground

By E. P.

It was a mild spring in 1945, the same spring that saw the world ending the Second World War and almost all peoples again entering upon their peacetime life.

But the war in the Ukraine was not ended. For the Ukrainian People's Army (UPA), this spring meant in fact the beginning of a new and much more difficult war.

The German invaders had disappeared, and it became possible for Moscow to concentrate its attention on our movement. Special troops of the MGB [new name of the GPU] were sent against us for the first time. And so the most acute questions in the Ukraine and especially among the revolutionaries became: "What shall we do now?" and "How shall we struggle under the new conditions?"

This spring a small group of insurgents occupied the Dolobychiv Forest in the region of Kholm. Among them were: Yahoda-Chernyk, very famous in the northwest part of the Ukraine as commander of a tactical force of the UPA; his assistant commander Duda, with his group of "Destroyers"; also some members of the underground political movement, including D., the representative from the city of Kholm; H. R., radio operator and polytechnic student; D-sh, a tall, stout merry-maker from Volhynia; Slota, editor of the local mimeographed Information Bulletin; and others. Almost all of them worked in the local underground cells.

But I was mostly interested in another man, Lotzman, a professor in Kiev University, whom I met there for the first time. He had joined the underground only quite recently and still had no important job in the movement; he was attached only to the local propaganda staff. But during my short stay in the Kholm region I heard so much about him that he aroused my curiosity.

I was told that he read our publications, even some of the central organs, but that he was obviously dissatisfied with them. "There has been great progress among you," he used to say, "but it is still too narrow. You must take on greater scope. You can't talk to USSR workers in this way."

"What is 'narrow'? What kind of greater scope do you mean?" he was often asked by the soldiers.

He gave no direct answer, limiting himself to a sentence or two. But whenever he seemed to be in good spirits, he became more talkative, and often he himself took the initiative in talking about plans for revolution in the USSR. He broadened the concept of a new classless society to apply it to the whole world and actually talked about a "world revolution."

Soldiers listened to him; not always understanding what he was saying, but he continued to argue for his ideas and stubbornly tried to convince the others.

"Professor, why don't you write an article for our central press?" he was often urged. "Well, I'll write it, but later sometime," was his usual answer. "I haven't thought it through yet as a whole. I'll write it when I finish it in my head."

Looking Ahead to the War

And thus he was often sitting somewhere under a tree, reading books and making notes. Sometimes he sat in this way throughout the whole day and soldiers would not dare even to call him to meals.

Lotzman often got angry when he saw a soldier who was better clothed than an ordinary peasant or who wore some Red Army insignia or medals (perhaps because he was a deserter from the army). In such cases Lotzman would approach and begin to upbraid him: "Why do you wear these scraps? Are they necessary to fight Stalinism? A revolutionary must not be clothed better than the ordinary worker for whom he is fighting."

And he would begin a sociological lecture: "It makes a bad impression on the population, and on the insurgents too." Then he would get into a bad mood and tell everybody he met that our movement had anarchistic tendencies and

The author of this memoir of the Ukrainian underground arrayed against the Kremlin is a commander of a small detachment of the Ukrainian People's Army (UPA) who came out from behind the Iron Curtain in 1948. The memoir was published in the current Vpered, the organ of the Ukrainian Revolutionary Democratic Party in emigration in Germany.

It is from a period of the UPA's history which is now past, namely, the period of 1945, when the UPA's fight against the Germans came to an end and it was faced with the task of reconstructing its forces for the struggle against Stalin's police and army.

At the present time the UPA still exists and operates in the Ukraine within the USSR, but the Ukrainian authorities in exile were asked by the UPA command, about a year ago, to refrain from giving out abroad any kind of information about the UPA's present activities because such information very often becomes exaggerated and arouses disbelief, on the one hand, and, on the other, it leads to carelessness which helps the Russian police to piece together certain facts and data which it otherwise would not get. So the editors of Vpered inform us.

In the present memoir, the author gives us a vignette of the kind of political discussions which circulated among the ordinary soldiers of the UPA on the eve of their penetration into contact with the normal conditions of life under the Stalinist regime. The diversity of opinion reflects the true face of a wide popular movement which at that time was still a mass guerrilla army of ordinary workers and peasants.

In presenting this memoir to the readers of LABOR ACTION, we do not feel there is great need to accompany it by any extensive political commentary, such as would be indicated if it were considered a theoretical document. In the diversity of the speculations among the soldiers, including those of the protagonist Lotzman, readers are invited to get the picture of the groping of ideas in the movement toward finding a programmatic base for the struggle against Stalinism.—Ed.

that our revolution might degenerate because of this.

These are only two examples but they sufficiently characterize Professor Lotzman.

He was very strict about his appearance. Though the weather was getting hot, he would sit on a stump somewhere apart from all the others, clad in wadded soldiers' trousers and ordinary peasant jacket. On his head he wore a fur cap which also served as a pillow. His feet were encased in high boots made of coarse leather. Add to this a big tarpaulin sack full of books, and a pistol which was to be seen protruding from his trousers pocket, and you have a complete picture of Professor Lotzman.

One evening the insurgents were sitting by the fire, cooking some soup in a pail. Another group were sitting around Commander Yahoda. As usual, all of them were talking about our perspectives for the future, especially about the possibility of war between the USSR and the Western allies. For many were of the opinion that the success of our movement depended very much upon the defeat of Russia in such a war.

Slota was trying to prove that such a war was inevitable in the near future and that the conflict had already begun. From this assumption he deduced perspectives for our struggle which seemed to him very bright.

D. approached the possibility of war more cautiously. He made the point that beginning a war was not the same thing for the USSR and for the Western powers, since the USSR is constantly armed, and when Stalin orders it, the army, the state apparatus, the press and the ra-

dio all think and do what Stalin says. It is true, he said, that Stalin is preparing for another war, for everywhere we see the propagandists who talk about the "finish of capitalism." But in the West, at least five years are necessary before they can ready the state apparatus and "public opinion" for a war against their ally.

Since the war was not very close, D. proposed that our command reorganize the underground and limit its membership with the aim of a long and continuing struggle.

H. R. tried to solve the problem in still another way. He argued that the Stalinists do not want a new war now and that it might break out only in 10 or 15 years. Meanwhile Stalin will foment disturbances abroad and pursue an aggressive policy but retreat whenever the threat of a new war looms up close. In order to begin a new war the USSR must develop its economic capacity at least to the levels of Western production, and for this it will need a long time.

From this H. R. concluded that only small groups of professional revolutionaries should remain in the underground, while all the youth must "legalize" themselves and go into the schools and the Soviet economy; from there they must keep in touch with the underground and prepare the ground for the future revolution.

These three views precipitated extensive discussion among the participants and soon they were shouting so loudly that Commander Yahoda had to remind them that they were not in a club-room but in a forest on territory occupied by the enemy.

The Clay Feet of Stalinism

Then Professor Lotzman came into our group. "It would be a good thing if we could get him into the discussion," Yahoda hinted to me. "It looks as if he's in a good mood today."

But Lotzman needed no urging. He began to talk himself:

"Why are you racking your brains about when the war will begin? Do you think it will solve all our problems? Have you forgotten that one war has just ended and that it has in fact solved nothing? And what will happen if Stalin wins the new war too?!"

These questions took all his listeners unawares, for none of them had really thought of the possibility of a victory by Stalin over the whole world. So everybody cocked his ears to hear what Lotzman would say further.

"I think that even if the Stalinists conquer the whole world there will still be a way out for us, probably even the best way out. Stalin will be able to hold power only as long as new contradictions within the USSR have not yet been born.

"Let's take a closer look at today's Stalinism. Today it has lost its whole arsenal of ideas with which it can push forward the existing reality. Today the Stalinists are trying to utilize their last opportunities; the cards they are playing are the imperialist and chauvinist spirit of the bureaucracy, the messianism of the Russian nation, and the support of the demoralized and reactionary elements in the party, through which they try to hold together the empire. Undoubtedly they have had some success in this, but it is temporary, I believe.

"If you assume that Stalinism spreads over all of Europe, this would mean that there will be a vast majority of non-Russians under its domination. Not for long will a French Communist, or a Chinese revolutionary, or indeed an ordinary European worker, stand for its economic exploitation, slavery and totalitarianism, its propaganda about the superiority of the Russian nation and its culture, etc. This means that with its expansion and broadening Stalinism will become weaker and weaker.

"Once it has entered on the road of totalitarianism and colonial oppression of its peoples, it can't get off this road, because this will mean its immediate death. Therefore Stalinism must choose the road of slow death until it is destroyed by its own inner contradictions; by the contradictions between the workers and the bureaucracy, between the imperialist center and the oppressed peoples."

(Continued on page 71)

SELF-PORTRAIT OF A 'CLEVER IMBECILE'

ARROW IN THE BLUE, An Autobiography, by Arthur Koestler.—Macmillan Co., N. Y., 1952, 333 pages, \$5.

By HAL DRAPER

While Arthur Koestler beats his breast often enough in his newly published autobiography, there are two of his life's misfortunes which he does not mention. The first of these, and the less important, is that too many people have taken him to be a Political Thinker.

This is very bad for Koestler because it leads him right into his besetting pattern (he tells us all about this in his book) of constantly disappointing his friends' expectations. I remember, for example, the first lecture in America given by Koestler in 1948 when he first arrived on these shores. It was at Carnegie Hall in New York and the audience was filled with liberal and labor characters, heavily leavened by ex-radicals, and all of them prepared to hear their own most profound political thoughts expertly articulated; when he began their hands were almost literally poised to applaud him to the rafters.

"The speech was a fiasco," Koestler reminisces in the present book, and he is not exaggerating, but, with the deep insight into motivation for which he is noted among his admirers, he has an explanation. It appears in his chapter entitled "And So to Sex." It seems that when he was 13 he fell in love with a little girl named Vera. When his teacher asked him why he found her attractive, he recalls, "This I was able to answer without hesitation, and I truthfully said, 'Her vaccination marks.'"

Vaccination marks fascinate him, he explains further, and by devilish chance it was none other than Vera whom he met on Broadway just before going to Carnegie Hall to make his debut. Don't misunderstand: all they did was chat on the street corner, but still—

"The speech was a fiasco, mainly because of Vera's vaccination marks, though a breakdown of the microphone also helped."

Now, as a matter of fact, the preliminary trouble with the microphone, and the jocular quip with which Koestler met this emergency and which really served to warm the audience up to him, did not hurt at all; but obviously the disappointed audience could not have known about Vera. The vulgar interpretation of his flop would have been, merely, that he had nothing to say, and this in truth was what the audience was painfully conscious of.

This theory apparently does not occur to Koestler, or at least crossed his mind only to be immediately rejected, in favor of the more profound hypothesis. Which brings us to the second of his life's misfortunes:

He sometimes allows himself to fall into the philistine error of believing that he is a Political Thinker indeed. The trouble is that in such moments of moral weakness he even ceases to be entertaining.

PERAMBULATING LOBSTERS

At Carnegie Hall that night he warned his audience honestly enough. He was not a politician, he told them, but a writer. He did not explain, however, why he chose to talk about nothing but politics, and not at all about writing; or even about writing about politics, which is a pity since his autobiography expresses his fierce distaste for playing a false role while it simultaneously laments his uncontrollable inclination to do so.

As with his lecture, so with *Arrow in the Blue*—the sympathetic reader may not find that which may have moved him to open the book, but he will not fail to be interested in the course of being disappointed. As a political novelist, if not a Political Thinker, Koestler is at his most interesting when he lets political ideas swirl in and out on their own, reflecting them, sensitizing the reader to them, but never when he is ratiocinating about them. The latter is the cruelest of all temptations for him. It

fascinates him even more than vaccination marks and has just as disruptive an effect upon his ability to do that which he can do.

So Koestler continually falls between two stools, in his autobiography as in his novels. In *Arrow in the Blue*, for example, the sections in which he discusses serious political ideas are merely vapid; but the chapter on Paris bawdy houses may impress one as his most sustained intellectual effort. The musical-comedy atmosphere of the Vienna university dueling *burschenschaft* to which he belonged is presented with loving nostalgia and indeed as the beginning of his political consciousness, but the high point of hilarity and humor in the book (and very funny it is too) comes when he describes the period when he was literally starving to death in Israel.

Yet it is really hard to tell just when he is taking himself seriously, all the harder because it is obviously just as hard for himself as for his reader. He lets us know about his tendencies in personal relations toward a kind of exhibitionism; he is even exhibitionist about his exhibitionism; he works hard at the job of making himself look ridiculous (an effort which appeals to him because it is not the ratted road of autobiography), he reminds us of "the answer Gérard de Nerval gave his friends when they asked him why he was walking on the boulevard trailing a lobster at the end of a blue ribbon: *Parce qu'il est tellement gentil!*" and there is many a lobster that gets trailed through *Arrow in the Blue*. So many lobsters, in fact, that the N. Y. Times book reviewer said in effect: Tut-tut, Koestler makes himself look so bad, so often, that he really is too conscientiously an honest man.

FROM LIBERALISM TO STALINISM

The brutal self-analysis which he indulges in falls mainly in one connection: when he is presenting the apology for his political career. Otherwise he is very obliging in providing the materials for amateur psychoanalysts. His childhood is made up of "guilt, fear and loneliness," and anything one may want to prove about his ego, id, unconscious or any given variety of complex is given plenty of scope. For the essayist who wants to begin with a suitable symbol, he provides (though not perhaps with charity aforethought) his first words at the age of three: "*Mademoiselle, pantalons mouillés.*" But of the course of his political life he is infinitely more sparing, quite throwing away the very best opportunity to make himself look ridiculous.

He came to political consciousness of a sort as a Zionist—a Revisionist Zionist, admirer of the Jabotinsky who was the spiritual father of the most reactionary, even semi-fascist, wing of the Zionists. In this he is unrepentant, as his *Thieves in the Night* showed. There would be much to comment on here; but the climax of this first installment of his autobiography is his joining the Communist Party of Germany, and to this we must turn attention.

He began, while a journalist for the great liberal publishing house of Ullstein, as a liberal with vague radical sympathies for the Social-Democrats. Koestler, the political writer, does not devote a word to the ideology of this German liberalism which was rotten to the core. Rather, he does an excellent job of describing the cowardly and treacherous manner in which this liberalism capitulated and adapted itself to the rising tide of Hitlerism. It is devastating. Every word of it must remind the reader of the similar process of capitulation in Russia before the advance of Stalinism, but strangely enough the parallel does not occur to Koestler.

Inside this liberal, "internationalist," and enlightened publishing house, owned moreover by Jews, as Hitler loomed closer in the months before his seizure of power, "The editorials became stuffy, patriotic and provincial. It was not necessary to instruct editors and foreign correspondents to change their course . . . we sacrificed, on the spur of the moment, our whole social philosophy. . . . Though the Ullsteins were Jews, they tried to Aryanize the firm by degrees. . . . In some cases the colleagues of a man knew that he was due for the axe while the

victim himself was still strutting among them ignorant of his fate . . ." etc.

Since, in Russia, this sort of thing can happen only as a reflection of the devilish Marxist or Leninist philosophy (as admirers of Koestler know), it would have been difficult to explain how the best of Western liberals could get like Rubashovs. Could it be, in fact, that this was the experience on which he drew for *Darkness at Noon*?

His contempt for the liberals, then, is documented in this way. Contempt for the wishy-washy reformist Social-Democrats is expressed equally. The basis for it cannot be ideological, since Koestler gives us no reason to believe that his political ideas were any different. Why then the attraction to the CP? They were "firm and uncompromising." They knew what they wanted. They were bold.

Thus Koestler—without beating his breast about it, without pointing it out consciously as he does in the case of smaller foibles—presents himself, willy-nilly, as the type of liberal intellectual who became Stalinized for the same reasons that others went to the Nazis. He was drawn to the CP for the same reason he was drawn to the Zionist Revisionists.

This is the type! How he could have reveled in self-revelation about it, as he does in other connections! But this would have been too close to home.

His self-defense is a serious one. He claims, in sum, that no one could have known better in those days, that the choice was solely between Stalin and Hitler; and he had to take his choice. There was "no prima-facie case" for rejecting Stalinism; he still writes, in this book of his today: "only the conservatives and reactionaries did that." True, Bertrand Russell and H. G. Wells had rejected "the Soviet regime" from the beginning, but their reasons "were less honorable than our error," he says.

And he never even mentions that this CP which he joined, like the rest of the Comintern, had not long before gone through a violent public struggle—in the eyes of the whole world, including Ullstein journalists—which was fought precisely over the multiplying evidence of the deep-going degeneration of the Russian regime and its Stalinized parties.

IT TOOK FIVE MINUTES

What is most noteworthy is not that he was unaware of this then. What may be startling is that he writes now as if he were perfectly justified then.

This CP that he joined was following the suicidal policy of treating the socialists as fascists, of refusing united fronts against Hitler with them, of a splitting dual-unionism, but Koestler understood nothing. For further documentation we have to turn to his autobiographical sketch in the book *The God That Failed*. He there describes the moment he signed up with "Edgar."

"We talked about politics. I had qualms about the party line—why, with Hitler *ante portas* [before the gates], could we not come to an understanding with the Socialists? Why did we persist in calling them 'Social-Fascists' . . . ?" Edgar explained, with great patience. . . . He argued brilliantly and after five minutes I was convinced that only a complete fool could favor collaboration between the two branches of the workers' movement against the Nazis."

After five minutes! Truly Edgar did not have to be very patient. In five minutes, Stalinist policies which were alienating wide sections of the German working class were satisfactorily cleared up for this Political Thinker, who thereafter and thereby was enabled to become an authority on why workers go Stalinist, for had he not gone through it all himself?

And so we get his chapter on "The Psychology of Conversion," the latter term being a pseudonym for Arthur Koestler, and above all we get a dissection of the errors of Marxism, about which Koestler knows all, since to him Marxism is the Stalinism which he understood so brilliantly when he was an agit-prop in the CP. . . .

(Turn to last page)

Discussion in the Ukrainian Forest: A Vignette — —

(Continued from page 6)

During a pause, D. asked: "And what do you think about this: What ideas will then be the motor force of anti-Stalinist revolution? For it seems that Stalin will be able to kill every kind of consciousness, every free thought, and will educate everybody in his own spirit."

"By no means!" exclaimed Lotzman. "The ideas of a society are formed by the development of the society. What would characterize such a Stalinist society? The same things which characterize it now: nothing can change.

"On the one hand, the oppressed peoples; and on the other, the whole arsenal of theories about the superiority of the Russian nation. This will only sharpen the national question.

"Furthermore: on the one hand, theoretically socialized property exists; on the other, the property belongs in practice to the state bureaucracy. The revolution will go forward under the slogan of giving this property to the whole of society in reality. It is quite unbelievable that any slogans or sentiments will appear to restore this property to private individuals.

"And finally: on the one hand, there is the

propaganda for democracy and freedom; and on the other, there is the naked dictatorship of the bureaucracy. This will bring to birth the revolutionary slogan of the establishment of a true people's democracy.

"These are the three main ideas of the anti-Stalinist revolution: namely, the liberation of the nationalities; the expropriation of the property from the bureaucracy and its transformation into genuinely socialized property; and democracy. If we want our movement to become an organic part of this future revolution, we must combine and develop these three ideas into one doctrine and propagate it in the USSR."

"But," someone interrupted him, "that is a very distant revolution. Until it comes Stalin will terrorize the whole population and nobody will be able to oppose him."

"No, you are mistaken, comrade," Lotzman smiled. "The fear is exaggerated. Don't be so impressed by the figures about genocide. Stalin now occupies half of Europe. Maybe soon he will try to take China. In the newly occupied countries Stalinism will not remain strong for a long time—only until it has destroyed the main con-

traditions of the old regime.

"Don't forget that it is not an October Revolution which is taking place in Europe and Asia. It is a mere occupation by a foreign army. Stalinism will be strong only until new people come to power in the economy, in social and political life. Soon, very soon, these people will become a soulless bureaucracy which stands above the rest of society, and between the two there appears an abyss which Stalin can no longer bridge.

"This is not even a question of a decade; but during this time we must stand and endure, for during this time we will still be lonely in our struggle. But the future belongs to us and to similar movements in other countries under Stalinism."

But Lotzman never actually got to finish his talk exactly this way. A warning came from a peasant that Russian police were near the forest. Some months later when I again visited this region, I no longer saw Professor Lotzman. It was perhaps his professorial absentmindedness that cost him his life. I was told that he disappeared during a battle with attacking MGB troops in the autumn of 1945.

School for Capitalists — —

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!

For information about The ISL, write to Independent Socialist League 114 West 14 Street New York 11, N. Y.

The Handy Way To Subscribe!

LABOR ACTION

Independent Socialist Weekly 114 West 14 Street New York 11, N. Y.

Please enter my subscription: NEW RENEWAL 6 months at \$1.00 1 year at \$2.00

NAME (please print)

ADDRESS

CITY

ZONE APT.

STATE

Payment enclosed. Bill me.

(Continued from page 1) merce and the National Association of Manufacturers.

The difficulty is that as long as they were merely businessmen, they saw the whole national picture only from one angle. That angle as determined specifically by the position of their own business relative to the economy as a whole and more generally by the problems of all the businessmen with whom they associated.

Viewed from that angle, the most important single fact in American life was the question of profits from a narrow point of view. Every policy which affected profits adversely for their own firm or for business as a whole was bad, and every policy which made greater profits possible was good. From this simple point of view a whole philosophy of politics could easily be developed.

But now they are in charge of the government. Although their prejudices have already been established, they must take responsibility for policies of national and international scope.

NOT SO SIMPLE NOW

In a flash it becomes evident that the simple conception of business profitability cannot answer the problems of the nation as a whole—and not even of the capitalist class as a whole, which is leading the nation. Even the welfare of such a giant concern as General Motors becomes a factor of relatively minor weight when considered from the point of view of the welfare of the whole capitalist economy.

In the circumstances of a young, lusty and flourishing capitalist world, the government official had very wide range within which he could operate without seriously affecting the basic health or tendency of the economy. In some countries the government organized and subsidized major sectors of the economy; in others it let them develop without much regulation; and in still others the government operated to no small degree as an agency which helped the capitalists openly fleece the rest of the nation of vast hunks of the national real estate and mineral wealth.

But we live in a different world today. The economy still has vast potentials of industrial development, but the social conditions in which these potentials can be realized are narrowly circumscribed.

Even though the profit motive is still the basic life-force which keeps American capitalism going, the life-blood now must be pumped THROUGH THE GOVERNMENT to keep it circulating. And it is quite evident that this heart of the capitalist could not continue to perform its function adequately without the constant stimulus of the armament economy.

All the businessmen, we can assume, arrive behind their Washington desks with the idea that, once they have unraveled the "mess" left them by the Democrats, they will proceed to carry out their program: balance the budget, cut taxes, give maximum incentive to businessmen. That will keep the economy going and expanding. Government controls

and red tape of all kinds have been hampering the natural expansion of the economy. They know this, because they have experienced it. They know that their particular firms could have done much better if it had not been for taxes, price controls, materials allocation, and the like.

METAMORPHOSIS

But from behind their Washington desks, the country somehow will take on a different look.

As they accept the armament program as a necessity, they will find that a thousand consequences flow from this acceptance. And if at some point armament production begins to level off and "weak spots" develop in the economy, they will find the businessmen themselves coming on their knees to Washington begging for all kinds of "intervention" designed to keep their own particular businesses afloat.

This metamorphosis of staunch "free-enterprisers" into responsible government-bureaucrats is nothing new, to be sure. During the last war it was a constant complaint of businessmen that their colleagues who had taken over government responsibilities had unaccountably turned into some variety of Fair-Dealers.

What they meant by this was simply that these men were forced to consider the interests of the economy as a whole, and to supervise its direction from the point of view of its general interests. Of course, in their minds the "interests of the economy as a whole" really meant the "interests

of the capitalist class as a whole." But the difficulty is that in a war economy, and even in an economy dominated by a vast armament production, the toes of this or that particular capitalist have to be stepped on.

From this point of view, the Eisenhower administration, with its new big-business-dominated bureaucracy, will also function as a school for unreconstructed "free enterprisers" in the meaning of government responsibility from the point of view of the total needs of capitalism, even where these may come into conflict with the immediate interests of some section of the ruling class.

IT'S A HARD WORLD

Of course, the businessman-turned-government-bureaucrat is not alone when it comes to having his point of view changed by his new function. This tends to apply even more strongly to the labor official who assumes responsibility for running the government. As the economy is a capitalist economy, the businessman finds it easier to adapt his views to its general needs than does the labor leader—or at least he should.

For example, it will be much more difficult for Martin Durkin, the new secretary of labor, to defend the interests of the labor movement as a whole than it will be for Charles E. Wilson, the secretary of defense, to defend the interests of all the capitalists.

It appears that Durkin has had experience in not-defending the interests of labor in a government post before. Wayne Morse, who sat on the War Labor Board with Durkin, reports that the latter "never failed to back up board decisions against the unions." (Pasadena Independent, Dec. 18.)

It would be wrong to conclude that, therefore, once given government responsibility, the solid phalanx of big-businessmen in the Eisenhower administration will behave exactly the same way as did the men who ran things under Truman. Even though the latter were hardly a group of starry-eyed idealists or "theorists" (one would have to go way back in the Roosevelt administrations to find anyone of importance who might fall in this category) they came from much wider fields of American life, and represented a political party which was more plebeian in the nature of its mass support, and hence more subject to the pressures of various groups in our society.

The point is that the big-business administration will be able to serve the narrower interests of the capitalists as individuals only within strict limits. Those limits are imposed by the necessary size of the budget in an armament economy; by the struggle against Stalinism on a world scale; by the shaky underpinnings of world capitalism; and not least of all by the strength of the organized labor movement in this country.

November 5, 1952 was a day of celebration in the clubs where the members of the U. S. Chamber of Commerce and the NAM gathered. As each Eisenhower appointment became known (except for Durkin) the cocktail shakers were kept busy serving up the raw material for the toasts. But the time is rapidly approaching when the cries of joy from that quarter will become more muted, and may eventually turn into grumbles.

It's a hard world we live in, after all—even for the fat boys, even in a moment of triumph for them.

LABOR ACTION BOOK SERVICE

114 West 14 Street, N. Y. C.

specializes in books and pamphlets on the Labor and Socialist movement, Marxism, etc., and can supply books of all publishers.

Send for our free book list.

Why the Special Treatment — —

(Continued from page 1)

Gurion. But what we are concerned with at the moment is not the exaggeration of the comparison, but rather the fact that the main protests on this case are based not on the violation of the rights and liberties of the accused but rather on the damage which the board's findings may do to the morale of the service.

This is not a practice which is confined to the New York Times and the Foreign Service Association. It has become quite the mode among liberals and even "professional" defenders of civil liberties to view the attacks on the rights and liberties of citizens from the point of view of expediency rather than principle; to fight them on the ground that they are damaging to this or that institution rather than to the fabric of the freedom of the nation itself.

One example which comes immediately to mind is the eventual distortion of the fight against the loyalty oaths at the University of California into a fight to defend the prerogatives of the Academic Senate, in the course of which the principle of academic freedom was given a bad battering. Many other examples could be cited.

Of course, the good of the service, not of the victim, was the primary consideration in the mind of Secretary of State Dean Acheson when he requested permission of the president to set up the special board in the Vincent case. In his memorandum to Truman, Acheson wrote:

"This involves an issue far

greater in importance than the disposition of a loyalty case involving one man. Important as it is to do full justice to the individual concerned, it is essential that we should not by inadvertence take any step which might lower the high traditions of our own Foreign Service to the level established by governments which will permit their diplomats to report to them only what they want to hear."

This statement had particular reference to the section of the LRB's report on Vincent which accepted as evidence against him the fact that he had criticized the government of Chiang Kai-shek and praised aspects of the Chinese Stalinists' governments when he was in China.

FLIMSY BASIS

But Acheson criticized the board's report on several other grounds. He pointed out that the board had written that they neither accepted nor rejected testimony given by Louis Budenz against Vincent, and that they have the same attitude toward the adverse findings of the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate with regard to him and to the Institute of Pacific Relations.

"The panel [of the LRB], however, proceeds to state," writes Acheson, "that although it has not accepted or rejected these factors, it has taken them into account. I am unable to interpret what this means. If the panel did take these factors into account, this means that it must have relied upon them in making its final determination.

"Yet I am unable to understand how these factors could have played a part in the final determination of the panel if these factors were neither accepted nor rejected by the board."

After taking up every other aspect of the LRB's report on Vincent, and showing that each of them is equally inconclusive on the basis of the evidence behind it, Acheson points out that the finding of the panel of the LRB in this case had been arrived at by a majority of one, "two of the members believing that no evidence had been produced which led them to have a doubt as to Mr. Vincent's loyalty."

The importance of all this is simply that it reveals the flimsy basis on which the whole "loyalty" witchhunt is being conducted. After all the evidence had been accumulated, two out of five members of the panel had not even been made to feel that there was a reasonable doubt as to Vincent's loyalty.

SPECIAL CASE

The rest found that a doubt had been aroused in their mind not by any particular piece of evidence but by the fact that they disagreed with Vincent's judgment on the relative merits and strengths of the Stalinist and Chiang Kai-shek governments in China during and right after World War II; that Budenz (whom they could not make up their minds really to believe) said he had been told that Vincent was a Stalinist; and that Vincent had associated with some Stalinists. It appears that even on this last point the evidence in the files was so vague that after reading them Acheson could not tell whether "this association arose in the performance of his duties or otherwise."

The appointment of a new, special board to go over the evidence in the Vincent case once again in no way modifies the viciousness of the whole "loyalty" procedure developed by the Truman administration. It is just Vincent's luck that his particular case involves the integrity of the whole department in which he serves.

Even if the new board should find in his favor, that will not change the procedure in the case of others who are accused. Most of them are far less prominent than he is, and yet they may lose their jobs and have their names blackened as Stalinist agents on evidence which is no better than that which swayed the board in this case.

From the record, as it is revealed by Acheson, the "evidence" used by the board in the case of John Carter Vincent is of an ancient and dishonorable character. It is an application of the maxim that "where there is smoke, there must be fire," where there are accusations, there must be guilt. And this does indeed have the smell of the mentality of the "wretched men of the Kremlin."

Koestler — —

(Continued from page 7)

Speaking of the poor devils "found particularly often among the intelligentsia" who become unthinking automatons of the Stalinist "closed system," Koestler writes: "I like to call them the 'clever imbeciles'—an expression which I don't consider offensive, as I was one of them."

Since it is not an offensive expression, we cannot imagine why this brutally frank Political Thinker leaves his confession in the past tense.