

LABOR ACTION

Independent Socialist Weekly

OCTOBER 30, 1950

FIVE CENTS

**Kremlin Puts West on the Spot
With Demagogic Proposal on Germany**

... page 2

Philanthropy and the Belt Line

... page 6

Jim Crow: Killer of the Dream

... page 7

Labor and Stalinism in Italy

... page 2

**After Hanley:
It's Tammany's
Turn in Muck**

By TONY TOWERS

NEW YORK, Oct. 24—It's a pity in some way that the November 7 election is only two weeks off. At the rate at which Tammany's secret machinations are coming to light—there's a new scandal every day—the voters can get a bellyful of how capitalist politics is played.

More important perhaps, the leaders of the labor movement, whose politics has put them in the middle of the scandal, may or may not be red in the face, but their ranks—and especially the ranks of the Liberal Party—have a right to be embarrassed. The daily dirt is piling up around Tammany's candidate for mayor, Ferdinand Pecora, who is being supported by the Liberal Party, the CIO Council and other unions.

The most recent exposure, triggered by Drew Pearson's broadcast on Sunday, October 22, concerns the more intimate details of certain sessions between Tammany leader Carmine De Sapio and the spurned Acting Mayor Vincent Impellitteri. Once upon a midnight dreary, it appears, Impellitteri tried to persuade the Democratic leader that he was just the man to run for New York City mayor on the Democratic line. He had al-

(Continued on page 3)

CIVIL WAR BY TERROR AND ATROCITY RAGES IN KOREA

By ABEL BAKER

While the international war between U. S.- and Russian-directed armies in Korea is coming to a destructive end, the civil war continues without abatement. Given the reactionary social character of the forces contending for rule, the weapon being used on both sides—the Stalinists and the Rhee regime—is terror by mass murder and atrocity; and the victims are among all strata of the Korean population.

Also among the victims of this bitter internecine struggle are the American prisoners who have been subjected to the most abominable atrocities. The meaningless murders and other crimes visited on the GIs are a measure of the inner collapse of the Stalinist armies, their political demoralization in the sudden retreat in which they now find themselves.

In a larger sense, these bitter killings without purpose give us a glimpse of the abyss into which all Korea has been thrown by the two world powers. While the physical destruction is incalculable—and in such a backward handicraft-agrarian society may take an extremely long time to rebuild—it is the social anarchy, the breakdown of the codes which maintain human values without being replaced by anything new except force, which will drag out the struggle indefinitely. No social peace is in sight for the unhappy land, and without it even reconstruction itself will be marked by an atmosphere of unresolved conflict. The large-scale mass murders by both the Stalinists and the victorious Rhee group are the con-

tinuation of the civil war by other means. While doubt can be expressed as to the figures of the Stalinist murders, the facts themselves have been too well authenticated. In hundreds of villages as well as in towns and cities, the Stalinists seem to have

(Turn to last page)

'Legal' Atrocities First — Then 'Free Election' for Rhee

Among the "crimes" for which the newly restored Rhee regime in Seoul intends to exact punishment is—in so many words —"UNWITTING OR UNWILLING SERVICE" TO THE NORTH KOREAN INVADERS.

This, reports N. Y. Times correspondent Richard Johnston on October 24, is "Class C" for "collaborators" with the Stalinists. (Class B means open and willing collaboration, and Class A entails profiting through collaboration or helping in causing death or suffering by the hands of the Stalinists.)

In other words, anyone who was of "service" to the Stalinists without even knowing it or with a gun at his temple is a criminal, according to Rhee justice.

This fantastic basis for indictment can be only a legal cover through which the U. S.-propped rulers can bring down the whip on anyone they choose, any opponent of their regime at all or anyone they want to put out of the way for any reason whatsoever. (After which, "free" elections will be held. . . .)

The nature of the law is further underlined by the fact that Rhee's chief prosecutor has announced that "full lists of Communists and sympathizers had fallen into the hands of the police and military intelligence officers." If this is true, the necessity for the unheard-of Class C—even from the point of view of anti-CP terror—is rendered still more outrageous.

In the midst of atrocities, the Rhee regime's "Class C" is a "legal" atrocity.

Brooklyn College President's Dictatorship Runs into a Storm

Gideonse Swings Ax on Academic Freedom

By EUGENE MARTEL

NEW YORK, Oct. 23—The administration of President Harry D. Gideonse at Brooklyn College, one of the four city colleges, has outdone all past performances in its latest attack on student rights. But for the first time in years the students have demonstrated that they will not be intimidated and have fought back with determination and—even more important—with political understanding of what is happening.

Gideonse opened up at the outset of the fall semester. On the first day of registration the college chapter of the Labor Youth League, Stalinist youth group, was suspended "in view of the United Nations war in Korea and the world situation in general." (See story in LABOR ACTION for October 9.) By so doing Gideonse established a new criterion for the continued functioning of all campus groups, support of American imperialist policy in general and support of the Korean war in particular.

The student clubs reacted immediately. A meeting was called by the Eugene V. Debs Society, a militant socialist club, to which all but the Stalinist clubs were invited. The result of this meeting was the establishment of a coalition committee encompassing all the socialist and liberal clubs and excluding the Stalinists; the coalition set as its goal the reinstatement of the LYL.

The committee had already contacted the American Civil Liberties Union and had started making plans for a mass protest rally on campus when its activities were interrupted by Gideonse's second blow against student rights: the revocation of the charter of the college newspaper, the Vanguard.

Vanguard has had a tradition of opposition to the

Gideonse administration. It was suspended last May as a result of its exposé of Gideonse's autocratic intervention into a faculty election (see story in June 12 LABOR ACTION). More recently, Vanguard has opposed the administration's policy of favoring the introduction of ROTC onto the campus. It has opposed regulations which have strengthened administration control over it and which tend to restrict it as a critical and independent student newspaper.

38 LINES

More to the point, the first (and last) two issues of Vanguard this term have been extremely critical of the LYL suspension, dubbing it an example of "perverse patriotism" and comparing it to the methods of the Stalinists themselves. It was in answer to this criticism of the administration, and because of the administration's desire to remove once and for all the threat of future criticism inherent in the existence of a free and independent college press, that the paper's charter was revoked.

The events which specifically led to the revocation of Vanguard's charter are in themselves the most damning evidence against the school administration.

At the time of the last Vanguard suspension a regulation was passed requiring "simultaneous presentation through editorials of multiple student opinion on controversial issues." This was and still is unheard-of in college papers; it makes an editorial policy impossible. For every editorial attacking the administration, another alongside it defending Gideonse was required. And so with all "controversial" issues.

The last issue of Vanguard carried four editorials: two each, pro and con, on the question of the LYL suspension and the double-editorial regulation. The two student defenders of administration policy were Harry Taubenfeld, president of the Student Governing Association, and Harry Schwartz, former president of the college chapter of the "Common Cause" group. Their combined editorials were 38 lines shorter than the two editorials which were critical of the administration.

Their complaint on this score was presented at the next meeting of the Faculty-Student Committee on Pub-

(Turn to last page)

N. Y. Public Meeting—

MAX SHACHTMAN

THE SOCIALIST MOVEMENT:
33 Years After
the Russian Revolution

Cornish Arms Hotel, 23rd St. & 8th Ave.
THURSDAY, November 2, at 8:15 p.m.

Admission: 50 cents (including tax)

Kremlin's Demagogic Proposal on Germany Puts West on the Spot with Unity Appeal

By GORDON HASKELL

The heaviest gun in the cold-war battle for Europe fired last week was the Russian declaration issued at Prague demanding an immediate peace treaty with Germany and the unification of the country.

The statement was co-signed by all the Eastern Europe satellite states, including the East German puppet of the Kremlin.

The salvo was fired with an excellent sense of timing. The United States, Britain and France are engaged in the most delicate negotiations over one of the problems which is crucial to the formation of a powerful military force in Europe: the rearmament of Germany.

Inside Germany itself it is being debated with great vigor, and it appears that a large majority of the people in Western Germany are as opposed to rearmament of their country as are large masses of the people of the other West European nations.

The proposals made in the Prague announcement are worded so loosely that they offer almost unlimited opportunity for the Russians to pump into them any specific content they may desire in the months ahead.

They demand that the governments of Russia, the United States, Britain and France proclaim themselves against the remilitarization of Germany. (Their claim here would be, of course, that the "People's Police" in Eastern Germany is not a military formation, and hence could be included in any denunciation of remilitarization.)

They demand that the occupation authorities "remove all hindrances in the road of development of a peaceful German economy" and prevent the rehabilitation of the German war potential. If accepted in good faith, this would thwart the minimum American demand that Germany be permitted to contribute industrially to the rearmament of France and the rest of Western Europe.

RUSSIAN JOKERS
But the proposals for which the Russians no doubt expect to generate the greatest enthusiasm in Germany are the ones calling for the immediate conclusion of a peace treaty with Germany, creation of a unified state, and withdrawal of all occupation forces within a year of the signing of such a peace treaty.

While this is going on, a Constitutional Council is to be established on the basis of "balanced" representation from the Eastern and Western zones. This will prepare for the establishment of a interim government ("democratic, peace-loving, sovereign"). In the meantime its proposals will be presented for "common approval" by the governments of the United States, Russia, Britain and France.

There is a good deal in this proposal which may seem attractive to the German people. If there were not, it would be poor propaganda. But in every phrase there is a joker, and it would be strange indeed if they were not recognized as such by the West.

word "democratic" to mean only forces friendly to Russia. Would they consider the parties of Schumacher or Adenauer "peace loving and democratic"? The proposal is vague on how the representatives are to be elected, or on the powers which the present occupation forces would have over decisions of the Constitutional Council. And there is certainly nothing in the proposal to suggest that the German people would be permitted to vote in a free election to determine their immediate political fate.

SOCIALIST PROPOSAL
Nevertheless, the Russian proposal is bound to have some effect if for no other reason than because the United States has not made and cannot make a better one, and the Americans are in the uncomfortable position of having to reject this proposal without having anything better to offer than the unpopular rearmament of Western Germany. Their position in rejecting this proposal is given weight only because they can demonstrate in negative fashion the unreliability and even downright dishonesty of the Russian plan.

Yet the question remains: Is there no proposal for the unification of Germany and the withdrawal of the occupation forces and

drawal of the occupation forces which can be made at this time which could actually achieve this goal in a progressive fashion? The answer is that such a proposal can be made, but the social force is not yet organized which can make it.

As things stand now, everyone knows that the cold war dominates any maneuvers or proposals which are made either by the Russians or by the Americans. The nations of Europe most concerned with the problem are lined up on one or the other side of this cold war.

And even inside these nations, there is not yet a powerful, organized, mass third force which is clearly and consciously independent of the two war blocs, and which speaks in the name of the torn and frustrated peoples of Europe in their own interests against the domination of both. All powerful political movements, both of the capitalists and the workers, are pledged to one side or the other.

In these circumstances the problem of Germany cannot be solved. As any German army today can only be created for the purpose of fighting on one or the other side of the Stalinist-capitalist struggle, the right of the German people to have an army, like that of any

other nation, doesn't even begin to be a real question. And even if the creation of such an armed force is considered in connection with its integration into a Western European army, that doesn't change the situation one bit.

MEETING THE CHALLENGE
The social-democratic parties in Britain, France and Germany cannot claim to represent a third force in world politics as long as they lean on American military and political power. These parties, to the extent that they have the allegiance of masses of workers in their respective countries, are the natural sources for the emergence of a third force in Europe. If they were to break their alliance with the United States and firmly proclaim their intention to unite their countries into an independent Western Union as a third, socialist force in world politics, they could quickly rally to themselves the mass of the peoples of the Continent who are now plunged in despair and await the Third World War with a feeling of helpless resignation.

Such a movement could easily take up the Russian challenge for the unification of Germany. They could demand immediate withdrawal of all occupation forces and

immediate nation-wide free elections with full confidence that the outcome would unite the whole of Germany with the Independent Western Union. They could take the political offensive on this question because the mass movement such a force would create inside Germany would be all they need to expose and thwart the machinations of the Russians.

Such a development is for the future. Unfortunately, the American labor movement is one of the powerful forces which stands in its way, the other one being the Stalinist parties of Europe. The American labor movement is closely tied to the foreign policies of the American government, as the world Stalinist movement is tied to the dictates of Moscow. To the workers of Europe the appearance of a solid national front in both the United States and Russia makes the task of building an independent movement of their own seem almost impossible. For independent socialists in this country the first task is to hasten the separation of the most advanced sections of the American labor movement from the sterile politics they are now playing. Such a separation would be a mighty blow for the creation of a Third Camp in Europe.

Labor and Stalinism in Italy

Workers Still under CP Influence; Trend Is Toward Right in Silone's PSU

By HENRY JUDD

ITALY, Oct. 1—A brief trip to this old and complex land of Italy is hardly more than sufficient to give anything but hasty impressions and a few general observations. One of the first, and perhaps the most important, of these is the fact that the heavy hand of Stalinist influence still hangs, politically and socially, over the entire land.

The Italian Communist Party is, according to the observations of those best equipped to know, still the strongest, most popular and certainly the most active of all the Stalinist movements in Europe. It is considered to be far better organized and prepared for action than its sister party in France. Aided and abetted by the Nenni Socialist Party (alleged to still have 500,000 members, and with a large daily press of its own), Stalinism—although in decline since the failure of its great general strike in 1948 when Togliatti came close to assassination—is a powerful force weighing upon the political life of Italy.

The sources of Stalinism's strength are not difficult to discover. Even by comparison with France, Italy is an extremely poor and poverty-stricken land.

Between Rome and the industrial cities of the North, the land appears dried up and far from fruitful. South of Rome, in the still semi-feudal areas of Abruzzi, Calabria, etc., all reports indicate that the ancient problem of the cafoni, dramatized in all the writings of Ignazio Silone, have not changed in the slightest.

WORSE THAN FRANCE
During this visit to Italy, the government "celebrated" the first distribution of land under its new law, adopted 5 years after the end of the war! About 30 peasants received their share of landlords' property, with others scheduled to follow in due order.

tions, etc., are but some of the social problems. We noted that much modern reconstruction of homes and office buildings is going on, but it was stated that the apartments are only for purchase, and none can be bought at less than 1 million lire (close to \$2,000), which excludes ALL categories of workers automatically.

There is little question that a careful study of the effects of the Marshall Plan aid upon the life of the masses would indicate that less advance has been made in this respect than even in France! This is confirmed by the quickly hushed-up quarrel of the ECA-Marshall Plan representative in Italy who made some incautious remarks to this effect.

The cultural and political atmosphere, dominated by a government which is clearly clerical and "rightists" in every respect, is far worse in Italy, as numerous signs indicate. The Holy Year in Rome permitted the church to organize huge campaigns for its viewpoint. Friends indicated that in all those small but important details—such as elementary education, the dealings of the average man with the government, etc.—the spirit has remained not much different from that under Mussolini.

LABOR DIVIDED
A student comrade states that most of the students of the higher classes are reactionary and belong to that vague and ill-defined sector of the population known as "neo-fascists." There is by no means the active cultural and intellectual life which abounds in France and Paris, and the brief which produced so many fine works is said to have definitely been liquidated by both clerical and general political reaction.

At the present time, the trade-union movement in Italy is divided into no less than five different centers! The Stalinist-controlled center, as in France, contains the masses of industrial workers and has had much success among the agricultural workers and poor peasants, although no really successful strikes have been organized for a long time. There is also the republican anti-Communist trade-

union center consisting of unions which left the Stalinist CGT; the Catholic trade-union center, which is stronger than in France; and small centers organized around the right-wing socialist party of Saragat and the leftist socialist party (Unitarian Socialist Party) which has been in existence for over a year since its split with the party of Saragat.

A fierce struggle rages constantly within the labor movement for control of the many unions and the individual factories. Recent successes have been scored by the Unitarian Socialist Party which campaigns primarily to take unions out of the hands of Stalinist control.

It is important to realize that many factories and unions remain in Stalinist hands because of the fear and systematic terror campaign which the Stalinists conduct to keep workers under their thumb. In fact, it was clear that the Stalinists have a much bolder and "thumb-nosing" attitude toward the Italian government than does their sister party in France. This further illustrates the comparative weakness of the coalition Catholic-Social Democratic government in Italy.

The socialist and leftist movement in Italy is appallingly weak and divided. The small Trotskyist movement which had once existed, and which committed the astounding blunder of joining the Stalinist Popular Front election bloc some time ago, has apparently disappeared; at any rate, no trace of it could be found and we were assured it no longer existed. So much for the political capacities of the so-called Fourth Internationalists who, with the exception of his History, have not even succeeded in publishing any of the writings of Trotsky.

We have already mentioned the combined Nenni-Stalinist movement which obviously exerts the leading influence of all political movements among the workers. The Saragat Socialist Party, an extreme right-wing social-democratic organization, is not of much interest and has continued its career in the coalition government; the same career, that is, which

brought about the split. Its members voted for the Atlantic Pact resolution of DeGasperri and its policy is exclusively "pro-American." It is affiliated with the COMISCO, the socialist center organized by the British Labor Party.

This leaves the Unitarian Socialist Party (PSU) which was organized a year ago under the leadership of such well-known Italian socialists as Matteotti, Ignazio Silone, the writer, Mondolfo, an old-time socialist theoretician, Lombardi, etc.

THE PSU
It is difficult to describe with any sense of exactitude or sureness the political perspective and program of this party for two simple reasons: First, the party is obviously in the throes of a serious political evolution which, according to some critics of the PSU, will carry it right back into reunification with the Saragat socialists; and because of the rather obvious lack of desire on the part of the party leadership to discuss political questions freely and openly with others.

As can be gathered both from its weekly press (La Lotta Socialista) and discussions with members of the party (insofar as they are willing to discuss), the whole trend of the party is simply rightwards, toward the existing tendency of support to America in any and all war situations, etc. Apparently, a discussion in which much disagreement exists is now under way in the party, but it is impossible to learn its exact nature.

The PSU is also affiliated with the COMISCO, and there are some who refer to the party as representing the British Labor Party viewpoint. Its leaders pin their hopes on gradually winning away the Italian working class from Stalinist influence, primarily in the unions, and recreating a united socialist party, including many supporters of the crypto-Stalinist Nenni. It is hard to attempt any evaluation of the PSU, largely because of a lack of published material and the reluctance of its responsible leaders to exchange ideas.

After Hanley: It's Tammany --

(Continued from page 1)

ways been a good obedient Tammany man, ex-Mayor O'Dwyer's right hand in fact, and surely he had the right to collect his reward now.

But De Sapio wasn't playing ball with Impelleritteri, and he told him to run along home and get out of the mayoralty race as an "independent" if he knew what was good for him. The five county Democratic bosses had chosen Pecora to quarterback for the Tammany team in this election (all the more valuable to the shrewd Tammany leaders because Pecora had not been identified with their machine in the recent graft-ridden period).

VIRTUAL ADMISIONS
Impy refused to sit on the sidelines, and he decided to take it to the voters by running as an "independent." A persistent fellow, he tried three times to wear out De Sapio but the latter told him to peddle his wares elsewhere. He wasn't in any buying mood, so Impy had no choice but to set up his Experience Party and begin a loud and noisy campaign picturing Impy as the heroic fighter of bossism and sinister influences.

In recent weeks Impelleritteri has charged that De Sapio attempted

to buy him off by offering him the Democratic candidacy for Supreme Court judgeship—for a term of fourteen years at \$20,000 yearly, thus a \$300,000 bribe—if only he'd quit the mayoralty race. Having very little else to offer the voters, Impy's biggest appeal has been this claim of "independence" of the Democratic bosses and his belligerent attitude toward his close associates of only yesterday.

According to De Sapio's version, it was Impelleritteri who offered to withdraw from the mayoralty race, provided, however, he was given the Supreme Court judgeship, in addition to three other judicial positions for his supporters. He claimed that he was so deeply committed to his supporters that he needed to take care of them. As De Sapio explained to a reporter who asked him why he didn't make the deal: "He had a job at \$25,000 a year, good for three years more, and I could not see giving in to political blackmail from one who had already done quite well from the organization." De Sapio, of course, was referring to the job Impelleritteri had as president of the City Council, obtained through the grace of a Democratic nomination, after having worked his way up through a series of other Tam-

many appointive and elective jobs.

Both in the interview with the reporters and in the prepared statement issued to the press, there is no question but that it was completely within the power of De Sapio as Tammany leader to hand out the Supreme Court judgeship, as well as sundry lesser judicial posts, if he was so disposed. In this manner is justice dispensed in New York City. The political bosses decide who shall be the judges, and these high offices of supposed honor and trust are used as bargaining bases whenever the need arises.

RICH REWARD

De Sapio's statement affords another insight into how Tammany makes life comfortable for its supporters; it also reminded him that, through the years, the Democratic Party had richly rewarded him. I also reminded him that he would continue in his present post as president of the City Council for three more years at a total of \$75,000 salary, plus the use of a city car and chauffeur."

Thus De Sapio's statement clearly and cynically reveals that the real power still resides with the Tammany tiger. They lay down the law in New York and woe to

any challenger of it. De Sapio denies that he offered Impelleritteri the Supreme Court judgeship, but no one takes that seriously. De Sapio gives himself away when he says it was "discussed." Politicians of his breed don't go in for idle discussions.

From his corner of the ring, Impelleritteri insists that the juicy plum of the judgeship was definitely dangled before his eyes. And not only before his eyes. According to his statement to the press on the subject, "De Sapio admitted making such an offer in the presence of about forty leaders in Rochester, during the New York State Democratic Convention." Other details are given which make it appear likely that Impelleritteri's version of this offer is substantially correct, even if he doesn't tell the entire truth about his end of the bargaining.

This sorry mess breaks shortly after the furore caused by the publication of the letter written by the Republican candidate for Senator, Hanley, in which another sordid deal is laid bare. Governor Dewey assured him that his debts would be taken care of provided he would step aside so that Dewey could run for re-election. One good expose deserves another, and hard-

ly had the charges and counter-charges died down on the Hanley-Dewey deal when it was the Democratic turn to show that they could be just as corrupt and rotten as the Republicans in their deals.

The Republicans have been honest enough in calling the Democrats bums, crooks, stinkers, scoundrels, low enough to steal from school children, and candidates for either Dannemora prison or Matteawan. The Democrats have retaliated in kind, and referred to the Republicans as brazenly wicked, evil plotters who break old men's hearts, sordid conspirators of nefarious plots against the people, and puppets for the Wall Street bankers. Each becomes righteously indignant of the misdeeds—of the other party.

LABOR SILENT

Each side tells half of the truth, and putting together both halves you have a complete picture of what is dished up for the voters in New York State.

Sadder of all is the silence of any labor forces when the times cry so loudly for a voice that will rally the working people on the political field. The trade-union forces are split three ways on the mayoralty candidates, with Pecora and Impelleritteri both backed by strong segments of the organized labor movement and even the Republican Corsi has some labor support.

What an attractive power could be exercised by an independent party of labor which challenged the filthy deals of both machine-ridden parties by running candidates of its own! In a situation such as exists in New York today where both parties stand exposed of using their power against the interests of the people, a labor party, based on the trade-union movement could unfurl a clean banner and arouse the people to its support.

Instead we have the sorry spectacle of a Liberal Party which must keep silent about the Democratic bosses because it has endorsed their candidates for the three major positions of governor, senator and mayor. What can their candidate Pecora say about the whole system of graft and patronage as revealed by the De Sapio-Impelleritteri exchange? How will he clean up New York City? Will he fire all of the Tammany appointees (so richly rewarded by their organization and his) who now occupy berths in City Hall? Why doesn't he commit himself on the five years of O'Dwyer misrule? Pecora is very eloquent on the misdeeds of the Republicans, but let him look closer to home.

Only candidates with no ties to any of the boss parties could dare to tell the whole truth, and until labor organizes its own party and runs such candidates, it will continue to divide its strength on the political field and be at the mercy of the political bosses. It will find itself gagged on the political field so long as it throws its power behind one or another of the boss party candidates. It is high time for the organized labor movement to get out of the mud of capitalist politics and begin to operate on its own and for itself.

Cecil B. DeMille Group Loses in Fight --

Screen Directors Guild Kills Oath

By CARL DAVIS

The fight in the Screen Directors Guild over a new non-Communist loyalty oath has ended (at least for the moment) with a victory for President Joseph Mankiewicz, who opposed it.

The conflict broke out last August. The new oath proposed would have been superimposed upon the present non-Communist oath required by the Taft-Hartley Law, which was signed by all the officers of the union.

The reactionary wing of the Guild, under the leadership of Cecil B. DeMille, Clarence Brown, Frank Capra, Leo McCarey and Albert S. Rogell who sponsored the super-loyalty oath for all members, had not reckoned with a fight but it did arise as a result of the opposition of President Mankiewicz and his faction.

That such a struggle occurred at all should come as no surprise, since the initial cause for this travesty and others like it goes back to the time when President Truman issued his Executive Order No. 9835, directing the attorney general to establish a list of "subversive organizations" to govern actions of the administration's loyalty boards. From then on, there has been no end to the wild-haired, know-nothing conduct of various private industries, labor unions and public institutions.

The president's action was bound to have a vicious logic. Public servants, civil-service employees and school teachers were all compelled to take double oaths to guarantee their loyalty. Private snoopers, ex-FBI agents and professional reactionaries entered the lists with their private campaigns and information bureaus, the net result of which has been to blackmail and smear public figures and professionals.

GIANNINI'S WAY

For some reason or other, superficially attributed by some to the strange spell cast by its climate, California leads the country in the mad hysteria to seek out the Stalinists, who rode so high during the days of the grand alliance between the United States, Great Britain and Stalin's Russia. Station KFI of Los Angeles, for example, established its own loyalty oath and blacklist; a large automobile sales agency, for the same city, followed this lead with one of its own.

teachers to uphold the Constitution was insufficient and that all state-employed teachers were compelled to sign a second and special oath, again to uphold the Constitution and to swear that they were not Communists. Giannini, head of the massive Bank of America, presently the largest bank in the world, and a former Hearst attorney, led this assault and Giannini has now proclaimed the need for a new "vigilante organization" to save the country and his wealth.

If Giannini comes, can Hollywood be far behind? No—as a matter of fact, Hollywood has for a long time been immersed in a campaign to "clear its name" against the charge of being "immoral" and worse than that (since many people can stand immorality of a certain kind) of being "red." The leaders of the film industry have been working overtime to prove their "loyalty." It would seem that they proved it more than once in their spineless servility to the know-nothing reactionaries on Capitol Hill and the host of private censors who make a profession and a living out of baiting the movie industry.

But one spineless action deserves another, and the Hollywood film moguls have established again and again that they are "loyal" and should not be judged by a few "bad apples" such as almost every barrel has. Apparently, the industry was not cleansed when the Hollywood Ten were ousted. Or, perhaps the barrel has been badly contaminated.

DEMLILLE'S WAY

As already indicated, it appears that these are the days of the Cecil B. DeMilles, and the fight in the Screen Directors Guild has real importance because it indicates concretely one of the manifestations of the reactionary drift in the country—one which attacks intellectual freedom and conjures up totalitarian thought-control and practices in the name of fighting Stalinism.

When, back in August, the board of directors of the Screen Directors Guild under the leadership of DeMille (a noted Republican and the man the AFL kept off the air because he would not pay his union assessment), Brown, Capra, McCarey and Rogell, and in the absence of President Mankiewicz, adopted the aforementioned by-law, they merely established what a vicious thing was begun by the president's executive order.

by-law by a large majority in open ballot voting. Everything seemed quite rosey until Mankiewicz returned from Europe. He had already signed a non-Communist oath to comply with the Taft-Hartley Law. Mankiewicz objected to the new oath not on any principled basis, but simply because "the loyalty oath should not be imposed by other than government authority."

A "secret" meeting of the Guild board, reported the next day in the trade paper, Daily Variety, produced a split between the board and its president over a "blacklist" and the "propriety of a membership vote by open ballot." The DeMille group thereupon started a movement to recall Mankiewicz, who in the meantime began a struggle of his own, enlisting prominent directors among whom he counted John Huston, Elia Kazan, Billy Wilder, William Wyler, MANKIEWICZ WINS

The battle was joined. The DeMille faction, which included nine members of the Guild board, sent out signed telegrams to every film director and assistant director recommending the recall of Mankiewicz. The Mankiewicz group fought back by hiring a lawyer and going into court to prevent the DeMille-Capra-Rogell group from going through with his ouster. To strengthen their position and to insure their not being ruled off the election lists, the Mankiewicz group signed the controversial oath before a notary public! Up to that point Mankiewicz could not obtain a membership list from his co-officers in order to acquaint the membership with his position.

An agreed-upon stipulation before the court stated that no recall ballots would be counted until after a Guild membership meeting. On October 18, however, a turnout was announced by the Guild board itself. It was reported that John Ford, regarded as a conservative in Hollywood circles, declared at the meeting that the Guild should concern itself exclusively with professional matters, and the board, with Mankiewicz presiding, thereupon unanimously voted confidence in its president!

Finally, last Monday, October 23, a membership meeting of the Guild voted by closed ballot to demand the immediate resignation of the Board of Directors, nine of whose members were supporting DeMille, and also passed a standing vote of confidence in President Mankiewicz. The meeting was re-

By LEON TROTSKY

Marxism in the United States

35 Cents Order from Independent Socialist Press 4 Court Square Long Island City 1, N. Y.

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 world-wide imperialist rivalry for domination. This struggle can only lead to the most frightful war in history so long as the people leave the capitalist and Stalinist rulers in power. Independent Socialism stands for building and strengthening the Third Camp of the people against both war blocs.

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

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

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

INTERESTED?

Get acquainted with the Independent Socialist League—

4 Court Square Long Island City 1 New York

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

Name
Address
State Tel.
City Zone

YOU and SCIENCE

ON REDUCING SOCIOLOGY TO BIOLOGY

By PHILIP COHEN

Professor Ashley Montagu, of the anthropology department at Rutgers and author of On Being Human had an article in the Scientific American last April which is interesting. Somewhat along the lines of Oscar Wilde's paradox, "Nature imitates art," it is also true that man reads human problems into the natural world. There were the "social Darwinists" who read the "struggle for existence" into everything, and there is the opposite camp which seeks to make out that love and cooperation really rule all living things. Both are one-sided as a result of an anthropomorphic viewpoint and often fail to see that competition and collaboration are a unity of opposites in the struggle for existence.

Professor Montagu takes off on "the law of the jungle" to show that it is not usually "kill or be killed" but rather "cooperate or die." He does indeed note that both exist simultaneously but argues that "the evidence strongly indicates that the latter is the stronger and biologically the more important."

Even within a species, it does not help much to fix all attention on the beneficent results of cooperation, by piling up examples. An attempt to throw a sidelight on human ethics merely from raw examples in nature, which are furthermore selected tentatively, is inconclusive even if it proved that there are more examples on one side than on the other. For whatever the statistics on each side, it is the concrete objective conditions of the case which will determine whether the effect of aggression or of cooperation is beneficent, since both can be true.

Professor Montagu's article—which, needless to say, is socially well-intentioned—illustrates a not uncommon fallacy in the approach of natural scientists to social problems. The underlying assumption seems to be that sociology can be made scientific only by basing it on the natural sciences. Or rather: reducing it to the natural sciences; that is, attempting to derive its laws directly from the latter.

The most extreme example of this tendency, in which it was indeed carried to the absurd, was provided by the Technocrats, who explicitly claimed that the laws of society not only could be but had to be reduced to the laws of physics and chemistry!

The replacement of the laws of thermodynamics by biology cannot be any more successful. It is surely unnecessary to add that this does not gainsay the fact that biological facts condition the social and are therefore certainly relevant. "Biosociology"—to coin the term—has a field.

Businessmen and White Rats

The attempt to reduce the laws of sociology to the laws of the natural sciences is an understandable reaction to the state of sociology today. The scientist who takes this approach is perhaps better intentioned but is not wiser than the one who thinks he can afford to ignore sociological problems altogether in his capacity as a citizen.

But the attempt is constantly being made. As Professor Montagu writes in his article: "This concept [that 'The Golden Rule is sound biology'] is so far-ranging in its implications for human beings and for nations that a long-term research program has been started to collect and synthesize pertinent data from all parts of the world. The sponsor of the project is the Foundation for Integrated Education, a recently organized group of scholars and businessmen."

This project may turn up pertinent data in "biosociology"—we are not saying that it is useless in itself—but it will not do one thing, which is unfortunately the one thing it hopes to do: solve human social problems. Professor Montagu, for example, has his eye on war: "What of the so-called warfare between different species?—Lions kill zebras—no question about that. But the lions do it only for food. This type of aggression can no more be considered war than men can be said to war on oysters and chickens."

Very true, and also relevant in combating the stupidity of those apologists for war who proclaim (with regret) that it is biologically rooted in "human nature." (A good deal of "biosociology" is negative in its significance, in this sense.) But if the Foundation wishes to learn the roots of the unique phenomenon of human warfare, they will have to study that unique phenomenon, human society, as a field of science in its own right.

Marxism is the science of society which has given the most consistent and best-integrated answers to these questions. The challenge it presents cannot be gotten around by throwing sociology out of the window entirely. But a Foundation of "scholars and businessmen" may have a difficulty in meeting the challenge which they would not face if studying white rats or fish in a tank. The scholars may learn disconcerting things about the businessmen.

The same scholar might also be disconcerted by new-found knowledge about white rats, but he would never be hampered by wondering whether the white rats would discontinue funds for the project, or by fear that his loyalty to the rats might be questioned.

LABOR ACTION Independent Socialist Weekly
Vol. 14, No. 44 October 30, 1950
Published weekly by the Labor Action Publishing Company, 114 West 14 Street, New York City 11, N. Y.
Editor: HAL DRAPER
Assistant Editors: MARY BELL and L. G. SMITH
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.

Reading from Left to Right

CONTROLS AND TENSIONS IN THE SOVIET SYSTEM, by Merle Fainsod. (American Political Science Review, June.)

Professor Fainsod interviewed one hundred refugee Russians living in West Germany and Austria, who either were non-returnees or who had escaped from the country. The article presents their answers to questions asked by him, dealing with the reason they fled or failed to go back, with their view of what made people antagonistic to the regime ("tensions"), and with the methods of control used by the regime within their own experience. Fainsod carefully points out that, while the hundred were from varied walks of life, they cannot be considered a scientific cross-section and the results are not presented in any sense as definitive. They are nevertheless extremely interesting.

The first part of the article, on why the refugees skipped, brings out references most frequently to the low living conditions in Russia as compared with what they saw in their contact with the West (mainly Germany), and the pervasive fear and insecurity of Russian life. It is this latter point which is even more strongly spotlighted in the second part. Especially interesting were the replies of the individuals from more privileged strata of Russian society.

"The officers complained that they were constantly subject to the surveillance of the NKVD (now MGB), that they were not trusted, and that they had to function in a milieu of constant insecurity and fear.

"Insecurity and fear were also the chief grievances of the bureaucrats. They asserted that they dared not exercise any initiative; the

penalties of failure were too drastic. Like the army officers, they felt themselves under constant surveillance, and even more than the army officers, they reflected a feeling that the privileges of today might evaporate into the deprivations of a forced-labor camp tomorrow.

"The same sense of insecurity and fear was also strongly expressed by the intellectuals and scientists. . . . One of the younger scientists spoke with great poignancy about what he called the 'inner migration' among the young intellectuals—the effort to transfer one's activity from more politically dangerous activity to less politically dangerous fields. . . ."

The last-mentioned refugee had gone into microbiology for that reason—and ran smack into Lysenkoism. The hand of totalitarianism had reached out to his field too.

There are some especially interesting comments on the younger generation, by a school teacher and by an ex-Komsomol. The latter said that "even very young children began to pose embarrassing questions which raised doubts about the official propaganda. Crowded conditions at home, food shortages, low living standards, the arrest of friends and relatives, the difficulty of obtaining a higher education when no stipends were available, compulsory labor service—these and other elements of life in the Soviet Union planted doubts which this informant said proved embarrassingly difficult to handle when youngsters in their early teens came to him to discuss their problems."

The ex-Komsomol also stressed that one had to distinguish between the present young generation in this respect and the previous generation of youth in the First Five Year Plan period, when there was a great deal of idealistic enthusiasm among them.

WORLD POLITICS

OBITUARY FOR AN EMPIRE BUILDER: THE LEGACY OF SMUTS

By JAMES M. FENWICK

The ideals of a class are revealed in the heroes whom it exalts. Such was the case with Jan Christian Smuts, whose death last month was commemorated with such unctious in the press of the western bourgeoisie. For the colored and colonial peoples of the world, and for humanity in general, there can be little mourning over his passing.

Smuts was capitalism's beau ideal of the colonial statesman. Ever since the founding of the Union of South Africa in 1910 he had played a prominent role in South African and international political life.

Internationally he was instrumental in holding the Union in the Allied camp in both world wars, despite very substantial and anti-British feeling. Domestically, with the exception of an eight-year period between 1924 and 1932 when he was out of office, all the legislation passed between 1910 and 1948 bore the impress of his reactionary outlook. The result was the constant erosion of the rights of ten million non-Europeans, so that today they are "landless, voteless, tolling outcasts." Without Smuts the raging nationalism of the current Malan regime would hardly have been possible.

We are indebted to The Torch, a weekly published in Capetown, for a summary of the activities of governments in which he was a leading figure. We shall touch only the high points.

COLD WAR ON AFRICANS

In 1910 the restriction of the franchise to British subjects of European descent, which was the take-off point for subsequent color legislation, was largely Smuts' work. In 1911 non-Europeans were excluded from many types of employment, the legislative basis for the nation-wide recruitment of native labor was begun, and certain acts were declared criminal depending upon whether whites or non-Europeans committed them. In 1913 an "African could no longer buy land outside 'group areas,' nor occupy land as a rent-paying or sharecropping peasant. Africans were compelled to have their cattle limited under amendments to the 1913 Act."

In 1913 the movement of Indians from one province to another was restricted. In 1917 special native courts were recognized. In 1918 racial classification of the population was established. "In May 1921, at Bulhoek, when 500 'Israelites' peacefully demonstrated, Smuts, then minister of native affairs, sent 800 troops, and these killed 163 and wounded 129 Africans. One hundred were sentenced, three of these to six years." In 1924, "at the close of Smuts' term, the Industrial Conciliation Act was passed, which debarred Africans from recognition as employees."

In 1923 the Native Urban Areas Act was passed. "This was the legal basis for the whole system of urban compounds, locations, townships, registered-service contracts, control of ingress and residence, control of beer-brewing, and the extensive Pass Law system." In 1922 non-Europeans were excluded from peacetime military training.

In 1933 "agitators" were barred from certain specified areas. In 1935 the "Workmen's Compensation Act defined hookworm as an industrial disease for 'Europeans only.' Different scales of pay were laid down, discriminating against African workers."

NOT LOUD BUT DEEP

In 1937 apartheid (segregation) was established in industrial schools. In the same year an amendment of "the Old Act provided for the eviction of Africans from urban areas; for compulsory residence in 'compounds, locations, villages, or hostels'; control of 'foreign' Africans; prohibition of entry of 'surplus' Africans. It carried, too, a vital land clause, prohibiting Africans from buying land in any urban area without the consent of the governor-general." In 1946 police were used to break up a strike of 100,000 miners on the Rand.

The genteel philosopher of holism suspiciously resembles some of the elegants of the Confederacy in this country, who also on occasion cultivated a taste for the consolations of philosophy.

Smuts' life was a consistent one, but in actuality he wound up as an anachronism. Like his successor and caricature Malan, he operated in the fashion of the old colonialism, at a time when it was cracking at every joint in the Far East. Not all the memorializing words of a Churchill, a Malan, or a Nehru will save his name from a deserved and wretched oblivion, once the "curses not loud but deep" of the non-European South Africans and the best of the Europeans are translated into action.

That time may not be far off. World War III and the preparations for it, in which South Africa is destined to play an unprecedentedly important role, will necessarily accelerate the tempo of the struggle for freedom.

For World Politics—

Read the socialist press abroad!

La Batalla Bi-Weekly Newspaper of the Spanish POUM
The Socialist Leader Weekly Organ of the British ILP
Vpered Voice of the Ukrainian Anti-Stalinist Underground
For information and subscriptions, write to LABOR ACTION BOOK SERVICE 4 Court Square Long Island City 1, N. Y.

THE PRO-TITOISM OF THE SOCIALIST LEFT—14

Tito Adapts Stalinism to Yugoslav Needs

By HAL DRAPER

We have analyzed the Tito regime and state power in sufficient detail to satisfy the pro-Titoists' demand for The Facts. More: the study is important in itself in order to understand a new phenomenon in the Stalinist world: a non-Russian-controlled Stalinism.

Up to the rise of Titoism, the socialist understanding of the Stalinist social system has been hampered by the fact that only one specimen was available for observation: one country, Russia. The rise of Stalinist regimes in Eastern Europe added something to this but the new regimes were, as quickly as practicable, also built in the image of the Russian masters.

It is difficult to overemphasize the degree to which fact has distorted and conditioned all attempts to understand Russian society. This has been even more true, to be sure, of bourgeois attempts than of Marxist attempts, but it has been true also of the latter.

In hindsight, we can imagine an attempt to understand the new system of capitalism on the basis (say) only of early beginnings in one country, England. The analysis would inevitably be complicated by the intermixture of the characteristics of the system as such and of the national peculiarities of the specific context. A Marx born two centuries earlier could never have written Capital.

A fundamental problem in analyzing the nature of the Stalinist system (too often not even understood to be a problem) has been likewise: What is basic to the system and its laws, and what is specifically Russian about its concrete form in the single example before us?

Aside from all other considerations, even aside from the immediate political problem of the pro-Titoist euphoria in the socialist left, the phenomenon of Titoism is of great scientific importance precisely from this point of view.

Even Titoism, of course, does not fill the bill. Still strictly from the scientific point of view, what would be necessary would be a Stalinist-type bureaucratic-collectivist system which has arisen independently of Russian control. The Yugoslav regime arose within the womb of Russian Stalinism. Its leaders were trained by Russian Stalinism, and their ideology and methods were learned from Russian Stalinism. We cannot, therefore, consider the Yugoslav regime as if it were developing its new system out of the whole cloth.

But what is significant about the Tito regime is that it has more or less consciously set about to purge itself of specific Russian peculiarities of Stalinism. The Eastern European satellites could not do this because these Russian features could be imposed upon it from the outside by dictate. (Even so, the satellite fuhrers have made attempts . . . this is one source of "Titoist tendencies" and "deviations" even in the Kremlin's domain.)

Eliminating the Russian Accent

The Yugoslavs have set about to ADAPT the Stalinist system to their own conditions and needs. This is the master key to an understanding of Yugoslav Titoism.

This attempt is only in a stage of progress; it is a direction. We will see more of it, as long as the regime lasts. It is this attempt, and little else, which gives rise to the developments which our pro-Titoists interpret as a "return to Leninism," "progress on the road to socialism," etc. It is this process which is behind the undefined feeling of many socialist pro-Titoists that "something is happening" in that country. "Something" is indeed happening there.

The above-stated viewpoint, of course, is possible only if one regards Stalinism as a social system. We Independent Socialists call this Stalinist social system "bureaucratic collectivism," but it is not a question here either of insisting on this terminology or even on our own specific analysis. For those political fossils who still regard Russia as a "degenerated workers' state," Stalinism will never be anything but a collection of peculiarities of the specific Russian development, a grim sport of history—and they will never be able to understand anything. For those who seek to prove that Stalinist society is a modified form of capitalism, the fundamental problem does not even exist, and all questions can be answered by referring to the proper text in Marx, who foresaw all that is to be.

But if Stalinism is a new reactionary and exploitive social system, one thing at least should be clear: The viewpoint that Titoism is a form of Stalinism does not mean equating Yugoslavia and Russia. Precisely the contrary: it also raises the question of the differences between them, actual or potential.

Understanding these differences—in this context—will not lead to pro-Titoism, but it can lead to a deeper understanding of Stalinism and to a socialist approach to Tito-Stalinism.

The Tito regime seeks to purge itself of specific Russian peculiarities of Stalinism which have no relevance to its own problems and to adapt the Stalinist system to its own needs. What are these specifically Russian features?

Some of them are so obvious that it is only wishful thinking that can have led pro-Titoist Marxists in Europe astray. Take, for example, Lysenkoism. The Yugoslavs threw it overboard; the pro-

"THE CASE OF COMRADE TULAYEV" A Novel of Modern Russia by VICTOR SERGE
\$3.00 Order from: LABOR ACTION BOOK SERVICE 4 Court Square, Long Island City 1, N. Y.

Titoists hailed the step as proof that the Tito regime is breaking with Stalinism.

Now, there can be various theories about why the Kremlin saw fit to put its political cachet upon Lysenko's scientific vagary. It is certainly possible to explain why the Stalinist totalitarian system makes possible such a bizarre development, systematizes political interference in science and thus inevitably gives rise to the possibility of the canonization of unscientific doctrines which (for whatever reason) are convenient to the regime.

But why this particular unscientific doctrine, Lysenkoism? Whatever the reasons are (I do not know them), it can scarcely be doubted that they are specific. Or will someone argue that the theory of the inheritability of acquired characteristics flows "inevitably" from Stalinism? (In Huxley's Brave New World, it is demonstrated that the Mendel-Morgan theory can be of equal service to a totalitarian tyranny—just as atomic energy can be of equal service to any kind of regime.)

Whatever the Russian reasons which, in particular circumstances, led to the canonization of Lysenkoism, they are not relevant to the Yugoslavs or to Yugoslav Stalinism. And so the pro-Titoists enthuse about "intellectual freedom" under Tito—namely, the freedom to disagree with the Lysenkoist fantasy!

The case is so clear that it can stand as the type of Russian-Stalinist barnacle which the Tito regime seeks to scrape off its ship of state.

At the beginning of this year, Belgrade announced a campaign against "standardized ideas" in education—i.e., Russian-imposed formulas. Standardized ideas were going to be wiped out, etc. And so, in the name of the drive against standardized ideas, all textbooks were going to be rewritten—that is, re-standardized by the masters in Belgrade rather than by the masters in Moscow.

Meanwhile, the speeches against "standardized ideas" made beautiful quates.

Also earlier this year, "intellectual freedom" was decreed in the field of Yugoslav culture. Russian interference in the world of art and literature was vehemently denounced. The speeches were cogently phrased. And so the union of Yugoslav composers met in conference assembled to denounce Russian control of culture—and to pledge themselves to compose music in the REAL spirit of Marxist-Leninist science, to fight "bourgeois" deviations in music, and to pledge allegiance to Marshal Tito. Ditto with the writers' congress.

First Steps and "First Steps"

But it is in the field of political and social questions that this process has raised the murkiest smokescreen. We are given "proofs" that the Tito regime is becoming "democratic." At least, it is taking the "first steps on the road"—and you can't expect it to get there overnight, can you?

What would be a "first step"—a first step toward political freedom for the people? We have already indicated some; but everything boils down to this: A first step to democracy is any step which permits a man to oppose or disagree with the regime without fear of reprisal, to challenge the power of the regime, to propagate ideas critical of the regime, to break the regime's monopoly on politics.

There are first steps and "first steps." Last year Franco announced and held municipal elections in Spain, as a concession to Western attacks. The elections were fakes, of course, window dressing. But if a dupe is determined, he can claim: Well, it's a first step, isn't it, and you can't expect to get there overnight, can you?

We have already mentioned that the Czech Stalinist regime proclaimed the right of independent candidates to run in its election on the basis of a thousand petition signatures. If a dupe is determined to convince himself that Czech Stalinism is democratizing itself, he could point to this demagoguery as did Konni Zilliacus, adding inevitably: It's only a first step, of course, you can't expect. . . .

Some time last year, the Bulgarian Stalinist regime announced, with much fanfare, that the "People's Councils" were being given increased power. The decree was announced, expounded, cheered and hailed. A first step. . . .

To read the decrees in the Stalinist satellite states, democracy is advancing by leaps and bounds. One thing is sure: the Yugoslav regime is not unique in its democratization by decrees. To point to these without a concrete analysis of their meaning in a totalitarian state is simply acting the part of a determined dupe.

What is pointed to in Tito-Yugoslavia? First and foremost, the Titoists' "fight against bureaucratism." There could be no better example for explaining both what is common to Stalinism and what is different from present-day Russian Stalinism in present-day Yugoslavia. (Next week: Tito-Stalinism and Bureaucratism.)

MURDER IN MEXICO The Assassination of Leon Trotsky by General Sanchez Salazar in collaboration with Julian Gorkin
The story of the assassination of Trotsky written by the ex-Chief of the Secret Service of the Mexican police who was in charge of the investigation.
235 pages \$2.50
Order from: LABOR ACTION BOOK SERVICE 4 Court Square Long Island City 1, N. Y. (Orders must be accompanied by payment)

Philanthropy and the Belt Line

The Ford Foundation Serves a Purpose—for the Ford Family and Ford Motor Company

By LARRY O'CONNOR

Toward the end of September the world was informed that a vast new force for human peace and progress was about to go into high gear. This force is the gigantic Ford Foundation which consists of the bulk of the non-voting stock of the Ford Motor Company, valued at anywhere between \$238 million and \$1 billion.

The yearly income which the foundation will have to spend runs between \$15 million and \$50 million. The discrepancy in the figures is due to the fact that, since the Ford company has been a family affair with all stocks held by members of the family, no one outside the charmed circle knows exactly what it is worth.

The money will be spent to advance the welfare of mankind by promoting Peace, Freedom, Stability, Education and Social Science. The foundation has not announced any specific expenditures, but has so far only outlined the general fields in which it plans to subsidize work.

It announces that it will promote Peace by supporting movements to relieve world tension and strengthen the UN. It proclaims it will strengthen Freedom through work to advance freedom of thought and speech and maintenance of democratic control. It will foster Stability through support of efforts to advance economic well-being and equal opportunity. It will aid Education by assisting programs to expand and improve teaching facilities and methods. Social Science will be developed by the advancement of the study of man and factors that influence his behavior.

Magnificent prospects are opened up for human achievement. Surely, the man in the street can only look at the prospectus and exclaim over the greatness of heart, the charity, the vision, the praiseworthy humanitarian kindness of the capitalists who make all this possible!

For Carping Critics

It may be that the reader has not gotten used to associating these lovable characteristics with the Ford company, and may be inclined to look for the "catch." More specifically, a worker on one of Ford's belt lines may wonder why some of the philanthropic milk of human kindness does not somehow trickle down from the front office.

Such suspicious persons may remember that these philanthropic foundations set up out of industrial capital are almost an institution in the United States—so much of an institution that Ferdinand Lundberg's famous book *America's Sticky Families* devoted a whole chapter to them. Here this carping critic pointed out the immediate reason why the tycoons create them.

For one thing, the endowment of the Ford Foundation with the above-mentioned vast wealth will save the Ford family a gargantuan slice of inheritance tax when the present Fords die. The inheritance tax per million dollars is no small bookkeeping item. The government won't get it; the vast fortune will stay up in the Foundation.

Since the Foundation can and will invest and engage in other financial transactions, and since the family controls the Foundation, it will still be available—not, to be sure, to buy mink coats or yachts and such petty consumers' items but for another very important purpose as far as the Ford company is concerned: to be manipulated to back the Fords' financial operations.

For another thing, the kind of disagreeable person who throws cold water on everything will also point out that by this device the Ford family retains its cherished complete control over the

Ford Motor Company, which is the source of this bonanza of wealth. For the inheritance tax on a few million (or is it billion?) dollars cannot be paid by taking some change out of the bank. It would have to be paid by selling some of the company shares.

Now the shares are owned by the Foundation—for the good of mankind—and are not available to be grabbed up by General Motors or the DuPonts or other bad capitalists who don't have the good of mankind and the Ford family at heart.

By-Products

Other carping critics, as narrow-minded as the others, will no doubt complain that the Ford family will see to it (*it's their money, isn't it?*) that the funds are spent only in ways which will be kind to the capitalist system, as well as to mankind, if that is possible.

The milk of human kindness and all that is great stuff, but it may tend to sour if a Ford Foundation scholar, pursuing his untrammelled way in search of Truth, wanders off in directions too uncomplimentary to Free Enterprise, Private Profit, and the American Way of Life. The board of directors may reasonably ask themselves whether such misuse of their charity is really consistent with the attainment of Peace, Freedom, Stability (especially stability), and other humanitarian goals.

Of course, in the past scholars financed by various seven-figure foundations have done much valuable work, some of which even had direct or indirect implications not suitable for publication in a family (Ford family) newspaper. It would be unwise for the carping critics to either deny this or brush it aside. There are all kinds of by-products of this particular method of financial manipulation via philanthropic trusts. In varying degrees, the foundations have permitted greater or lesser latitude to its scholarly beneficiaries.

It is to be feared, naturally, that in the political climate of the U. S. today, even these by-products will not be the same. It is also to be pointed out that some of the most noteworthy medical advances also came about only as a by-product of the inhuman mass slaughters of modern war. We advise against denying or brushing this fact off too—or of using it to apologize for war.

This brings us, finally, to the angle of the Ford Foundation which is directly related to the subjects which it has decided to study: How does the very existence of this Foundation relate to democratic controls, economic well-being, and equality of opportunity? And specifically, how are these generalities related to the only people who made the Ford Foundation possible—the

workers, past and present of the Ford company?

This is one question we have not seen discussed in the press in connection with the Foundation. Yet is there any better place to start with these studies than at the source which makes them possible?

Every penny which will be spent by the Foundation represents the expenditure of human labor in Ford's iron smelters and foundries, in the paint shops, the stamping mills and on the assembly lines. The income of the Foundation is the dividends of the company, and the dividends represent sales of automobiles and parts which are made by men.

Foundation of the Ford Foundation

Indeed, the capitalist system is a marvelous thing! In the days of the Pharaohs some of the surplus wealth of the community was put into pyramids. There you could see the thousands of slaves toiling under the whips of their overseers, laboriously building these vast and futile monuments.

But under our civilized system, no such sight will offend the eyes.

Every morning of the work week some fifty thousand weary men will get out of bed and go to the factories.

All day they will toil at tasks which are mentally dulling and physically exhausting.

They will turn a few screws, or bang dents out of fenders, or spray paint.

In the evening they will go wearily home to listen to the radio for a while, or to have a few drinks or go to a movie, and then to bed.

Thousands of their brothers and sisters in white collars will sit at desks adding figures, typing bills, sending out invoices.

Others will be working in the drafting rooms and the testing laboratories.

These are the men who make possible the Ford Foundation. Their fathers and grandfathers built the factories in which they work. And if the system continues, their children will work in these factories after them.

Slaves and Benefactors

Were they consulted on the Ford Foundation? Were the slaves of old consulted on the pyramids? But perhaps if the Ford workers were consulted they would simply demand wages so high or hours of work so short that there would be no dividends and hence no money with which to advance Peace, Freedom, Stability, Education and Social Science. Yes, it is not inconceivable that they would act as their masters do.

They might have the temerity to suggest that their education, and that of their children, would be of some importance.

They might have some opinions on the equality of opportunity for them and for Henry Ford II.

They might even decide that the speed of the assembly line is a factor which very strongly influences their behavior (in fact so strongly that they were out on strike against it not so long ago).

They might suggest that the first thing to do is to slow it down to a point at which they have a chance to think and act like human beings during their working hours.

Yes, the Ford Foundation is one of the marvels of American capitalism. And the most marvelous thing about it is the subtle, impersonal, almost mysterious way in which the daily labor of tens of thousands of human beings can be exploited so that a handful of men sitting at the pinnacle of this exploitation can appear as the benefactors of mankind.

A basic pamphlet—

"SOCIALISM: THE HOPE OF HUMANITY"

by Max Shachtman

Read it! 10 cents

Labor Action Book Service

4 Court Square, Long Island City 1, N. Y.

FORD'S CHARITY BEGINS AT HOME

By leaving \$4,000,000 to the Edison Institute of Greenfield Village the widow of the late Henry Ford, when she died, recently saved possibly a \$3,000,000 inheritance tax for her heirs. Both Henry and the late Edsel Ford contrived to have their estates escape heavy taxation by setting up the Ford Foundation and retained exclusive family control of the Ford Motor Company for their family.

How it works was explained by A. H. Raskin in the New York Times of October 1:

"By leaving the great bulk of the company's stock to the foundation, the Fords eliminated this part of their estates from state and federal inheritance taxes, which would have run as high as 77 per cent and thus made it unnecessary to sell any stock on the open market. In this way any change that estate taxes would give outsiders an opportunity to gain control of the Ford enterprises was obviated."

At the time of Henry Ford's death in 1947 Business Week said (April 12):

"The Ford Foundation eliminated the need for payment of tax on the overwhelming share of the inheritance and kept company control in the family's hands."

Since Henry Ford II, old Henry's grandson, is chairman of the foundation, control of that tax-dodging fund also remains in family hands.

LABOR ACTION BOOK SERVICE

can help you build your own labor and socialist library.... Write for free book list. And remember: we also supply books of ALL publishers. Get ALL your books from

LABOR ACTION BOOK SERVICE

4 Court Square Long Island City 1, N. Y.

BOOKS and Ideas

Jim Crow: Killer of the Dream

KILLERS OF THE DREAM, by Lillian Smith. W. W. Norton and Co., 1949. \$3.

By KATE LEONARD

This book, published in the fall of 1949, is a further contribution to the growing literature on race relations in the U. S. It is an indictment of the white-supremacy doctrine and its practice in the South.

Lillian Smith, co-editor of the *South Today*, is a white woman, born and raised in Clayton, Rabun County, Deep South, Georgia. She is a liberal in residence in Georgia where "it is not legal to be human." She is also a Christian reared, as she is well aware, within the American Protestant tradition. She has read her Freud, among other things.

It may be that only someone who comes from a section where the dream was crushed can value the significance and the strength of the American democratic tradition. Lillian Smith believes that this tradition, crushed under the weight of Jim Crow, must rise to live again. Certainly the attempt, and such early manifestations of the process as *Killers of the Dream*, have significance for us.

How this author puts to shame, in her own country, the crop of Southern pseudo-liberals, called forth by the times, who stand pat on the platform that "the explosive issue of segregation must not be called into question?" Concerning segregation Miss Smith reports that the white South says under its breath, "God cannot change it." "Nothing can change it," is preached from all pulpits, "Liberal" and reactionary alike.

Miss Smith speaks of the rigid rote learning of the Bible Belt discipline on sin, the cataloguing of the sacred parts of the body (beginning with the white skin) and the profane parts of the body, the superiority embedded in a white skin, and segregation, the logical extension of white superiority, as if she had both learned and unlearned her lessons well. "When we remember that our forefathers accepted slavery and that our people now accept gross racial discrimination and acute poverty and disease without letting the evils enter the region of 'right' and 'wrong,' it becomes apparent that the morals of the South have been for too many only a mass cleansing of hands."

CLEAR-CUT ON JIM CROW

Not to call segregation into question seems to have required neither God nor demyankees nor federal troops. To raise the first question requires only a Lillian Smith (or again a Judge Waring). It is these voices which have assigned themselves the task of spokesmen for a coming Southern reformist movement. The liberals, the protesters, and those who would protest had they the courage are beginning to say of home. One of the liberals, an eloquent professor, wrote this book.

Miss Smith not only questions segregation. She will have none of it and none of its ways. It is this clear-cut stand, rather than how and why the stand is taken, which is important. With the how and the why it is easy to quarrel, now and again, and basically.

The cultural starvation in the South resulting from white supremacy rampant is her underlying theme. The book is written principally to delineate what has happened to the white half of the South living under what she dubs "the skin, sex, and segregation" regime. With this there can be no quarrel unless one quarrels with a vantage point. Miss Smith does not let off easy the local killers of the dream.

"IT HAS TO BE NOW"

If her creed, that this arid state of affairs need not continue because "we are tall enough for men," is inadequate for a solution, it is yet a call for intervention. To read her book is to recognize this. "What we do today cannot be decided upon until we agree on these three things: our wants, our survival needs, our belief as to what is right. As for timing? There is no choice. It has to be now."

"There is no choice. It has to be now"—this is why she has, nonetheless, been treated roughly from some quarters.

We give two examples. The Atlanta *Constitution* wrote: "Lillian Smith has written a new book, and brother, is it a stinker!"

You remember Lillian. She wrote *Strange Fruit*. This one should have been called *Strange Literature*. Not only is this claptrap, but very badly done claptrap."

Lee N. Allen, a Southern gentleman in residence in Philadelphia, wrote the N. Y. Times: "Lillian Smith doesn't know what she is talking about. The Negroes of the Deep South whom Hodding Carter [pro-segregation Mississippi liberal] and I know do not seek an end of segregation. These natives, both white and black, encourage a development of a Negro nationalism. With the emergence of this situation there will be no incentive to cross the color line, for the Negroes will have equality."

SACRED SKINS

Except for the forthright opposition to segregation, including the "separate but equal" claptrap, we did not think Miss Smith's book said much that is new, if at times she says it startlingly. She has been a teacher, and her book begins with an incident which shows that "even its children know that the South is in trouble." At one point she comments: "But we were still bending to the power of Southern tradition though thoughtful parents had begun to suspect that this filthy old procreancy who supports politicians and their industrialist-backers has far too much to do with shaping the lives of our children."

Much of her book is taken up with the effect the "filthy old procreancy" has upon personality, mainly the personalities of white people.

Miss Smith speaks of the rigid rote learning of the Bible Belt discipline on sin, the cataloguing of the sacred parts of the body (beginning with the white skin) and the profane parts of the body, the superiority embedded in a white skin, and segregation, the logical extension of white superiority, as if she had both learned and unlearned her lessons well. "When we remember that our forefathers accepted slavery and that our people now accept gross racial discrimination and acute poverty and disease without letting the evils enter the region of 'right' and 'wrong,' it becomes apparent that the morals of the South have been for too many only a mass cleansing of hands."

ON ECONOMICS

About here, we leave Mr. Rich White and Mr. Poor White, with their bargain breaking. Lillian Smith sees the bargain breaking, but she believes nothing can change it, nothing—unless both Mr. Rich White and Mr. Poor White change themselves. But Mr. Poor White's education has begun.

One of the more friendly criticisms of Lillian Smith is that she minimizes economics. This is so. However, this is usually not done when outlining how all this came to happen.

The book is dotted with sentences like the following: "After the Civil War when the Southerners were in panic because of the race disorders of Reconstruction, and northern interests were looking covetously at rich untapped resources of Southern materials and markets and Democratic parties were in heated controversy over a national election, the Republicans, backed quietly by Northern economic powers, agreed to let the Southern Democrats manage the 'Negro problem' in their own way if their spokesmen would accept the Republican candidate Hayes as president. . . . The South accepted. Hayes became president. Negroes became the white South's 'problem,' the Supreme Court drew the teeth from the Civil Rights Act, interpreting the Fourteenth Amendment to accord with this gentlemen's agreement, and suddenly new bright voices in the North began to drown out the old abolitionists' talk of human freedom by saying 'the race problem is insoluble.' From 1877 to 1915 there was peace among white folks, North and South."

STRIKING A BARGAIN

One of the chapters, "Two Men and a Bargain," is a simple and effective explanation of what has, more elaborately, been called the proto-Dorian convention. Mr. Rich White made a bargain with Mr. Poor White, and Mr. Poor White carried it out, although by now it is cracking at the seams. It was Mr. Rich White's idea, but Mr. Poor White made it work. There is no minimizing of economics here, and likewise no condoning of the bitter truth.

Said Mr. Rich White: "To keep my farm and my mill going the way I want them to go, making big profits off of little capital, I have to keep wages low. And folks coming in from the North have to keep wages low, too, for that's our Southern tradition. . . ."

"There's two big jobs down here that need doing. . . . What I mean is, you boss the nigger, and I'll boss the money. If you get restless when you don't have a

job, or the kids look puny and shoulder blades stick out more than natural, all you need do is remember you're a sight better off than the black man. But if you get nervous sometimes anyway, and don't have much to do, and begin to get worried-up inside and feel mad with folks, and you think it'll make you feel a little better to lynch a nigger occasionally, that's O.K. by me too. I'll fix it with the sheriff and the judge and the court and our newspapers so you won't have any trouble afterwards; but don't expect me to come to the lynching, for I won't be there. . . ."

"Now, if folks are fool enough to forget they're white men, if they forget that, I'm willing to put out plenty of money to keep the politicians talking, and I don't mind supporting a real first-class demagogue or two, to say what you want him to say—just so he does what I want about my business. Best thing you can do, seems to me is to Jim Crow everything. . . . When you don't have meat to eat and milk for the younguns, you can eat Jim Crow and if you don't think too much about it, you'll never know the difference, for you don't seem to have much sense, anyway."

After a time—a long time—Mr. Poor White got to studying. Seemed like things ought to be kind of different. "Brother," said the black man in the back seat (easy-like), "don't you think we could do it? Together we could do it?"

"Maybe," said Mr. Poor White (voice mighty easy), "maybe; but you couldn't come near me except in the union, you hear that?"

ON ECONOMICS

About here, we leave Mr. Rich White and Mr. Poor White, with their bargain breaking. Lillian Smith sees the bargain breaking, but she believes nothing can change it, nothing—unless both Mr. Rich White and Mr. Poor White change themselves. But Mr. Poor White's education has begun.

One of the more friendly criticisms of Lillian Smith is that she minimizes economics. This is so. However, this is usually not done when outlining how all this came to happen.

The book is dotted with sentences like the following: "After the Civil War when the Southerners were in panic because of the race disorders of Reconstruction, and northern interests were looking covetously at rich untapped resources of Southern materials and markets and Democratic parties were in heated controversy over a national election, the Republicans, backed quietly by Northern economic powers, agreed to let the Southern Democrats manage the 'Negro problem' in their own way if their spokesmen would accept the Republican candidate Hayes as president. . . . The South accepted. Hayes became president. Negroes became the white South's 'problem,' the Supreme Court drew the teeth from the Civil Rights Act, interpreting the Fourteenth Amendment to accord with this gentlemen's agreement, and suddenly new bright voices in the North began to drown out the old abolitionists' talk of human freedom by saying 'the race problem is insoluble.' From 1877 to 1915 there was peace among white folks, North and South."

STRIKING A BARGAIN

One of the chapters, "Two Men and a Bargain," is a simple and effective explanation of what has, more elaborately, been called the proto-Dorian convention. Mr. Rich White made a bargain with Mr. Poor White, and Mr. Poor White carried it out, although by now it is cracking at the seams. It was Mr. Rich White's idea, but Mr. Poor White made it work. There is no minimizing of economics here, and likewise no condoning of the bitter truth.

Said Mr. Rich White: "To keep my farm and my mill going the way I want them to go, making big profits off of little capital, I have to keep wages low. And folks coming in from the North have to keep wages low, too, for that's our Southern tradition. . . ."

"There's two big jobs down here that need doing. . . . What I mean is, you boss the nigger, and I'll boss the money. If you get restless when you don't have a

the stork that brings all things, good and bad, to this earth." It is hard to grasp the possibility that to this obviously honest writer, this seems an adequate summary of Marxian thought on race prejudice or on anything else.

LIBERALS' FORFEITURE

She has a vast impatience with the doctrine that the cause of man's inhumanity to man is "economics." We suspect she has heard it once too often, offered as a grand and inglorious excuse from sophisticated opponents of her stand that the time to end segregation is now. We wouldn't know, but it is possible that to the Hodding Carters even Karl Marx could look like an indulgent mama.

When she gets ready, and especially in her climax, Lillian Smith not only minimizes but ignores economics. We see no particular reason to scold her for it. Surely the South is big enough for the "Southern Marxists" to live side by side with her. If they were more active, they might recruit some of those she softens up.

Killers of the Dream has been said to be "gushy" in spots. It is one's privilege to skip gush. Its author has been called sentimental. Somewhere else we said that Lillian Smith has not yet taken to the hustings. We take it all back. She proposes just that—that non-segregation become a political platform in the South: "It is the liberals' forfeiture of their opportunity to be with the people our democratic beliefs which disturbs me."

She is neither sanguine nor pessimistic about their chances. She is for the attempt, and that is an adequate beginning.

Not in the Headlines

H. C. of L.

In a little over 10 years the purchasing power of the consumer's dollar has fallen almost 40 cents, the National Business Research Agency reports.

Food costs almost doubled in the decade, it says, so housewives have "to pay over 70 cents for the same amount of food previously bought for 33 cents."

The Purge Pays

"In a war, much of the red tape involved in getting out of a union contract could be dispensed with, informed observers say. Once the government officially put the Red brand on one of the unions already notoriously friendly to the Communists, they assume employers would have a perfect defense in court for breaking the contract." —J. E. Meyers, New York Journal of Commerce.

The Man for the Job

What with the atom bomb and all, the Board of Control of the city of Toronto got a great idea for civil-defense preparations.

They appointed William J. Stewart as their chairman of the Civil Defense Committee.

Stewart, a former mayor, is one of the city's leading undertakers.

They Got the Idea

In Washington, D. C., the Minimum Wage Board announced that the living costs for a single woman in the capital had increased more than \$11 a week in the last five years. Following which, employers were deluged with uniform demands of \$11 pay raise. The news item doesn't say whether they got it.

Lobbying by Big Business Is 'Billion-Dollar Industry'

By MARY BELL

In a preliminary report the House Committee on Lobbying Activities has made public a partial survey disclosing that 152 corporations out of the country's half million had spent \$32,124,800 in the past three and a half years for lobbying. Chairman Frank Buchanan (Dem., Pa.) concluded that "the business of influencing legislation is a billion-dollar industry."

Lobbying not only includes direct contact with legislators but also advertising, pamphleteering, campaign contributions and the like. It is the practical means used under the present social system to assert the pressures of varied interests on government.

Buchanan can only guess at the dimensions of big business's activities because of the few corporations covered. In addition, the survey was voluntary and such a giant as the U. S. Steel Corporation gave no figures on its expenditures. Yet it is known that the latter contributed \$30,000 to the rightist Foundation for Economic Education and also shelled out to the National Economic Council, which is headed by the notorious Merwin K. Hart, anti-Semite and admirer of Franco.

Many other heavy contributors to these right-wing propaganda groups were unnamed in the report. Senators Thomas, Murray and Green, in demanding fuller investigation of corporate lobbying, asserted that "America's leading corporations are spending millions of dollars of the stockholders' money for political propaganda."

Expenditures of labor, farm, government and consumers' groups have not yet been made public. It is expected that business lobbying costs will outweigh all the rest

combined. Buchanan believes that such expenditures are "good and proper and in keeping with our great American rights of free speech and a free press." The modification—which may be blocked by Republican members of the committee—that the Democrats would introduce into untrammelled lobbying is the requirement that such expenditures be made public. No other curbs are advocated.

MONEY TALKS This "free speech" and "free press" approach to corporate lobbying endows the corporations and businesses with souls. It equates the minority who own and control industry—and who try to dominate the minds of legislators, Congress, school teachers and the general public through the vast sums at their disposal—with the labor movement.

A demand to control corporate lobby-financing would immediately bring the cry from the capitalist legislators, "Control labor expenditures for lobbying too!" Such was the kind of thinking also exemplified by the 81st Congress when it attached wage control to price control in its recent legislative recommendations.

The arbitrary equating of capital and labor is made by a Congress which is elected as much by lobbying techniques, business-filled campaign treasuries and high-pressure advertising as by universal suffrage.

"Free speech" and "free press" in a capitalist democracy are thus regulated automatically by the money any given group has to afford them. Suffrage is almost universal, but the right to speak and to be heard, to influence the voters, depends upon the source of supply.

Civil War by Terror in Korea --

(Continued from page 1)

launched a brutal program of social extermination. These acts are different from the purposeless murders of U. S. soldiers. Here is no brutalized backwash of war but the calculated decision to eliminate or at least diminish the number of their opponents.

SCORCHED EARTH

It may take months before we know, or we may never know, the details about these events. From the reports available it appears that the Stalinist occupiers, when faced with military necessity to abandon territory, selected for physical liquidation those elements of the population belonging to classes antagonistic to their regime so that restoration would become very difficult if not impossible — a sort of scorched-earth policy applied to people. Those selected seem to have been members of families of Rhee's police, landlords, active pro-Rhee elements.

The pattern that emerges is that in each locality these elements were selected out for local assassination. There was no time for a more economical program of organization into slave-labor battalions. Instead, they killed persons who were related to, or had been or might be in the future sources for the reorganization of the restored Rhee state — a dozen

in this village, scores in that town and several hundreds in every city.

Social upheavals, it is true, have commonly been accompanied by bloodletting, though deaths through revolutionary terror have rarely equaled those, through even minor wars in number. And most often counter-revolutionary terror has been far more bloody. In both cases there is at work a motivating passion clearing away obstacles to a definite goal and substituting a new order.

NOT BY THE PEOPLE

In China, in the wake of the Stalinist armies, the peasantry, sensing an end to the old oppression and not yet feeling the new oppression, sometimes exploded with the accumulated wrath of centuries and strung up the local symbol of all that was hateful and anti-popular. Or, more often, the Stalinist-organized "People's Courts" hauled in some victims, again as symbols, using the indictments for propaganda purposes.

However one views the Stalinist crimes in Korea, they cannot be fitted into any pattern accompanying social change. The missing element is the people.

The executions were carried through in a hurry, as part of evacuation, by military squads. The victims selected were, it is true, in the main socially reactionary, but their liquidation was

executed not in order to wipe out reactionary elements but to so organize the class base of the Rhee regime as to assure social anarchy no matter what the outcome of the war. They were killed because no new power could be established to replace the old.

Far from being an accompaniment to a popular rising, these murders seem to have antagonized the people. Reaction to the killings may account in part for the quick disillusionment with Stalinism on the part of many. While human life has never been highly valued in Korea, the Stalinist murders in South Korea displayed a rare savagery. For analogy one must turn the pages of history back to Genghis Khan.

In the wake of U. S. military victory, Syngman Rhee is returning to power and with him are returning all the expropriated landlords, all the bureaucrats who had fled, all the social parasites accustomed to rule by the privilege of ancestry. Still a regime alienated from the people and fearful of them, reprisals are its natural and indispensable tool for re-establishing its power.

RHEE'S TERROR

For the second time in four months, the villages are scenes of social vengeance, as every peasant who obtained land, every in-

tellectual who participated in the short-lived government, every tradesman who sold anything to the invading soldiers, all are suspect, with thousands being jailed, tortured, beaten and killed. The army command has intervened in innumerable instances to prevent these atrocities.

But while in the larger places some control is being established, albeit with difficulty, terror reigns in the villages. Maddened still further by the Stalinist killings, the landlord terror squads murder at will, so that even Rhee had to issue a warning against reprisals. Even in Seoul it took several days to end random murders, while the suburbs still ring with nightly shots, according to several reports.

Rhee's government is no novice to rule by knout and gun. The so-called Youth Corps who roamed the villages on the eve of the 1947 and 1948 elections were experienced in the use of terror for political ends. Just before the war broke out, a revolt on the tiny island of Cheju was suppressed by killing one third of the population. Suppression of the Yosu revolt in 1948 was so bloody as to evoke sharp protest from U. S. officers.

U. S. military intervention is proving as disastrous for the Koreans as the original Stalinist invasion. None of the problems

has been resolved by these moves and counter-moves. It has been a futile adventure on both sides. The story, so widely published, about how a U. S. army officer selected the new mayor of Pyongyang indicates the kind of democracy being brought to the North. The State Department and the UN have warned Rhee not to take over in the North. But reality is stronger than edicts, especially when MacArthur winks at Rhee's extension of power.

THE ROAD BACK

Who is to rule in the North? To this question Rhee has the only realistic answer on the spot. A whole new bureaucracy cannot be selected at random, as the mayor of Pyongyang was selected. Nor would anything different emerge if this did happen, since only the remnants of the former upper classes feel sufficiently at home under U. S. army protection to come to the surface of society.

What is happening is an old and often-repeated tragedy. On the heels of the U. S. army the old dispossessed classes are returning. Some two to three million persons left North Korea between 1946 and 1948. This mass migration included practically the entire Japanese-organized Korean bureaucracy, landlords, usurers, etc.—all those who were fearful of the new regime, those whose land had been taken, those who were in opposition to the Stalinists and were forced to flee. This whole social layer is now on the road back. It is being restored by Rhee's troops and even more by the Taehan Youth Corps, Rhee's personal political terror arm.

We must try to imagine what it means when a landlord returns with his family and coterie to a village where the peasants have had the land for three to five years. What measures must the landlord take to regain his power over the peasants, to regain his estate, to inspire the old awe? How many heads must fall to reassure him, to minimize his insecurity? This is the work of the Youth Corps.

Rhee's locusts are already swarming over the North. They are already destroying the bases of the Stalinist regime and trying to create new bases of power for themselves. The terror extends itself to the North. All Korea is made a charnel house.

Korea's agony is not over. The civil war has now entered a new phase.

Gideonse Swings an Ax at BC --

(Continued from page 1)

lications (FSCP), and Taubenfeld, who is a member of the FSCP, introduced a resolution calling for the revocation of Vanguard's charter. On the vote, Taubenfeld aligned himself with the four faculty members against the three other student votes.

IRONIC NOTE

That a prearranged strategy had been decided upon by Taubenfeld and his crew and Gideonse is obvious from the following facts.

On the morning of the FSCP vote, the Vanguard's financial adviser, Professor Lipsky, refused to give normal supplies for the publication of the paper, indicating that the administration knew beforehand that a vote to revoke the charter would be introduced and passed. In addition, immediately following the FSCP vote, Professor William Pitt — not a member of the FSCP and representing the dean of students — who had been present at the entire meeting, left the room and proceeded to change the lock on the Vanguard office door and to order the eviction of the Vanguard staff. It is obvious from this that Taubenfeld is nothing more than an administration stooge.

Gideonse then proceeded officially to sanction the publication of his new "house organ," Kingsman, which was to take the place of Vanguard. All former Vanguard staff members have been barred from the Kingsman, and Gideonse has staffed the new paper with an assemblage of hysterical red-baiters like the above-mentioned Schwartz plus the rah-rah fraternity boys.

An ironic note was introduced with the appearance of the first issue of Kingsman when it was soon discovered that one of its editorials was 12 lines longer than its companion piece!

ISSUE NEW PAPER

Most significant, however, was the formation of the Campus Coalition to Reinstate Vanguard. This body immediately established the Campus News Publishing Association; on October 20 it distributed outside the school gates 5000 copies of a new independent student newspaper entitled Campus News.

The Campus News is financed entirely by student contributions

totaling \$170 a week. It intends to exist on campus until an unfettered Vanguard is re-established. The Campus News Publishing Association consists of the Eugene V. Debs Society, Liberal Independent Party, Students for Democratic Action, Student League for Industrial Democracy, Socialist Club, Young Democrats and Young Liberals. All indications point to a broadening of the campus coalition and the sponsorship of Campus News by now unaffiliated clubs.

In addition to publishing Campus News, the coalition has:

(1) Initiated a petition campaign addressed to the Board of Higher Education, the city body controlling the city colleges, requesting an investigation into the Gideonse administration.

(2) Scheduled an on-campus protest rally for Friday, October 27, at which Professor Arthur C.

Cole, chairman of the History Department and head of the academic-freedom division of the ACLU, will be the featured speaker.

(3) Approached the ACLU for aid. The Civil Liberties Union will determine its policy at a meeting on Tuesday, October 24.

MANEUVER COMING?

In addition to the campus, off-campus student publications have added their voice to the general denunciation of the Gideonse administration. The latest issue of Anvil and Student Partisan, which is published by the New York Student Federation Against War and which contains a documented exposé of the Gideonse administration, is being sold outside the college gates by members of the federation. Editorials attacking the Brooklyn College administration have appeared in

the Columbia Spectator, the Washington Square (NYU) Bulletin, the NYU Evening News, and the City College Ticker.

As a result of this mounting on-campus and off-campus pressure, Gideonse has indicated that he is ready to give some concessions to the students. He had consented to address a meeting of club presidents on October 25, at which students will be permitted to pose specific questions and make specific demands.

It will be necessary for the campus coalition to be prepared for an attempt by Gideonse to split and thereby destroy it by granting some meaningless concession designed to win away more conservative students. The demands for the reinstatement of Vanguard with its staff and editorial board and the elimination of the two-editorial policy are basic and nothing else will do.

Univ. of Calif. Socialists Run a Candidate

BERKELEY, Oct. 19—For the second time in less than a year the Berkeley Socialist Youth League has run an openly socialist candidate in the student elections at the University of California.

In the regular student elections last year, the SYL candidate received 690 votes or about one fourth of the votes cast for the highest candidate. At the time of that election a new office was created called the graduate students' representative. This office was to be filled by a graduate student but was to be voted on by the entire electorate.

The SYL entered Bob Martinson, its local organizer, as a candidate in the election against three others representing more or less the fraternity, the moderate liberal, and the Stalinist points of view.

Since there was only one office to be filled, and since in order to win in the primaries a candidate would have to receive a majority (not a plurality) of the votes cast, the SYL felt secure in entering a candidate who would openly vie with the liberal and the Stalinist to see who would represent the students against the fraternity candidate, Carney Campion.

The SYL candidate ran on a

militant student program which included opposition to the loyalty oath, Rule 17 (which prohibits political groups from on-campus functioning) and compulsory ROTC. In all of his speeches and campaign literature Martinson made it clear that he was a socialist and openly analyzed the other candidates. In a series of speeches, it was pointed out that the other candidates were hiding behind their programs and were refusing to tell the students precisely where they stood.

GOOD VOTE

The students elections at the University of California are extremely limited and generally undemocratic in character. In order to vote a student must pay \$12.50 for a student body card; in consequence about one third of the students are disfranchised. Martinson was prevented from attacking the other candidates by the elections council, which does everything in its power to turn the elections into a high school popularity contest.

The election was further debilitated by a rainy election day and the succeeding vote was one of the smallest in the history of the student government.

In the primaries Martinson received 250 votes while O'Brien (the Stalinist) received about 320. Zion and Campion, the "machine" candidates, received around 500 each. This in a student body of over 19,000 people! Since the SYL was counting on a large, popular vote the size of its vote was very surprising. In an election where there was no secondary-choice voting, the SYL candidate received one half of the votes received by the highest candidate.

Once it had been defeated in the primaries, the SYL decided to openly support Zion, the liberal, but was prevented from doing so by the election rules. Zion was elected anyway by a margin of about 200 votes, many of which came from SYL supporters.

By openly appearing before the students against the Stalinist and liberal point of view, the SYL has again put forward its ideas and shown an increase in strength over the last election.

The Socialist Youth League of BERKELEY

AUTUMN CLASS in MARXIST SOCIALISM

Thursday evenings at 8 p.m.
466 Tenth Street, Room 218
(Half block west of Broadway), OAKLAND

- Session 3 . . . Nov. 2: The Paris Commune
- Session 4 . . . Nov. 9: State and Revolution
- Session 5 . . . Nov. 16: Marxism and Anthropology
- Session 6 . . . Nov. 30: Religion and Capitalism
- Session 7 . . . Dec. 7: The Evolution of Stalinism