

# I. F. Stone's Weekly

VOL. I NUMBER 29

AUGUST 8, 1953



WASHINGTON, D. C.

15 CENTS

## The U.S. Prepares to Go It Alone With Rhee

On the eve of the special session of the UN General Assembly, the Eisenhower Administration is preparing to go it alone. During the hearings before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee on the Mutual Security Act, there was a little noticed exchange between Senator Knowland and Secretary Dulles. "If our so-called allies don't realize the facts of life," the Senate's acting majority leader said, "why it becomes a question in my mind as to how long we tie the hands of this government and our foreign policy." Secretary Dulles said, "Those observations are very pertinent." They were followed by a proposal which foreshadows the policy now being followed.

The Mutual Security Act provided that funds were to be made available to the United Nations Korean Reconstruction Agency. Knowland proposed to add "or for such other Korean rehabilitation aid as the President may determine." "I could foresee a situation," he said, "where the United Nations in its General Assembly or Security Council might vote to divide Korea at the 38th parallel. I don't believe any such decision would be acceptable to the Republic of Korea. They might, quite properly, both resent and not welcome the United Nations agency there under those circumstances."

Were relief and reconstruction funds in the hands of a United Nations agency, the organization would have leverage with which to make Rhee submit to its decisions. This is what Knowland wanted to avoid. "I would not want the President to be foreclosed, if that situation did develop," Knowland continued, "for these rehabilitation funds to be made available to the Republic of Korea by either the United States doing it itself, or doing it in conjunction with the Korean government."

The special \$200,000,000 Korean relief appropriation passed by the Senate last week was framed to accord with Knowland's views. The fund was not made available to UNKRA but to "such officers or agencies" as the President may designate. Knowland said that "certainly during the period of cease-fire, before we learn whether ultimately there will be a peace, it will be handled by the United States authorities as distinguished from UNKRA." He also assumed it would be handled "in cooperation with the President of South Korea." Ferguson (R. Mich.) said he hoped the Army would handle the reconstruction job. "I believe," he went on, "we should be greatly disappointed if this fund were to be administered by others, such as the United Nations."

This discussion took place on the floor of the Senate the afternoon of the same day that the New York Times published James Reston's revealing interview with Rhee in Seoul. In this Rhee made it clear that the only solution he would accept was "that all Korea should be governed by

his regime" and insisted that the U. S. had promised "immediate and automatic action" against the Communists if they failed within the specified 90 days to accept these terms. Though the New York Times next morning headlined, "Senators Shocked by Rhee War Stand", not a single comment was obtained from a Senator willing to let his name be used, not a single protest was made on the floor. No one rose to oppose the point of view taken by Knowland and Ferguson, and the aid bill drafted to give Rhee freedom from UN interference passed unanimously.

Rhee's arrogant assumption that he could run the foreign policy of the United States was not publicly challenged. His supporters are a minority but vocal; the majority which dislikes him is scared stiff lest criticism of Rhee be used to make them appear pro-Communist. In this atmosphere Dulles is proceeding with his preparations, and these are preparations to ensure the failure, not the success, of the forthcoming political conference on Korea. There is no point in holding a conference if a major participant makes it clear in advance that it will not negotiate any item on the agenda. There are three items and Dulles is rapidly shutting the door on discussion of all three.

One item on the agenda calls for withdrawal of all foreign troops from the peninsula, and he has come up with a plan—cute is the only word for it—for keeping American troops in Korea "to assist in rebuilding the devastated land." Another item calls for free elections and the third is an "etc." The latter was a euphemism to spare American feelings while covering the crucial question of Red Chinese recognition, without which there can be no stability in the Far East. Dulles shut the door firmly on that at press conference, without waiting to consult America's Western allies.

The remaining item is unification by free elections. But here Rhee still insists that the only elections he will accept are elections in North Korea to fill the 23 seats left vacant for it when the South Korean Republic was originally set up. On this the Administration has as yet made no firm commitment—at least not publicly—but the American military in Tokyo are already acting as if it would be unthinkable to oppose Rhee on this. Nor is this Rhee's position only. In the summer of 1950 when peace seemed near and the holding of free elections began to be discussed at Lake Success, Warren Austin on August 17, 1950 revealed that the U. S. wanted the elections held on the basis that the Republic of Korea's jurisdiction would be extended over North Korea automatically. (See the chapter, Free Elections? in my *Hidden History of the Korean War*). It will be a miracle if Rhee does not get his chance to start up the war again. But, then, the truce was something of a miracle, too.

## Extending The Witch Hunt to The Church

Like the Queen in Alice, the House Committee on Un-American Activities often beheads the victim first and tries him afterward. In 1951, in a pamphlet on Communism and religion the Committee called the Methodist Federation for Social Action "a tool of the Communist party." A year later, the Committee devoted a full report to the Methodist Federation, but avoided conclusions. The Committee said only that the record "as presented herein may be of some aid to those who are interested in determining whether the Federation has been favorable to, or supported, Communistic objectives." This year for the first time the Committee has gotten around to questioning a Federation official, the Rev. Jack R. Mc Michael, until recently its executive secretary. Thus the Committee published its verdict of guilty in 1951, released an interim report in 1952 and began to hold hearings in 1953. Lewis Carroll would have been delighted with the sequence.

The Committee's helter-skelter methods of investigation were displayed in last year's report, which put together a miscellaneous batch of past newspaper and magazine articles on the Federation (all but two of them hostile), with no attempt at evaluation, logical order or summary. The result is weirdly anachronistic. The Federation is linked guilt-by-association style to the anarchist, Roger Baldwin; to Professors Charles A. Beard and George S. Counts who are accused of "bootlegging Marxism" into the public schools, and to Henry Ford, "who has made millions out of his Communist commercial connections." One of the more recent clippings, from the *Chicago Tribune* of 1951, reports a Federation meeting at Evanston, Illinois, where the speakers denounced everything—including Communism—but notes wistfully, "No one spoke a good word for capitalism." Unfortunately this is in the Christian tradition. There is little in the Gospel which can tactfully be inscribed over bank entrances.

From the Committee's point of view, Mc Michael last week made an unsatisfactory witness. The Committee likes the victim to lie quiet, to answer "yes" or "no" to loaded questions and to identify without further remark its favorite "documents"—photostats from the *Daily Worker*, which its researchers study as theologians once did Holy Writ, poring over every jot and tittle. The Committee was prepared to prove that the Rev. Mc Michael during the past two decades had been an indefatigable joiner and sponsor of endless causes left of center, and that these sundry causes had been "cited" as subversive. Mc Michael insisted on reminding the Committee that dozens of respectable Americans supported such causes, that many of them were not "cited" until years later, and that "citation" is not as impressive as it sounds when one remembers that the Attorney General acts without notice, hearing, or argument.

Mc Michael—Georgia born—affects the bucolic manner of a back country preacher, and has a disconcerting habit of saying "amen, brother" to Committee members. Tall, handsome, gangling, with balding sandy hair, he looks a good deal like

Lindbergh and exhibits filibustering gifts which would have made him a worthy colleague of Tom Connally. There were times when he, rather than the benevolent looking Velde, seemed to be running the show. The heavy jowled counsel, Robert Kunzig, strove vainly against McMichael's irrepressible flow of argument. The Rev. McMichael insisted on discussing "documents" and "citations" his own way. "I'm no lawyer," he said at one point, "but I didn't get my eye-teeth yesterday."

Amid the *Daily Worker* photostats were some glimpses of how spy-ridden America has become. A confidential New York City police report was read into the record showing that Mc Michael had spoken at an official gathering in 1941 on the eighth anniversary of the resumption of diplomatic relations between the U.S. and the U.S.S.R. Mc Michael was alleged to have praised the Soviet Union for realizing in practice Christian ideals of racial equality.

The Committee has a long standing reluctance to let anything into the record which might reflect favorably on a witness. It even fought hard to keep Mc Michael from getting into the record one of its own past reports, that of January 3, 1940, which listed 11 organizations as Communist fronts but did not include among them the American Youth Congress of which Mc Michael was then national chairman. Mc Michael also tried hard to show what the files of both the *New York Times* and the *Daily Worker* confirm, that after the Nazi attack on Russia he won a majority of the American Youth Congress to support a resolution opposing American military intervention in the European war. The Young Communist League was for all-out aid including a new A.E.F. but abstained from voting. This was Mc Michael's prize exhibit in support of his denial that he had ever been a Communist or a member of the Young Communist League.

The stage is set for a test by perjury prosecution. Two ex-Communists employed by the government as informers and witnesses identified Mc Michael in secret session as a Communist. Manning Johnson, who left the party in 1939, said he knew Mc Michael as a member of the National Committee of the Young Communist League. Leonard Patterson said he was with Mc Michael in the New York district of the YCL in 1934 until Patterson left in 1935.

The dates may prove crucial. Mc Michael entered Emory University outside Atlanta in 1934 and graduated in 1937. He was in China in 1938 on a YMCA student exchange fellowship and did not come to New York until 1939 when he entered Union Theological Seminary. When confronted with Johnson, a burly man with wary eyes, Mc Michael denied ever having known him. Patterson did not appear but the Committee produced two other witnesses, Mr. and Mrs. John J. Edmiston, who said they were undercover FBI operatives in 1940-41, posing as Communists, and saw Mc

(Continued on Page Three)

## I. F. Stone's Weekly

• Editor and Publisher, I. F. STONE

Published weekly except the last two weeks of August at Room 205, 301 E. Capitol St., S.E., Washington 3, D. C. Subscription rates: Domestic, \$5 a year; Canada, Mexico and elsewhere in the Western Hemisphere, \$6; England and Continental Europe, \$10 by 1st class mail, \$15 by air; for Israel, Asia, Australia and Africa, \$10 by first class mail, \$20 by air mail. Single copy, 15 cents. Tel.: LI 4-7087. Entered as Second Class mail matter, Post Office, Washington, D. C.

August 8, 1953  Vol. I, No. 29

### COMMENT

#### The Difference

The respected and independent *Philadelphia Bulletin* tried its best last week to make the new Smith Act arrests in that city the occasion for a liberal editorial of a kind.

It said "the FBI arrested several Philadelphians on charges of conspiring to overthrow our government by force and violence . . . while these persons have not been tried and found guilty, the evidence against them is of a different quality from that adduced against others by a Congressional investigating committee. None of them has been arrested because back in the forties his name was on the letterhead of some organization with a high-sounding name that subsequently proved to be a Communist front. None is accused . . . because he expressed doubt of the guilt of Alger Hiss . . ."

The *Bulletin's* criticism of Congress-

sional committees is correct but its interpretation of the Smith Act arrests is not. Its opening statement is inaccurate. Those Philadelphians were not arrested for "conspiring to overthrow our government by force and violence." If the editors will look at the indictment they will see that these men were charged with "conspiracy to advocate" revolutionary doctrine.

The difference is considerable. The first charge requires proof of conspiratorial preparation to use force and violence against the government. The second only requires proof of preparations at some future time to *advocate* overthrow. The former deals with concrete acts, the latter with books and ideas. These and their proper interpretation will be on trial in Philadelphia, as they were on trial at Foley Square.

Unlike many witnesses before Congressional witch hunt committees, the men arrested are Communists. But the charge against them when examined in the light of the criminal law is tenuous. The Smith Act for the first time since the Alien and Sedition laws made advocacy of revolutionary doctrine a crime in peacetime. But in Philadelphia, as elsewhere, the government has yet to indict a single Communist for advocacy. All have been indicted for *conspiracy to advocate*. This, like the related seditious conspiracy of the old English common law, is a long way from the tradition which holds that a free government does not punish for ideas, but for overt acts.

"Conspiracy" at its best is a vague category of crime, open to abuse. Conspiracy to advocate is conspiracy at its worst. So far the government has proceeded only against national and local leaders, but the dragnet is flexible enough for small fry. Anything done in furtherance of a conspiracy makes one a party to it.

Just as a man may be ruined by a Con-

gressional committee because he once joined some Popular Front organization, so a man who joined the Communist party because he felt deeply about some social evil it was fighting in perfectly legal ways may end up by going to jail as part of a conspiracy to advocate revolutionary doctrine. Both procedures have the effect of frightening liberals and radicals into inactivity. This is the way conformity is imposed. This is the mechanism of thought control.

#### For Senator Taft

The Chicago Tribune praises Senator Taft for having defended the secessionists during World War II. We remember with gratitude his more recent defense of academic freedom. We sent the Senator a note of appreciation and best wishes for his recovery some time ago when he was still well enough to acknowledge it, as he graciously did. We join with men of diverse views in expressing our respect and regret at his passing.

#### Little Europe Crumbles

The fall of de Gasperi last week and the broadside fired at Adenauer by the German trade unions foreshadows the end of that truncated Catholic "little Europe" which American policy helped create after the war. Unfortunately in Italy and in Germany, the successor regimes under present circumstances are apt to prove worse. History may see the de Gasperi and Adenauer governments as little more than interim caretaker regimes which held precarious power while Italian and German Fascist forces revived. As moderate Catholicism fails, U.S. policy is already turning toward the neo-Fascists rather than the Socialists for an alternative alliance.

## Will Thought Control Be Extended to The Pulpit?

(Continued from Page Two)

Michael with known Communists at a Youth Congress meeting in Columbus, Ohio, in June, 1940.

Mc Michael could not recall ever having met them or been at that meeting in Columbus, Ohio. Mrs. Edmiston testified, "Our appearance was different when we were working with the Communist party. We were trying to play a part." She testified Mc Michael was not "identified to us as a Communist party member" but added, "The question is, who is doing the most damage, the Communist party member who rolls the poison pill or the person who, in the guise of religion, shoves it down our throats?" Congressman Clyde Doyle (D. Calif.) asked Mrs. Edmiston, "Did you try to identify Mc Michael as a Communist? You made an effort but failed?" Her answer was, "Right." These inconsistencies may explain why Senator Byrd was able to state in an interview that J. Edgar Hoover told him the FBI had no information on which any clergyman could be prosecuted as a Communist agent.

The inquiry into the churches is underway. The Committee released testimony taken in executive session two years ago when Congressman Donald L. Jackson (D. Calif.) sitting as a one-man committee questioned another progressive clergyman, the gifted Rev. Stephen H. Fritchman of the First Unitarian Church in Los Angeles. Rev. Fritchman pleaded his privilege under the Fifth to a series of questions linking him with various liberals and radical causes. The three top officials of the Methodist Federation in a statement expressing their faith in the integrity of Mc Michael put the basic issue when they said the purpose of such inquiries is "to intimidate all clergymen . . . so they will leave social issues alone." The question in the Mc Michael case is not how, whether or to what degree he followed party line but whether churchmen will let themselves be frightened out of the right to speak the truth as they see it, and have the courage to close ranks in defense of those who exercised that right in the past.



## JENNINGS PERRY'S PAGE

## But For Buffer Zone Foes Might Make Friends

In Korea, as after every cease-fire in every war, the first problem of the opposing brass has been the inclination of their troops to cross over and shake hands with the other side. And this is a sign to be cherished, I am sure, by all who look for natural man in the end to survive and surmount the recurrent torrents of synthetic hate with which history is besmirched.

Apparently it is impossible completely to indoctrinate the young men sent to shoot each other. Left to themselves they would swarm together immediately the guns are put down to swap gadgets and grins. In the buffer zone in Korea it was the old story. The officers had to be very stern about it. A good case can be made for the possibility that the buffer zone is needed not to prevent clashes among the men but to prevent fraternization.

We see how that is far from the battle lines where it is much easier to preserve the calculated illusion that the Enemy is all-foul, sub-human, feral and treacherous. It will be easier in Korea, too, to keep the young men adjusted for mortal combat if they are not permitted to trade cigarettes face to face. They actually get to serenading each other. Our command had to order that cut out. Two days after the pullback began and just before the neutral commission took over the zone, the press wires out of Munsan did however carry this quaint paragraph:

"The U. S. 8th army eased its 'no fraternization' order to allow Marines and Chinese to work together in identifying the dead."

With the dead, of course, the grounds of common humanity safely can be recognized. Dust to dust was not spoken only of the West or of the East. There is no danger that the dead will realize that after all the man who sped the bullet he stopped was a pretty good Joe, much like himself except around the eyes. The Marines who will work with the Chinese sorting out the bodies undoubtedly will find it much more difficult than Mr. Dulles does piously to assume that these people do not deserve to be admitted to the family of the nations. Working with the dead leaves little room for snobbery.

The pity is that for the living we must actively resist

the drift toward conciliation and understanding which instinctively begins whenever the battle is quieted. The troops in Korea cannot be allowed to mingle and strike hands; they must be kept, as Gen. Mark Clark warned on leaving for home, in "battle fitness and alertness." Hard training—"running up and down the hills"—is scheduled for them, as well as more amusements and interests. It could be that operation Big Switch will provide new accounts of atrocities to sustain "morale," a prospect already anticipated by some of the stateside press.

Here we have to appreciate the size of the task of the brass, our brass and the Red brass also. For though we have done everything we can think of to hold down the world's elation at the event in Korea, to take the joy out of the cease-fire and hedge against the hope of peace, there is a rather general conviction that the war cannot be started up again and a rather general suspicion that the painfully negotiated armistice is a more important triumph—of intelligence—than any victory simple force ever could achieve.

The soldiers of the opposing armies in Korea have at this juncture, it must be remembered, an attitude vis-a-vis each other uncommon in the ranks after other wars. There are no victors and no vanquished. There can be no condescension, no resentment. In addition to the mutual respect the fighters on both sides have gained in the course of the inconclusive war there is inevitably a feeling of equality in the present situation. Fraternization would be natural, and it is doubtful that a physical separation of two miles is far enough to discourage a sense of companionship among GIs where UN or Red resting without danger so close together.

All along, the Korean war has had notable elements of unconventionality, thus encouraging the hope that history need not again drearily repeat itself. In many ways it is regrettable that the rules of conventional posture now should prohibit peaceful intercourse among the young men in the services. Associated culturally instead of at gun-point, they well might discover broader bases of friendship and tolerance than can develop in such limited acquaintance as that furnished by the sole permissible fellow-traveling—in picking up the dead.

I. F. Stone's Weekly

8-1-53

Room 205

301 E. Capitol St., S.E., Washington 3, D. C.

Please enter the following subscription. \$5 for 1 year is enclosed. (See page 3 for foreign rates)

Name .....

Street .....

City .....Zone.....

State .....

I. F. Stone's Weekly

Room 205

301 E. Capitol St., S.E.,

Washington 3, D. C.

NEWSPAPER

Entered as  
Second Class Mail  
Matter  
Post Office  
Washington, D. C.