

LABOR ACTION

Independent Socialist Weekly

JULY 17, 1950

FIVE CENTS

STALIN'S NEXT MOVE IN KOREA?
... page 6

Korean Test of Politics: America Faces Illusory Victory
... page 3

UAW Signs a Bad 5-Year Contract
... page 2

Why Is NAACP Losing Membership?
... page 8

Railroad Union Asks Strikebreaker Truman: Can 'Free Men' Still Strike in This Country?

Draft On, No-Strike Pledge Planned For the Korean 'Slaughterhouse' War

Two weeks after President Truman proclaimed that the United States is engaged in suppressing "bandits" in Korea, the first call has gone out for 20,000 draftees for the war. Every indication is that hundreds of thousands will follow these first victims of the draft once the machinery is set up to handle large numbers of draftees.

The men in the armed forces are engaged in what the newspapers and the front soldiers refer to as a "slaughterhouse." It is an apt word. For it describes not only the murderous character of war, but also the utterly inhuman nature of this one. It is not a war for the interests of any people—Korean, American or any other—but a war for American imperialist control in Asia and the world.

LABOR ACTION is opposed to drafting a single man for the slaughterhouse war!

The draft is only one of the first measures in dragging the home front. The top labor leaders

assembled in Washington on July 11 to discuss the role of the labor movement with war mobilizer W. Stuart Symington. They referred to the no-strike pledge of World War II as an example of what labor can do for war. From newspaper reports it seems that the labor chiefs tried to bargain a little. They indicated a willingness to give a no-strike pledge if they are given posts on all levels of any war agency set up.

They are, it seems, willing to

barter away for a few government jobs the freedom of the American workers to defend their living standards against the profiteering employers.

LABOR ACTION is against any no-strike pledge in the slaughterhouse war. Let the rich pay for the war from their profits. What a tragedy it would be if the American labor movement were to accept reactionary policies at home in the interest of fighting a reactionary war in Korea!

Russian Demagoguery vs. American Stupidity—

U. S. Offers the Saviour, Stalinists Promise Land

By JAMES M. FENWICK

Two brief press items amid the verbiage being printed on the Korean war go a long way toward showing how the Stalinists are able to win the political support of the Koreans through economic reforms—reforms which the United States, hamstrung by its capitalist ideology, is unable to institute.

The Russian totalitarianism, ruled by a new exploiting class, is able to use anti-capitalism as a weapon. It uses this weapon, to be sure, only for the benefit of its own tyranny; U. S. capitalism is able to make no political appeal with meaning.

The first item in the contrast is a New York Times story from Tokyo reporting on a North Korean broadcast:

The radio said the government would confiscate all land owned by the former Republican government, private companies and tenant-workers acres belonging to private landlords. Owner-farmers working their own land will be permitted to hold a maximum of twenty chobu (about forty-nine acres) as against thirty chobu in North Korea.

"The confiscated land will be distributed among farmers who own less than the designated holdings, as well as among laborers working for hire."

The second was a New York Herald-Tribune story from Tokyo concerning what was described as a "morale-boosting" leaflet, two hundred thousand copies of which were dropped to South Koreans from planes:

"On the front is a picture of President Truman, accompanied by his statement on North Korean aggression against the Southern Republic. On the re-

verse is a picture of General MacArthur and the story of his visit to the battlefield. The leaflet said:

"The United Nations Security Council has given full approval to President Truman's order for American air and naval support for the Korean army."

"General MacArthur took immediate action to carry out the President's order. American planes and ships have already reached Korea and are in action. More will come."

"The United Kingdom has made available British naval forces in Japanese waters and, once more General MacArthur finds himself Supreme Commander in the Far East fighting against aggression."

"All patriotic Koreans will take heart at the news that General MacArthur himself has flown to Korea to give his personal supervision to this international aid."

"Well-known to all Koreans as a great and true friend of their nation, General MacArthur's presence in Korea shows the determination of the democratic nations of the world to aid Korea in driving out the aggressors."

"His vast knowledge of the Far East as well as his world-famed military genius will be of tremendous value in the struggle to defend Korean independence and freedom."

"The leaflet, in Korean," the story concludes, "was prepared by the Psychological Warfare Branch of the Far East Command's Military Intelligence Section."

There is only one thing which remains unclear: Why doesn't the Department of Defense put an end to the war immediately by simply launching MacArthur over North Korea?

By GORDON HASKELL

President Truman is once more engaged in breaking a railroad strike. With cynical disregard for the interests of the workers involved, and with a strikebreaking formula developed by Franklin D. Roosevelt and perfected by himself, he is answering the question asked by Arthur J. Glover, president of the switchmen's union: "whether free men in a free country can still bargain with their employers over their living conditions without fear that big government will team up with obstinate employers."

Doubletalk

"Our unions can best show the workers of other lands that the democratic way, not the Communist way, is the road to real economic advancement." —Harry S. Truman in a speech to the American Newspaper Guild convention.

The issues in this strike are easy enough to understand. Operating railroad workers have never won the 40-hour week. During the war they worked 56 hours a week on straight time. Since the war the non-operating workers have won the 40-hour week and this year most of the operating workers (those who actually operate the trains) have demanded the 40-hour week without reduction in take-home pay.

They went through all the involved and drawn-out procedure of the Railway Labor Act. Finally, an emergency board, appointed by Truman, handed down one of the worst decisions in railroad labor history. It granted the switchmen the 40-hour week, but stated that an 18-cents-an-hour increase was enough for them. Acceptance of this ruling would have meant a material cut in weekly take-home pay for the workers, who are none too well paid now. They rejected the proposals of the board, which they have a perfect legal right to

(Turn to last page)

New Crime Invented

In Birmingham, Ala., Police Commissioner Eugene (Bull) O'Connor began his own "direct action" campaign against the Stalinists in his area. On July 10 he ordered his detectives to arrest every known Stalinist without visible means of support OTHER THAN THAT RECEIVED FROM THE COMMUNIST PARTY on vagrancy charges. To date Commissioner O'Connor has had two Communist Party leaders who were passing out leaflets protesting the United States intervention in Korea arrested on "vagrancy" charges.

He intends to go full steam ahead in his illegal drive against the Stalinists, saying "I hate rattlesnakes and I hate Communists. I intend to stamp them out just as I would a den of rattlesnakes." To date no rattlesnakes have been arrested.

COMING—

- THE RECORD OF THE RHEE GOVERNMENT IN SOUTH KOREA, by Jack Brad.
- THE SOCIALIST PARTY AND KOREA, by Philip Cohen
- THE PACIFIST TACTIC, a discussion.
- RECENT RESIGNATIONS FROM THE DANISH CP.



UAW Signs Bad Five-Year Allis-Chalmers Contract

By AL JOHNSON

MILWAUKEE, July 6—A pattern for labor's fifth round is perhaps shaping up. The General Motors settlement, which was followed by the settlement at Briggs, has now been supplemented by a contract between the United Automobile Workers (CIO) and the Allis-Chalmers Company. The settlement provides for a three-cent general increase, two cents to go into a package for later distribution to correct inequities, three weeks' vacation after fifteen years, the escalator clause, modified union shop, five-year contract, and an optional taking of a three-cent annual improvement factor after July 1, 1952.

If the Briggs settlement can be hailed as a victory, the Allis-Chalmers contract must be considered a defeat.

It is true that UAW leaders like Livingston will say: "Look at the advancement over previous years! Haven't we got the escalator clause? We've got a wage reopener with the right to strike after two years. We're dealing with a rough outfit, a company that kept verbatim minutes throughout negotiations, etc., etc."

In addition, it can justly be said that the Communist Party forces had gone far to ruin the locals in the past and many of the most miserable sections of the past contracts were carried over. Besides, the new contract provides for an improved seniority system, the right of entry of UAW International representatives into grievance procedure, leaves of absence for workers taking on International union jobs and elective officers, and a change in the form of arbitration.

For over a year, off and on, the UAW has met with Allis-Chalmers in trying to reach an agreement. The company was obstinate and nothing was accomplished. After GM settled the die was cast; the present settlement is an outcome of Detroit's GM negotiations.

What's wrong? First of all, there is the five-year long-term run of the contract, which everyone realizes is a danger. What's wrong in addition?

WIDE-OPEN LANGUAGE

In GM the contract, whether it is considered to be good or bad, has at least been tested in years of arbitration cases. Interpretations have already come down. Final determination as to whether or not such language interferes with production will be made by the superintendent of each department. Lurching—in case this is not understood—means to eat a wrapped sandwich at the work station!

Again, on grievance time: "the employee and his steward shall, at their request and after explaining the complaint to the foreman (or assistant foreman) be permitted to discuss such complaint privately at the employee's place of work. But, if the foreman (or assistant foreman) believes that the discussion is continuing beyond a reasonable length of time, he may inquire of the steward and employee when they expect to conclude their discussion and may [] fix a time for its termination."

Wide-open language like this runs all through the contract. Probationary employees no rights at all. The use of the words "may" and "mutually acceptable" appear frequently. Does anyone have any hope that Allis-Chalmers has

changed over the years and has become "honorable"?

With regard to the escalator clause, the May level of the cost of living is taken as the base; and the first report will be on November 5 and will not go into effect until January 1, 1950! November is a time when there usually is a seasonal drop in the cost-of-living figure.

On top of this the readings are semi-annual and will take place in March, which also happens to be a bad month for the reading. So in effect the escalator clause will not give much protection, unless there is a new wild inflationary period.

So it goes: the GM workers in the skilled trades got a flat five-cent increase. AC skilled-trades men have to wait until sixty days before July 1, 1951 to see how the two-cent inequities adjustments are going to be distributed.

The union received the modified union shop of GM except that there is an escape period for those who are members now! They got language in the contract that will protect their assessments. The only discrimination clause is that the company will not discriminate against union members and the union will not discriminate against non-members.

T-H PRINCIPLE

An interesting sidelight is the guarantee that all union local elections will be conducted in the shop, and members who serve on the election committee are paid by the company. This is a provision that cannot be opposed in principle—a good militant union uses election day in shop voting as a demonstration of its strength—but what are AC's motives?

We quote Walter Geist, president of AC, who is not known as a lover of unions: "All of the foregoing is predicated upon the important principle that the affairs of the union shall be conducted in accordance with democratic principles [look who's talking!] and practices. The union

New NMU Contract Full of Holes

The following report on recent issues in the National Maritime Union is from the July number of the CDU Bulletin. The CDU (Committee for Democratic Unionism) is the progressive group in the NMU which is opposed both to President Joe Curran's dictatorial administration and to the Stalinist forces in that union.—Ed.

The NMU Negotiating Committee has reached an agreement with the ship owners on the hiring-hall issue. The new clause regarding employment is being hailed, by the union officials, as an improvement in the contract.

The fact is that there are more loopholes (that can be used against us by the shipowners and government agencies partial to them) in the new clause than in the old. A measure of security remains, since men supplied by the union hall have preference of em-

ployment on the basis of having worked for one or more companies under contract. This would serve the purpose of preserving the hiring hall for a time.

The methods used by Joseph Curran and the administration in making this compromise, after constantly claiming that they would not agree to any weakening of our employment system, are a direct violation of trade-union democracy. The ballot presented for ratification of the negotiations shows how little regard the officials have for the membership.

None of the points negotiated was outlined for consideration. The ballot is a disgrace to the NMU and to labor as a whole. Certainly the attendant issues in these negotiations should have been settled in a manner more beneficial to the membership. For instance:

(1) A joint committee is to be established for the purpose of setting up a work schedule for members of the steward department on tankers. You may recall the last contract negotiations (passenger-freighter, 1949) when a similar clause was inserted providing for work rules for each department to be worked out and posted aboard all ships. This job was assigned to the National Port Committee, but was not concluded. Once again, such a job may be entrusted to persons who are evidently unfit for such a responsibility.

(2) The Welfare and Pension Fund clause is still to be worked out; and the 25 cents to be paid into this fund each day for every man on the payroll falls far short of the average achieved by the auto workers, the steel workers and the mine workers (John L. Lewis).

(3) The new agreement will be signed for a period of three years,

Stalinist FE Claims A Fake Victory

By PETE JARMS

CHICAGO, July 9—The Farm Equipment Council of the Stalinist-controlled UE (United Electrical Workers) has announced to its members that it has gained a terrific victory at International Harvester. This claim appeared in the union's paper, FE News.

What are the facts and what is the truth?

The Stalinist claim is a whopping lie. After signing a bad contract, they do not even adopt the tactic which Reuther uses in his United Auto Workers—the attitude of "critical realism" which goes like this: "We didn't get everything, but in the context of the situation we got the best we could." Instead the CP union heads insist on bragging to the world that they have won a victory.

The contract which the local FE unions of Harvester signed on June 30 [FE] stands for the farm-equipment locals of the United Electrical Workers—Ed.] is a continuation of the 1948 contract for another two years—plus four infinitesimally small changes, five-cent wage increases for twenty classifications, and an increased medical and benefit program.

Besides this, it was left up to the local unions whether they wanted a contributory or non-contributory pension plan.

McCormick Works in Chicago accepted a contributory plan. Three per cent of the workers' wages are deducted up to \$3,063 earned, six per cent after \$3,900. In effect they are taking a wage cut to pay for their pensions.

Not only are these "militant" Stalinists accepting a virtual wage cut in these days of rising cost of living. They are also admitting that their workers can save out of their earnings—how then can they ask for wage increases?

It is in keeping with our system of free enterprise," said Livingston, "that workers who participate in the benefits of this contract will also be able to participate in an increasing standard of living."

It is a good thing for the UAW that Briggs came through, that Foote Gear in Chicago signed a good contract in its settlement with the CIO electrical union, IUE; that Seeger Sunbeam in Evansville, Indiana, signed a good contract with IUE-CIO—because the Stalinists are sure to make hay over this AC job. It will be impossible for any of the UAW leaders to explain away the above-mentioned features of the contract merely by saying, "You should have seen the contract the Stalinists had before they were thrown out of AC in Milwaukee!"

And the Allis-Chalmers workers have to live with this contract for five years!

Then came the GM contract with the UAW on May 30. The example of the economic package won by the UAW brought

forth no settlement for the UE. A week later the UE-FE national bargaining committee accepted a two-year agreement with one wage reopening during the life of the contract, and referred other matters back to the local unions.

The local unions attempted to meet with local managements on wages, inequities, etc. The individual works managers of the company refused to meet, declaring that the whole matter had been settled nationally. Powerless because of the central strategy, the locals finally settled for the terms agreed on June 5.

BUCKLED UNDER

The widespread criticism of the five-year term feature of the UAW's GM contract is legitimate—but the UE-FE has, since 1946, accepted exactly the same contract as it had before without any changes. It boasts that it has a "finished document." Yet the important changes that were necessary remain as pressing as ever—on piecework, holiday pay, vacation pay, adjustment for skilled trades and non-production workers, and other sections.

Once again the CP leadership of a trade union has shown that it can talk militantly in words but buckle under to the company in action instead of fighting for the legitimate needs of the workers in the shop.

The Harvester section of the UAW-CIO began its negotiations with the company in the face of this UE-FE schedule. Its contract expires on August 23. It faces the same problems as did the UE-FE. It is to be seen what it accomplishes.

Jolt

President A. J. Hayes of the International Association of Machinists got jolted right under his nose. Several years ago the IAM joined the "National Council for Community Improvement," which was supposed to unite management, labor and others for the announced purpose. Recently the big-business chairman of that outfit, William O'Neil of General Tire and Rubber (Akron), sent out what was supposed to be a private letter to "business leaders" connected with the council. By a slip a copy reached Hayes.

O'Neil's letter contained a diatribe against the "trend to centralization of authority and the paternal state," which Hayes had no difficulty translating into English as an attack upon demands for social legislation. So he resigned as a trustee—from this one.

The American-trained South Korean army, called three weeks ago one of the finest fighting forces on the Asiatic continent, is a shambles. It didn't fight. It lacked the will to fight!

The Stalinist army has been carrying on a military campaign which is remarkable, unpleasant as that fact may be. In a country which American officers said prohibited the use of tanks, the Russian trained army employs tanks with deadly effect. In a season which is "absolutely unfit" for military campaigns, the Stalinist army turns bad weather into a good cover against American air power.

The details of the debacle are now being given the American

Now out! 1948 Bound Volume of LABOR ACTION \$3.00

The Korean Test of Politics: America Faces Illusory Victory Due to Political Defeat

By WALTER JASON

As the painful realities of the Korean conflict begin to tear away the rosy illusions of fighting a Terry-and-the-Pirates or push-button war against Stalinism, the vast political and military implications of the Far Eastern crisis are forcing themselves upon the world.

The military defeats sustained thus far are a reflection of the political failure of American foreign policy in Korea. It is, of course, also a major blow to American military prestige. Even such a conservative magazine as Newsweek refers to the situation as an echo of Pearl Harbor!

Lt. Colonel Thomas MacClure, who just returned after four years with the United States military government in Korea, put the political debacle quite succinctly. "Plainly speaking," Col. MacClure said on July 8, "The South Koreans hate us. They hate most white men."

"Moreover," he added "the South Koreans aren't interested in fighting. Quite a few of them are Communists."

Like the late General Joe Stilwell, Col. MacClure is not going to be very popular in Washington circles for expressing himself bluntly. But the fact remains that the political analysis of the reactionary role of American imperialism in Korea and the entire Far East which LABOR ACTION has been making receives daily confirmation.

The Korean situation furnishes the "purest" test between American and Russian foreign policies in the Far East. This is why the political implications bear such heavy weight in world politics.

Five years ago, America and Russia divided Korea, and each sought in its own way to transform the occupied territory into a political and strategic asset. The military struggle today is a test of the success or failure of those policies. And the verdict is clearly on the side of the effectiveness of Stalinist totalitarianism as against American imperialism, as was the case in China.

This, to be sure, is no reason to hate Stalinism less! What it DOES mean is that the Stalinist monster cannot be scotched by the American citadel of world capitalism, which is politically impotent before it.

The American-trained South Korean army, called three weeks ago one of the finest fighting forces on the Asiatic continent, is a shambles. It didn't fight. It lacked the will to fight!

The Stalinist army has been carrying on a military campaign which is remarkable, unpleasant as that fact may be. In a country which American officers said prohibited the use of tanks, the Russian trained army employs tanks with deadly effect. In a season which is "absolutely unfit" for military campaigns, the Stalinist army turns bad weather into a good cover against American air power.

The details of the debacle are now being given the American

people in the series of articles by Carl W. McCordle, of the North American Newspaper Alliance. He accompanied John Foster Dulles to Korea recently.

General Douglas MacArthur was caught with his pants down, according to McCordle. In terms of high strategy, the one place in the world excluded as a major trouble spot was Korea. In terms of tactical surprise, the North Korean army achieved complete success.

ILLUSORY VICTORY

What faces America now is a major military operation to regain at least military prestige. Without doubt, such a campaign is well on its way to organization, and General MacArthur does not intend to allow his carefully built-up prestige to suffer from the early reverses.

But the grim irony of the situation is that military success will bring only an illusory victory; it will force America to defend subsequently an area which has been discarded, in calmer moments, by American strategists as a military liability—"a potential Bataan"—and may provide Stalinism with an excellent situation to exploit, demagogically but effectively, among all colonial peoples.

The military struggle to retake Korea from the Stalinist-backed army is loaded with political dynamite. Colonel S. L. A. Marshall, who writes frequently for America's military journals and has just completed a definitive study on principles of leadership for the National Military Establishment, has already expressed the obvious overall strategy of America.

It consists of a pincer movement across Korea, to cut off the victorious army, reduce it to guerrilla status through combat, and then go through the long and costly "mopping up" operations in the mountains!

After American forces are built up to at least six infantry divisions, and after they achieve superiority in weapons, and complete control of the sky, then this campaign of victory begins—according to Marshall—and he is right.

The kind of warfare follows the pattern of Indo-China where 150,000 French colonial troops have been maintained for three years in a fruitless effort to defeat the Stalinist guerrillas.

IT'S A REAL WAR

Col. MacClure gave a graphic preview of this for Korea. "Our biggest danger will be sabotage and ambush. The South Koreans will work in the rice paddies during the day, just as peaceful as you please. But at night they'll form into gangs of marauders, crippling equipment and killing every American they can."

"I know that that will happen because we have had to contend with it during the four years I spent in South Korea!"

Instead of "police action," against "a bunch of bandits," as President Truman declared recently, the Korean campaign is a major military task, involving a real army, with full naval and air support! (The calling up of 600,000 draftees is an indirect re-

cognition of this as well as insurance against other Koreans.)

Now Colonel Marshall's plan, which he states is obvious, has just one little defect, and this is where politics comes in. A successful pincer movement can be made only above the 38th parallel, as Colonel Marshall points out. But the United Nations resolution specifically calls for establishing peace south of the 38th parallel.

The Stalinists are thus afforded the opportunity to scream about "Yankee imperialism in North Korea." They may well set up a puppet government for all Korea and try to make the struggle appear to be one for national independence against foreign occupation.

Stalinism is thus not just a powerful military force, but also a set of ideas—totalitarian to the core, but also anti-capitalist—and this makes it a much more difficult enemy to defeat than Nazism.

QUESTION MARK OVER EUROPE

The world conflict between America and Russia begins another crucial phase in a territory of Stalin's choosing, under circumstances most favorable to Stalinism, and with the least cost to the Kremlin!

Formosa, the Philippines and Japan are political liabilities, given the unpopularity of American policy, and they create military problems of vast proportions. (Stalinism may well have the same problem in relation to Eastern Europe that America has in the colonial world.)

The Korean crisis raises another important question. Will Europe fight for America in the event the conflict extends? Or are the European countries potentially Koreans?

But even before events answer these questions, America faces other unanswerable questions, which make its future course of action very difficult. Will Russia permit the Korean campaign to extend itself in the whole colonial world, and perhaps even Europe? How does one build the will-of-the-wisp of "military security," in such a fluid, dynamic world situation?

Naked force as the answer to Stalinism faces its first crisis in Korea. Its result isn't going to be a pleasant medicine for the American people to take.

Lords of the Press

Last year 200 daily and weekly newspapers in this country went out of business, inching press monopoly up another mark in the scale. The Monopoly Investigating Committee of the House heard one good reason for it recently: the high price of newsprint (paper), which furthermore is no accident.

Joseph J. Fiske, a New York newspaper consultant and former publisher, told Celler's committee that newsprint could be sold "for a handsome profit" at \$65 a ton although it is now selling for \$100 a ton.

Donald C. Cook of the Securities and Exchange Commission told the committee that seven of the eleven largest companies in the newsprint industry are controlled by U. S. corporations even though most of the mills are in Canada.

Chairman Celler said that several years ago, when the Department of Justice threatened to investigate the monopoly practices of the companies, they obtained passage of a law by the province of Ontario which makes it a crime for a representative of an Ontario corporation, even though it is a branch of a U. S. firm, to produce any record in answer to a U. S. subpoena.

And the kind of political guerrilla warfare that Stalinism is waging against capitalism everywhere cannot be reduced merely to pushbutton warfare, in which atomic bombs settle all questions. For while Russia has consistently maintained the political and military initiative since World War II, its overall strategy has been "defensive," from the viewpoint of engaging itself in all-out war. It seems to know that the first user of the atomic bomb may win a battle but lose the war, for its use will be a confession of political weakness and not strength.

And the congressman who advocated using the atomic bomb in Korea is the kind of political idiot that Stalin is banking on.

Hitler's dream of world victory through blitzkrieg warfare was shattered by the political and military realities of the situation in World War II. The present Amer-

ican dream of a quick and not very expensive victory over Russia by one quick blow of atomic power, is simply another variation of the same theme. The present commitment of American military might on a global scale, the fact that Stalinism is a world phenomenon, with over 800,000,000 people under its domination, are just two of the present realities that prick the American illusions.

In Korea, every possible weapon, good, bad or fair, was used in the fighting. Whatever was there, was used. In the world conflict, armies, navies, guerrillas, airpower, cavalry—whatever military might exists, will be used. For another war of attrition is in the making. And science may have devised terrible new weapons to make this more costly to mankind, but it has not changed the nature of modern warfare.

"MacArthur himself seemed to thrive under the new burden... Inside the Dai Ichi Building, once the heart of a Japanese insurance empire, bleary-eyed staff officers looked up from stacks of paper, whispered proudly, 'God, the man is great.' General Almond, his chief of staff, said straight out, 'He's the greatest man alive.'"

"And reverent Air Force General George E. Stratmayer put it as strongly as it could be put (even in the Dai Ichi Building): 'He's the greatest man alive.'—Time, July 10.

"Second Lieutenant Harry J. Bleecker, twenty-six, of St. Mary's, Pa., reported sadly that he had to leave behind six wounded. 'I gave them hand grenades to use if they wanted to,' he said, grimly."—New York Herald Tribune, July 9.

"Reports of early American reverses in Korea brought from President Truman today reassurance that the United Nations-sponsored defense against the attacking Communist armies of North Korea will work out all right. The president's optimism... was buttressed by advices from General of the Army Douglas MacArthur that the position of the American ground forces 'is not considered serious in any way.'—New York Herald Tribune, July 7.

"The bedraggled, red-eyed soldiers, some of whom were in a daze from lack of sleep, were violent in denunciation of the position they had been put in, and it was commonplace to hear the phrase, 'It wasn't a battle, but a slaughter.'—New York Herald Tribune, July 9.

"... in industry the word was passed around in high quarters that this would be a 'short war'...—New York Times, July 9.

"It will take 'at least 100,000 American service men and a year' to win the Korean war because the natives of both the North and the South hate Americans, an army officer who spent four years in Korea with the United States military government said today."—New York Herald Tribune, July 9.

"... Secretary of Defense Louis Johnson told reporters there were no plans 'at the present time' to call up military reserves."—New York Herald Tribune, July 4.

"President Truman authorized the armed services today to draft men and call up reserve officers to bolster the Army, Navy and Air Force 'to meet the situation in Korea.'—New York Herald Tribune, July 8.

"It is not even a war in the conventional sense, but rather, as President Truman characterized it, a police action."—New York Times, July 4.

"For, as a gasoline attendant in Hoopston, Ill., put it last week while discussing with reporters the reported death of a local boy in Korea: 'What do you call it? A hot or a cold war? What's the difference? The guy's dead!'"—New York Herald Tribune, July 9.

EVERYTHING CLEAR NOW?

"MacArthur himself seemed to thrive under the new burden... Inside the Dai Ichi Building, once the heart of a Japanese insurance empire, bleary-eyed staff officers looked up from stacks of paper, whispered proudly, 'God, the man is great.' General Almond, his chief of staff, said straight out, 'He's the greatest man alive.'"

"Reports of early American reverses in Korea brought from President Truman today reassurance that the United Nations-sponsored defense against the attacking Communist armies of North Korea will work out all right. The president's optimism... was buttressed by advices from General of the Army Douglas MacArthur that the position of the American ground forces 'is not considered serious in any way.'—New York Herald Tribune, July 7.

"The bedraggled, red-eyed soldiers, some of whom were in a daze from lack of sleep, were violent in denunciation of the position they had been put in, and it was commonplace to hear the phrase, 'It wasn't a battle, but a slaughter.'—New York Herald Tribune, July 9.

"... in industry the word was passed around in high quarters that this would be a 'short war'...—New York Times, July 9.

Next-A Labor Party! by Jack Ranger A Hard-Hitting, Meaty, Simple Presentation of the Need for an Independent Labor Party 25 cents a copy Order from: Independent Socialist Press, 4 Court Sq., 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

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

I want to join the ISL.

Name
Address
City Zone
State Tel.

PRO AND CON: DISCUSSION ON ISL POLICY FOR POLITICAL ACTION

By DANIEL WELSH

Hal Draper's article [in the issue of June 12], criticizing Saul Berg's proposal for a political action policy different from both Shachtman and Hall [in the issue of May 29] fails because it does not answer how socialists are to approach certain concrete situations in which they may be involved as unionists or members of PAC clubs.

Where a local PAC club or group of unions undertakes to sponsor a candidate of its own in the primaries of the Democratic Party, what is to be the function of socialists, and how does our attitude differ from that which we assume toward primary contests at other times? Draper fails to give an answer capable of intelligent application to concrete situations, and as a consequence only gives arguments to those who would see in every electoral contest in which labor engages the proper arena for socialists to intervene. It is not only a policy, such as is proposed by Shachtman, but the LACK of an alternative which opens the door for "opportunistic free-wheeling" such as Draper fears.

We have consistently advocated the building of rank-and-file precinct-level labor political organizations such as the PAC now actually is in a few localities. We have pointed out that there are many other things than electoral activity around which to build such organizations on a year-round basis. But when the time for elections comes around, the question then arises: what are socialists to do? On a local level, the question is: how labor can be moved into independent action.

While on a national scale the formation of a labor party remains our objective, locally the strivings for and the developing understanding of the need for independent politics can take shape in the form of struggle with the

Democratic Party machine within the framework of primary elections.

The argument is advanced "but this is engaging in capitalist party politics." Actually such primary fights remain within the framework of capitalist politics only to the extent that labor's political machine is part of, integrated with and remains subordinate to the Democratic machine and the "liberal Fair Deal Democrats" who are the public spokesmen of the Democratic Party.

Such was obviously the case in the campaign of Edwards for mayor of Detroit. But where the candidates are selected by and remain responsible to a local PAC, and where such candidates are run in opposition to the Democratic Party machine, there already exists in embryo all of the elements of independent labor political action.

Such a campaign emphasizes the distinct and separate interests of labor and the Democratic Party, it instills a consciousness of the need for an independent movement, and it helps build up support for and tradition around the PAC as an independent political center of labor.

True, it may not be the most desirable thing to have labor engage in primary fights, but are we simply to sit back and say to such a PAC club as that which ran Abner in Chicago: "Because you insist on running in the primaries, instead of strictly independently, we are not interested in seeing you win, and do not consider your campaign to be progressive"? Such a position is not only incomprehensible to pro-labor party elements within the PAC, but is not one bit more militant or "principled" in their eyes.

We agree that it is not OUR function to become the advocates of primary struggles, but where such struggles occur, we cannot stand aside.

THE BRITISH POLITICAL SCENE IS PORTRAYED EACH WEEK

— IN —

THE SOCIALIST LEADER Britain's Foremost Weekly

Yearly Subscription—Three Dollars
Shorter Periods Pro Rata

Order from:
SOCIALIST LEADER
318 Regents Park Road
Finchley, London, N. 3, England



LABOR ACTION Independent Socialist Weekly

Vol. 14, No. 29 July 17, 1950

Published weekly by the Labor Action Publishing Company, 114 West 14 Street, New York City 11, N. Y. GENERAL EDITORIAL AND BUSINESS OFFICES: 4 Court Square, Long Island City 1, N. Y. Telephone: IRonsides 6-5117.

Subscription rate: \$2.00 a year; \$1.00 for six months. (\$2.25 and \$1.15 for Canada and Foreign.) Re-entered as second-class matter May 24, 1946, at the Post Office at New York, N. Y., under the act of March 3, 1874.

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

"NEXT WAR" WILL COST A LOT MORE. (U. S. News & World Report, July 14).

This is a research report with a kick in it for anyone who thinks the cold war, not to speak of the hot one in Korea or the Third World War itself, can be combined with increasing welfare-stateism. The figures add up.

"A little war in Korea readily can cost 4 billion dollars a year on top of the 13.7 billion that U. S. now is spending on its own defense. Even that expenditure would not pay for any large-scale mobilization of men or of industry for war purposes. An effort as big as the United States made in the peak year of World War II would cost 124 million dollars at present prices, against the actual cost in 1944 of \$9 billion."

"One man . . . now costs the armed forces about \$4000 a year just for his training and keep. That cost averaged about \$1900 a year in the last war."

Here are some sample jumps in cost from World War II days to now. The increases listed are not only due to higher prices but also to costly improvements in the weapons of destruction.

A Garand rifle, from \$40 to \$64; a bazooka, \$36.25 to \$122; a jeep cost \$1,051 then, now (new-style) \$2670; a medium tank, from \$60,000 to at least \$120,000; a new light tank costs at least five times its World War II counterpart; anti-aircraft gun sets costing \$400,000

each are being ordered to replace the 40-mm. Bofors guns which cost \$40,000. So—

"Initial cost of a new infantry division was 14 million dollars in 1944. It would be 75 million now. An armored division was fitted out for 30 million in 1944. Its first batch of equipment would cost 200 million now."

"New planes are not much like the old ones they replace. A navy plane once had a radio, some guns, little else. Now, a typical patrol craft needs anti-submarine, radio communication, navigation, radar countermeasure and radar early-warning gear, plus guns, rockets, and automatic fire-control systems."

All of which adds up again: "Arms spending, these figures make it clear, will rise sharply if U. S. wants any large armies in the field with good new equipment. Present spending totals 13.7 billion dollars a year. That looks bigger than it really is. At today's higher prices, it buys only what 8.1 billion bought in 1944. It represents less than 10 per cent of the cost of one year's fighting on the 1944 scale."

"That gives taxpayers a hint about what to expect if the Korean war spreads. Arms buying on a mass-scale will tend to bring costs of individual weapons down. But there will always be some new and more expensive item to produce. As the cost figures show, nobody has been able to figure out a way to make cheaper weapons, or less expensive war."

WORLD POLITICS

Discussion: A Dissenting Opinion on the Character of Titoism

We are glad to publish the following dissenting opinion in the interests of a thorough discussion of the important question of the nature of Titoism. A reply to this article and other points being raised by pro-Titoist socialists will begin in next week's issue, by Hal Draper.—Ed.

By PAUL ROBERTS

A thorough attempt to define what is taking place in Yugoslavia would require a much larger article than this one. Henry Judd's "World Politics" column of June 26, however, simply cries for a reply.

Had Judd limited himself to his first and last paragraphs—about the "burden of proof" resting on those who discern changes in Yugoslavia—he would have saved himself and his readers trouble and embarrassment. For what lies between those paragraphs shows that Judd understands neither the origin nor the development of the Yugoslav CP's struggle.

Judd claims that the Yugoslav regime "rose out of the same historic and social processes" as those of Poland, the Baltic lands, Rumania, etc. He says: "In a word, the birth and coming to power of this regime, which took place when the Russian armies reached its borders and the Germans collapsed, was entirely of the Stalinist variety." If that were true, Tito and his friends would never have had the popular support and strength with which to make this break with Moscow. Fortunately, Judd's statement is incorrect from beginning to end.

While the Polish, Rumanian and other satellite countries "leaders" rode in on the Russian armies' baggage trains (what the annexed "Baltic lands" have to do with this discussion no one knows, outside of God and Judd), Tito and his partisans won to power after a four-year struggle against both the Nazi occupiers and the bourgeois restorationists. In that fight they got more aid from the Anglo-Americans than from the Russians, and they won that fight because they managed to become the rallying point of national resistance to the Nazis, while the bourgeois groups all managed to compromise themselves.

The Communist Party of Yugoslavia which resisted Stalin's machine was composed mostly of people who had joined up during the armed resistance to Hitler's

machine. This was no "party" mad, up only of old Stalinist hacks plus band-wagon jumpers scared of losing their jobs. This was a party with roots in the country—not a collection of satraps, relying entirely upon a foreign army for support.

There are not too many left of the pre-war "bred-in-the-bone" Stalinists, and even they have changed. As to asking the Spanish POUMists, I suggest that Judd go ahead and ask them! The POUMists have the same basic approach as this article, rather than the static, dry-as-dust approach shown by Judd's column.

SEES BIG CHANGE
Although Judd is completely wrong even on the question of the origin of the Yugoslav regime, he at least recognizes that there is also the question of the direction of present developments. Now, it is possible that arguments about nationalization or reconstruction are less interesting to Judd than to a wavering Stalinist worker.

Granted, but Judd is painfully unaware of the fact that the POLITICAL questions raised by the Yugoslavs are much more "interesting." The Yugoslavs have begun to subject the entire Stalinist system to quite merciless analysis. The very leader cult of which Judd complains is being attacked as anti-Marxist. And not just in pamphlets against the Russians. Even to a certain extent at home the change is evident. Let someone who has been to Belgrade a couple of years ago walk down its streets today. Not only have the pictures of Stalin disappeared completely, but even those of Tito are far less in evidence.

As far as the sincerity of Yugoslav declarations about democratization is concerned, I wish Judd would analyze those declarations a bit more thoroughly. Words are important not only in themselves, but at least equally in their effect on those who hear them.

The Yugoslav leaders tell the workers: Now that we are free of capitalism, our main internal enemy is bureaucratism; factory managers must no longer be appointed from above, they must be elected by the factory personnel (as a starter, in some 250 principal factories); we must avoid the monopolistic trend of bureaucratism that occurred in Russia and therefore break up and

decentralize the big bureaucratic ministries (industry, state planning, etc.) and transfer their functions to smaller regional and local bodies; we must encourage popular participation and initiative; we must avoid the terrible chasm that has grown up in Russia between the rich and the poor, etc.

EFFECT ON WORKERS

Do you really believe those leaders are stupid enough to think they can safely continue to tell such things to the workers while planning to do the opposite? And if by a miracle they are that stupid, do you think they could ever get away with it? Even if every word in the above paragraph were a sham (and too many of them have been at least partially put into practice for that to be the case), I submit that the effect of such words would be a tremendous blow at the stability of any Stalinist regime.

A short time ago some French trade-unionists went to Yugoslavia. Several of them were hard-headed union militants with a long experience fighting reactionary Stalinism, and not just starry-eyed "Tito worshippers." What they saw and heard in Yugoslav factories convinced them that the Yugoslavs are taking some steps, even if not always completely steady ones, toward an attempt to achieve some sort of synthesis between nationalization and workers' control.

When the Yugoslavs denounce the bureaucratic degeneration of Russia and announce their intention to fight bureaucratism at home, that is, it's true, a part of their propaganda war against the Cominform. It is also a part of their attempt to make their own system tenable by widening its mass base. In the process, however, their very system has been and is continuing to be modified.

How far such modification can successfully go on in a genuine socialist direction, and how long it can hold out in the face of the pressure of the two powerful imperialist camps, is another and longer story. More must also be said about Yugoslav-Russian relations during the resistance, about the wage spread today, about the growth—as compared to Russian extinction—of the new "Radnicki Savez" (factory council) which is getting increasingly important, about the Yugoslav CP's attempts to understand what has happened in Russia, etc.

SPECTACLE

WILL THE SWP WELCH ON THE DEFENSE OF RUSSIA?

By HAL DRAPER

The Socialist Workers Party's newspaper *The Militant* (Cannonite) has been an interesting spectacle for the last two weeks since the outbreak of the Korean war. This is more than can be said for the spectacle it presents in usual weeks, and the current interest is purely involuntary. The question is: How long can its editors keep printing articles on the Korean situation while still writing in uneasy circles around the one question which stares them in the face—without taking it up?

This question is: Do they or do they not advocate military support to the North Korean (Stalinist) side of the war?

For the benefit of those who just came in, it should be explained that this group represents about the only surviving species of socialist (*T. stalinensis*) in this country which proclaims its adherence to the doctrine of Defense of the Soviet Union, ex-fortress of the world revolution. Indeed, it is written in the books of the SWP, under the subtitle "The Laws of the Medes and Persians," that this doctrine is the Touchstone of Orthodox and the Dividing Line between the Petty Bourgeoisie and the Proletariat.

Not that this group particularly likes the Stalinists, you understand. (Does your corner grocer like the A & P?) But it's not a matter of taste. The Soviet Union is a workers' state, albeit a degenerated one. Trotsky said so. As a workers' state, it must be defended when it gets into a war with the capitalist enemy.

And we read in *The Militant* that the North Korean government is simply a puppet of Russia's, manipulated by the workers' state itself. Can it be that the SWP is playing with the idea that while it's all right to defend the great, big Soviet Union, it is out of bounds to defend a little puppet of the Soviet Union? In any case, it would take a whole long (German-size) resolution to explain that one away.

They "Condemned" the Finnish Invasion Too

But we need not wait. The *Militant* explains in indignant language that the Stalinists in Korea are not fighting for the interests of the Korean people. Very true. Then they are fighting for the interests of the Russian regime itself? The conclusion would seem to be inescapable.

And why are these bold defenders of the Soviet Union dillyng and dallying the necessity of coming out four-square (tough-mindedly) in support of a war which is fought for these interests?

The Militant, of course, has said the necessary number of censorious and unflattering things about the politics of the Stalinists in the Korean war. They are not concerned with Korean self-determination; they "bear direct responsibility for the tragic plight" of the Koreans; they "will try to convert Korea into the same sort of testing ground for war techniques and weapons" as was Spain; the war "is taking place within the broader framework of the struggle for world domination," etc.

But, as the initiates of the SWP know, these peccadilloes do not prejudice the question: Do they or do they not advocate military defense of the Stalinist side of the war while making such political criticism?

After all, when Russia attacked Finland in 1939, our subjects (as soon as the Old Man tipped them off) hurried to "condemn the invasion" with exemplary vigor while at the same time insisting twice as hard on the necessity of defending the Soviet Union in the same war. There's no contradiction between the two—for them. And what about now?

In 1939 they did not consider Stalin's Finnish and Polish invasions as being in the interests of the Russian people. They were content to argue that once the armed conflict was joined, they had no choice but to defend the workers' state in its death struggle with capitalism. So now: none of the *Militant's* reprimands made so far against the Stalinists' war policy bears upon the question of defense once the battle is on, as far as their own view is concerned.

Careful! It May Be a "Revolution" . . .

There is an alternate line for these harried souls to adopt—but it also leads straight to military support of the North Koreans' war. This is the line which the SWP's "Fourth International" did indeed adopt with respect to the Chinese Stalinists' fight against Chiang Kai-shek. (See their magazine *The Fourth International*, July 1948, page 156.)

This line was: support in military action of the Stalinists' peasant armies as against the Kuomintang while "exposing the compromises and betrayals of the Stalinist party and fighting its reactionary policy." What's stopping them from taking the same line for the Korean Stalinist struggle?

Lastly—and this clinches the question, ties it up in a ribbon and delivers it signed and sealed:

How do they know it isn't really the proletarian revolution that's going on in Korea?

Are they going to wait another five years to recognize a revolution that's going on under their noses?

They should have learned a lesson by now. One humiliation is enough. A short while ago the brains of the "Fourth International" in executive committee assembled voted a resolution which announced that a "dictatorship of the proletariat" now exists in Yugoslavia. They weren't sure when the proletarian revolution had taken place—maybe 1945, 1946, or maybe just the other year—a detail—but one thing was certain. A proletarian revolution had taken place there, some time or other, while they weren't looking. When Tito broke with Moscow, they repaired the oversight.

Is the SWP going to wait for a Korean Tito to arise (is it excluded, comrades?) before recognizing that this is it? Is it going to deprive the Korean Stalinists of its support in the meantime?

Careful! As the GIs sang: "Be kind to your web-footed friends, for a duck may be somebody's mother . . ."

They Need Your Help!

Local New York of the Independent Socialist League has been regularly mailing packages of food and clothing to needy workers in Europe. The relief committee has especially urgent need for clean, wearable clothing for children of school age, particularly in the 12-14 age group. Please bring or send your contributions to the city center of the ISL, at 114 West 14 Street, 3rd floor, New York City.

The Atrocity Reports Are Coming In Now

The first atrocities in the Korean fighting have been reported in the papers. If the reports are true, it is evident that the brutality on both sides will equal, in intensity if not in mass, anything which men have done to each other in the bloody annals of war.

First reports have come in of the shooting down in cold blood of American prisoners of war and of the probable slaughter of wounded soldiers. Such acts, although they have been seen on all sides in all wars, should be condemned without reservation.

But the Stalinist troops are not alone in their inhuman treatment of prisoners. The United Press reports that on July 10 United Nations observers came upon two truckloads of captured guerrillas. South Korean policemen were in the process of breaking the backs of the guerrillas with their rifle butts.

The report states that none of the victims had been caught in action with the Stalinist army, but were merely assumed to be guerrillas. The report does not

state that the UN observers stopped the atrocity.

The execution of prisoners of war by either side must be condemned, not just because it is inhuman and barbarous. After all, it is not much more inhuman than killing soldiers in action, or bombing cities and villages from the air. But this particular kind of inhumanity feeds on itself. The aim of military operations is to break the will of the enemy to resist. If men know that to surrender means certain death, they will continue to fight even after resistance becomes hopeless. Thus military operations are turned, of necessity, into extermination campaigns.

The atrocities in the Korean war must be condemned. But they must be condemned when committed by EITHER side. Chief responsibility must be placed on the governments and their officers who are charged with the indoctrination and control of the troops. And more generally, it must be placed on the shoulders of those responsible for starting and prolonging the war itself.

WITH THE ISL



You are invited to attend meetings, classes, lectures and socials sponsored by local branches of the Independent Socialist League.

For general information and literature, write to: Independent Socialist League, 4 Court Square, Long Island City 1, N. Y. (telephone IRonsides 6-5117). For information about the Socialist Youth League: same address.

AKRON

Write to Box 221.

BALTIMORE

Write to national office of ISL.

BUFFALO

639 Main Street, 2nd floor.
SYL meets Friday evenings.

CHICAGO

333 West North Ave., Room 3.
Tel.: MICHigan 9003.
SYL: same.

CLEVELAND

Write to Box 1190, Station B.

DETROIT

Meets Thursday evenings at Labor Action Hall, 8212 Twelfth St. (near Seward), Room 25. Educational program for evening begins at 8:30.

LOS ANGELES

213 S. Broadway, Room 201.

NEWARK

248 Market Street.

NEW YORK CITY

City Center and Labor Action Hall: 114 West 14 Street, third floor. Tel.: WATkins 4-4222, CHelsea 2-9681.

Manhattan (Wed.) Branch: meets Wednesdays 8:30 p.m. at City Center.

Queens Branch: for information, write to ISL City Center.

Manhattan (Thurs.) Branch: meets Thursdays 8:30 p.m. at City Center.

Brooklyn Branch: meets Wednesdays 8:30 p.m. at the De Luxe Palace, 558 Howard Ave., (near Pitkin).

SYL: for all information on New York SYL, address 114 West 14 Street.

PHILADELPHIA

1139 W. Girard Ave., third floor. Meetings Mondays at 8 p.m. Open house, Sundays 8:30-10 p.m.

PITTSBURGH

Write to national office of ISL.

READING

Write to P. O. Box 1671.

SAN FRANCISCO-OAKLAND

Labor Action Hall 466 Tenth St., Room 218, Oakland 7.

SEATTLE

Write to Labor Action, Box 358.

ST. LOUIS

Write to Douglas Bridge, P. O. Box 3414, Maplewood Branch, Maplewood, Mo.

WEST VIRGINIA

Write to national office of ISL.

YOUNGSTOWN

Write to national office of ISL.

THE NEW COURSE by LEON TROTSKY

The Struggle for the New Course

by MAX SHACHTMAN

Both in one book—Trotsky's historic essay on the beginnings of Stalinism, and Shachtman's study of the development of Russian totalitarianism

\$1.50

INDEPENDENT SOCIALIST PRESS

4 Court Square

Long Island City 1, N. Y.

Stalin's Next Move in Korea?

Will U. S. Be Fighting the Whole Country in Name of Its 'National Independence'?

By JACK BRAD

The embarrassing military reverses of the United States in Korea are an outcome of its political defeat. In the struggle for the minds and support of the Korean people, the U. S. has for five years offered nothing but continued division of the nation and support to the landlord reaction of Syngman Rhee.

Stalinism has thoroughly exploited this blind alley of U. S. policy and the people have made the identification between national division and the United States. Because this is so the people do not flock to the banner of the U. S., which is now the de facto South Korean state.

On the contrary, hating all foreign masters, they do not view the American intervention as a liberation but as support to a native puppet, a quisling. To most Americans, as to us, it is clear that the Northerners are Russian puppets as well. But in Korea this is not so simple to see. The reality is that the Northern army, its officers, language and domestic politics are Korean, while Rhee's regime has become an advisory council for MacArthur's intelligence corps.

What does the U. S. propose as its war aim in Korea? Its proclaimed intention, sanctioned by the UN, is to re-establish the South Korean state. But this state has indicated decisively in the past weeks that it is not viable, that it cannot defend itself, that it must depend on foreign military power for its very life, just as it has subsisted economically for its entire life on U. S. financial grants.

Identified CP with Social Change

This military and economic bankruptcy over-rides the social isolation that cuts off her ruling cliques from the broad masses of peasants, workers, students, intellectuals and middle classes. The tiny faction of the ruling class which supports Rhee is an absentee landlord group which rules mainly by terror, and that is why it has proved such a weak reed.

Like the Bourbons, this class has learned nothing. It has resisted fundamental change and has kept South Korea a backward corner of Asia. Rooted deep in a tradition of several thousand years of continuous rule, this crusty, rotten landlord class has not permitted any reform which could adapt the nation to life in the modern world.

Worse still, it has deliberately identified every desire for such an adaptation with Stalinism, with the result that millions of peasants have in effect been told by their masters that to try to better their lot, to change social relations, to obtain land, to modernize agriculture, to want freedom and equality—all these things were treason to the Southern state and placed the peasant on the side of the Northern Stalinists.

But Rhee's regime, while based on police terror of a particularly cruel nature, which valued human life cheaply, was still a very backward, Asiatic, feudal regime. It could strike bloody blows at its opposition, but because of its own backwardness it lacked the police techniques of a modern totalitarianism such as Stalinism. Therefore its efforts were in vain.

South Threatened Conquest

Opposition grew with each additional blow. In 1949 it was estimated that there were four times as many political prisoners as under Japanese rule. Twenty thousand guerrillas were killed in the South in that year alone, and revolts among the peasantry and in the army and navy were frequent affairs.

The scope of this opposition grew as Rhee lashed out in new directions, for it is the logical reaction of such a backward regime to broaden its attack as it feels its weakness growing. That is because it lives in an atmosphere of deepening fear and desperation. With the size of guerrilla forces growing from an estimated 16,000 at the end of 1948 to 90,000 at the end of 1949, in spite of a constant extermination campaign—a function which seemed to absorb almost all the energies of the state—the sense of fear of internal revolt grew greater constantly.

As a way out of this position the Rhee govern-

ment pressed constantly for a military solution to national division.

One of the scores of responsible public statements was made on New Year's Day 1949 by the South Korean chief of staff: "As a program of action for the new year," he said, "the lost land of the North must be regained and the nation unified."

A cabinet minister solemnly proclaimed: "We regard Communist-controlled North Korea as lost territory to be regained at any cost... if the people of North Korea resist the authority of the lawful government [of the South], then we must conquer them."

These threats indicated the feeling of Rhee that unless he subdued the North his regime was threatened, not only by invasion but—far worse—socially and internally.

Humpty Dumpty in Korea

Stalinism, of course, also threatened military unification, but not in the same way. The Stalinists' threats were made from strength and supplementary to their continuous, social, political and guerrilla struggle in the South. They had already neutralized or won over large segments of Southern society when they launched their campaign of conquest earlier this month. The success of their political drive was not so much due to the CP's positive program as to the almost universal hatred of Rhee's regime.

Today this South Korean state of Rhee's hardly exists. Its army has deserted; its social base is disintegrating. Not only the army but most other political elements have deserted.

In reality, South Korea today is a political vacuum, not because it is a battlefield but rather because the political life of the Southern republic, such as it was, has disintegrated. To propose to put this together again is as futile as the task which all the king's men failed to perform for Humpty Dumpty. Yet that is presumably the U. S. program.

But this program has a basic implication which all Koreans readily understand: re-establishment of the Southern state means permanent division, enforced by the armed might of the United States—an intolerable national condition. That is why, in the midst of its bitter agony Rhee's government does not attract any defenders. It has become identified with the politics of disunity as its sole means of survival.

This program, as much as all its previous crimes, has isolated it from almost all political factions. For the one desire that is universal among all groups is abolition of the 38th parallel boundary line. Rhee and the United States stand in the way of this desire.

A great opportunity for Stalinism is thus created.

It is in a position to justify its military conquest by proclaiming itself the unifier of the nation. The first step toward filling the Southern political vacuum which it can be expected to take may be a drive toward bringing together in some kind of national front all the deserters from Rhee's state.

Only the Beginning

Already well-established contacts exist between almost every anti-Rhee faction and the Northerners. This includes opposition groups on the far right as well as centrist and underground liberal, socialist and Stalinist groups. It is rumored that a substantial fraction of the dispersed Southern Korean parliament is already in Pyongyang, the Northern capital. The CP openly announced its intention of calling a national assembly of all parties, except Rhee's, in Seoul; this is stated to be its program before launching the war.

With this step Stalinism will be in a position to proclaim an all-Korean state which will contain a broad representation of South Korean leaders and groups and which will therefore be able to pretend to an all-national character. With such an instrument Stalinism will attempt to fill the political void and challenge Rhee, the United States and the UN in a fundamental political way.

Such a state might indeed have considerable attraction—again, not solely because it offers a positively desired goal but also because its opponents propose continued dismemberment. Reconquest of Korea by the United States for Syngman Rhee will then be difficult indeed against this facsimile of a national regime.

If the U. S. has suffered a serious political defeat as a result of its past policies, it may yet find that this was only the beginning. It may find itself in the ridiculous position of fighting the entire country in the name of "national independence."

In the July-August issue of... **The New**

INTERNATIONAL

KOREA: CAN THE UNITED STATES GAIN THE POLITICAL VICTORY?

by Jack Brad

Asia Enters World History

by Jack Brad and Henry Judd

The Scientist in a Time of Terror

by Carl Darton

The Nature of Titoism

by H. F. and Hal Draper

Four Portraits of Stalinism—IV

by Max Shachtman

DISCUSSION ON THE LABOR PARTY'S STAND—

Should We Criticize the BLP's Nationalism?

To the Editor:

The more I read and reread the two issues of LABOR ACTION devoted to the Schuman Plan, the less I understand the exact position of LABOR ACTION to the whole problem involved. The impression I gather of the whole approach is that it is a tragically confused and sectarian document wholly at variance with the general program and tactics of the ISL as applied to the present time.

What is wrong with sectarianism? Usually they apply theoretically sound propositions on an abstract basis without regard to the concrete circumstances of the given moment. And the result is a plunge into mid-air trying to maintain a comfortable position there and asking the labor movement to follow suit.

Now, let's take the very long article by Hal Draper. He could have saved himself and the readers a lot of toil and time, for he is breaking into wide-open doors and with self-satisfaction tries to impress one with the correctness of his position. But he misses the point completely.

No one, least of all the readers of LABOR ACTION, are under the impression that the Labor Party in Britain is "doctrinaire," "revolutionary" or in any way a candidate for fraternal association with, if not the Cannonites, then the ISL. It is exactly what Draper says it is: a reformist, social-democratic party full of imperialist and nationalist illusions. We all knew it all along. Had Draper written his article thirty or so years ago, say, in the early twenties, when the labor movement was in the ferment of a revolutionary upsurge, he would have been justified, and his theoretical arguments against the Labor Party's position as the MAIN hindrance to a united Europe would have corresponded to the reality of the day.

STEP FORWARD

Alas, we live in a period exactly opposite to those, by now, legendary days. We are still living amidst the terrifying barbarism of a revolution defeated in Russia, Germany, Europe, Asia and the whole world. The labor movement lies prostrate, decimated and confused. A whole generation of socialist, Marxist thought has been wiped out. We, the remnants, have to start all over again, from the beginning, with the additional burden of finding a road through the NEW phenomena of Stalinist reaction.

As a result of all the defeats of the labor movement, the plain worker has lost faith in his own strength and power. He is dragging his feet behind the various "democrats" without a sign of trying to strike out for an independent road. It is in this situation that the labor movement of Britain has found enough strength to take ONE step FORWARD. Not a lap, not a jump that would electrify the world, but just one step forward. And they found, to their own amazement, that they can do it and succeed.

Now they are bewildered by their own success, still full of illusions, uncertainty, but if not marching, let's say, walking on. They have done things that no one considered likely. And at present they are going through with their boldest step yet, namely, the nationalization of the steel industry. An industry which is not sick, backward with age but efficient, just, profitable and very much so, the heart and vital organ of British and world capitalism. And yet the Labor government is planning to go through with its intention of nationalizing it.

This step alone is sufficient to strike chills of terror into hearts of the citadel of world capitalism, Washington. Unlike Draper, the American capitalist is quick to recognize a class enemy when he sees one. From the first, Washington, after a brief period of waiting

and hoping that the Labor government would fall of its own ineptitude, started a subtle and sometimes not so subtle campaign to unseat Attlee, and to bring Churchill back into power. (Oh, how they drool at the very mention of Churchill.)

PLOT BY U. S.

First, Snyder forced the devaluation of the pound on the unwilling British. His hope was that the rise in the cost of living would bring a Conservative victory. This was not to be. Although weakened, the Labor Party is still in power, and (how terrible) still insistent on nationalizing steel.

Now comes the so-called Schuman Plan. So-called, because in reality it is not a Schuman Plan, not even a Monnet plan; it is an American plan, whose aim is to solidify the tottering capitalist, reactionary regimes of Europe, not only against Stalin but to a large degree against the Labor govern-

ment of Britain. This is the real meaning of the Schuman Plan. It is part of the cold war that Washington is waging against the labor movement of Europe and the British Labor Party in particular. It is not THE major cold war of our time, but nonetheless a very real and important one.

What is the British reaction to all this? Not being taken by the internationalist Jaberwocky of the plan, they see it for what it is, namely an American maneuver to drown the nationalized steel of Britain in the river of the supra-national steel authority of private enterprisers of the Ruhr baron variety; they reject the plan outright. Is this rejection progressive or reactionary? Should we support it, or should we not? Against whom should our main fire of criticism be directed? Against Attlee or Acheson? And what is more important than all that, what should we tell the American workers?

Our job is to unmask the phony internationalism of Acheson and company which eats and corrupts the American labor movement. At every trade-union meeting, wherever we have a chance we should

put forward the idea that the time has come for American labor to establish some sort of independent foreign policy of its own. Its first task is to defend the European labor movement from the conspiracy of what Schumacher in Germany calls "Europa, Inc." For only thus can we really fight Stalinism and strike it at its very heart. To direct our main criticism at the British labor movement now is nothing else but sectarian infantilism, which at best will not accomplish its purpose, and at worst put obstacles on the road of the American worker to his self-emancipation. Our slogans should be "Down with the Reactionary Schuman Plan," "No Faith in Acheson's Phony Internationalism," "Critical Support of the Labor Party Government" and last but not least, "For an Independent Foreign Policy of American Labor."

L. JACOBY

A REPLY BY THE EDITORS—

Uncritical Defense of BLP Line Is No Service to Socialist Aims

From Comrade Jacoby's criticism it would seem that he has not had at his disposal the British Labor Party's pamphlet "European Unity." Only such a circumstance can account for his apparent misunderstanding of the questions at issue, and hence of their treatment by LABOR ACTION.

The first point that has to be made is that the BLP's statement was not primarily an answer to the Schuman Plan. This plan was only mentioned in passing. "European Unity" was a general statement of the BLP's approach to the unification of Europe under any circumstances which it foresaw, and hence its attitude toward any steps whatsoever toward the political and economic integration of Europe.

If it were just a question of the Schuman Plan, there should be no misunderstanding of LABOR ACTION's position, at least by anyone who read it. In ALL the articles in which we dealt with this question (see LABOR ACTION of June 12, 19, 26), we clearly stated that the Schuman Plan is reactionary, that it is a plan for a great capitalist steel cartel on the continent, and that the British Labor Party was perfectly correct in rejecting it.

In the issue of June 26, which correspondent Jacoby criticizes, the lead article by Mary Bell was entirely devoted to this. He says nothing about this—the lead article. An editorial note on the front page called attention to the fact that the three articles in that issue were to be read as a package, discussing the BLP statement from various angles. With Comrade Bell covering first this important angle about which Jacoby is SOLELY concerned, Comrade Draper was assigned to discuss the political content of the BLP stand.

CRITICISM NEEDED

It is true that LABOR ACTION did not proclaim, as Jacoby does, that the Schuman Plan was a plot hatched in America as a means of unifying Europe against both Stalin and the Labor government in Britain. Though the American government has given its blessings to the plan, all evidence we know of indicates that the Americans were taken as much by surprise when Schuman proposed his plan as were the British, and came around to its support after some hesitancy.

But the BLP statement said much besides rejecting the Schuman Plan. It rejected any and all efforts, even by the labor movement and the social-democracy of Europe, to unite Europe economically and politically. To such a goal it counterposed the unity of its Commonwealth and the unity of the whole "anti-Communist world," including the United States. In doing so the BLP put an obstacle on the road of the anti-Stalinist movements in Europe, and even of the very emancipation of the American labor movement in which Comrade Jacoby is so vitally interested.

Should this fundamentally nationalist stand on the question of the unification of Europe even by SOCIALIST means be criticized by American socialists? It seems to us that the meaning of Jacoby's letter, whether he realizes it or not, leads to a rejection of ALL criticism of the BLP on the ground that it has gone further than any other labor movement has done in recent times, and that if the American labor movement were to do as much, things would be far better from a socialist standpoint than they are today.

OPEN DOOR?

We cannot accept such a line of reasoning precisely because we are so deeply concerned with the effect of the BLP's "one step forward" on the American and European labor movements. And it was from such considerations that we sought to make it plain to socialists and labor people that the BLP's stand on THIS question was not "doctrinaire socialist" but basically nationalist.

To Jacoby this is battering at an open door. But he should bear in mind that the whole American press was denouncing the BLP's statement as "doctrinaire socialist." We must remember further that even though the socialists of America and Europe may not have been affected by this nonsense, American workers WERE affected. If this were not so, the labor movement here would be on a different ideological level than it actually is.

On this particular point it was a question not so much of defending the BLP against the onslaught of the capitalist press, as of distinguishing for those American workers who read LABOR ACTION between what is a socialist position and what is a narrow nationalist position.

We must also point out—re-

garding Jacoby's remarks on battering in open doors—that the analysis in LABOR ACTION on the concept of "socialism in one country" as applied to the British Labor Party has not been made before in this fashion in LA or elsewhere that we know of. If "everybody" knows all about this too, it is too bad no one has written about it.

IN BRITAIN ALONE?

JACOBY urges that we direct our main critical fire at Acheson, and not at Attlee; that we defend the Labor government of Britain against Washington and Wall Street, and that we tell the American workers to emulate the example of their British brothers.

This we have done consistently, including during the last British election. This, as mentioned, was done in the very issue of June 26. TO LIMIT ourselves to this, however—especially on the specific question of the BLP's stand on European unity—would be a sad mistake.

For here was a specific statement of the BLP. This statement indicated a road for British labor which rejects any initiative on the part of the BLP for the unification of Europe on socialist or labor lines. And in doing so, this policy of the British Labor Party not only thwarts one of the most promising political strategies for the revival of the initiative of the anti-Stalinist labor movements of Europe, it also dooms the BLP's own "first step" to inevitable defeat.

Can the BLP build socialism in Britain alone or in the Commonwealth? That, it seems to us, is excluded. But if the BLP rejects the road of EXPANDING the beginnings it has made to the continent of Europe, of seeking every opportunity to urge the workers of Europe to emulate its example, of promising them its utmost support in such efforts even if this should endanger temporarily the stability of the British experi-

ment itself, it is dooming its own efforts to ultimate frustration.

Isn't it pretty clear that Britain's present prosperity is a result of the American boom? Isn't it equally clear that a depression would be catastrophic for the standard of living of the British workers and for full employment?

SOCIALIST DUTY

But then, isn't it the duty of socialists to do everything they can to make this clear to their comrades in Britain, and to urge upon them the necessity of abandoning their narrow, nationalist outlook?

As Jacoby must know, LABOR ACTION constantly and consistently urges an independent course in both domestic and foreign policy on the American labor movement. And we very well understand that the success or failure of the BLP will have a considerable effect on the rapidly with which American labor will enter on such an independent course. That is why we are so disturbed by a statement of the BLP's policy which, if followed blindly to the end, means almost certain defeat and further demoralization of the workers both here and there.

Our main task on THIS question was not one of counterposing some abstract or ideal socialist internationalism to the nationalism of the BLP. It was, rather, that of a concrete analysis of the political and economic alternatives for the BLP as they relate to the question of European unity and hence to the viability of the BLP's own political power. And beyond that, it was one of clarifying for those progressive American workers who read LABOR ACTION, the meaning and consequences of narrow nationalism, even when it parades under the banner of socialism.

Out of a fear of "sectarianism," let us not lose a sense of proportion with regard to the duties and tasks of a socialist propaganda group in these trying times.—Ed.

The Standard Biographical Work—

"KARL MARX"

by Franz Mehring

British edition, cloth-bound—\$3.00—while they last

LABOR ACTION BOOK SERVICE

4 Court Square

Long Island City 1, N. Y.

Its Convention Weighs The Problem:

Why Is NAACP Losing Membership?

By KATE LEONARD

The 41st annual convention of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People was held in Boston from June 23 through June 25, and was followed immediately by a conference in New York which laid plans to implement the main decisions of the convention. These included a plan to wage a stepped-up campaign to enforce the recent rulings of the Supreme Court on non-discrimination in higher education and interstate transportation, and to attempt to force a widening of the decision on education to include undergraduate, secondary and elementary schools.

One fact stood out in the thinking of the delegates: the membership of the NAACP has been steadily declining. The association emerged from the war years a strong and growing organization.

Risky Question

There's an old-line banker left in existence who still thinks that bankers ought to take risks on loans and stop yelling for the government to cover them. He's Earl R. Muir, a Louisville bank president, speaking to the Minnesota Bankers Association.

Bankers, he pointed out, are supposed to be paid for taking risks. But they have been shoving more and more risks onto Uncle Same, who has been guaranteeing that the money men will suffer no loss on risky loans they make to home owners, farmers, vets, etc.

As a result, said Muir, the government is now bearing the risks on the huge sum of \$26 billion in loans of various kinds.

"By accepting government guarantees, which mean that bad loans are to be paid off by the taxpayers, we bankers," warned Muir, "are divesting ourselves of risk-taking, our fundamental function. And we are endorsing government participation in business. If government takes the risks of enterprise, who can argue that it should not have a seat on the board of directors?"

That's what he's worried about—state control of banking—and is there a banker in the house who will answer his question?

In the good year of 1947 the NAACP campaigned for 1,000,000 members. Although this goal was overestimated, this was impressive. At the 1948 convention a membership of about 580,000 was quoted. The approximate figure by the end of that year was 360,000. The figure in 1949 is estimated at around 230,000. There is widespread concern about this state of affairs.

The Rochester branch presented a resolution to the convention advocating that the NAACP limit its legislative program to the furthering of legislation which deals specifically and strictly with civil rights or with the advancement of the Negro as a distinct minority group, under the mistaken idea that this would win friends and influence people favorably toward the organization. Anyone over 30 reading this resolution would get the sensation, "This is where I came in." This proposal had as much chance of adoption by the convention as a motion to tell time to move counter-clockwise.

WHY THE LOSSES?

At least five branches presented resolutions requesting that the dues be lowered from the current \$2.00 back to the \$1.00 which was in force prior to 1948. One of these resolutions pointed out that "the membership steadily increased until 1948, when the conference raised the membership dues to \$2.00; then a rapid decline in membership"—but said the "why" of the matter was not definite. But the dues schedule is neither the cause nor the remedy of the membership crisis.

The proposals are revealing, nonetheless. They show the concern, reveal a certain conception of membership, and betray a lack of understanding of the problem involved. The loss of membership is more weighty than the figure arrived at by subtraction. The drop is the more serious in the light of the fact that the NAACP has not been ineffective in the last period, and in light of a fact which can be grasped in the street—that Negroes are not pessimistic today and here.

Partial reasons are advanced for this state of the membership. Depression, the failure of the civil rights program on the legislative front, or Stalinist infiltration, are given in turn. There has been no "depression" of an intensity to produce this result. A temporary disillusionment followed the 1948 elections, in which the NAACP all but abandoned its formal non-partisan stand. But return to the fray was inevitable. It will be another day when Negroes advise President Truman to ignore the legislature, and yet another day when they follow the logic of this advice and abandon their demands upon Congress.

Nor could Stalinist infiltration (which is real enough) produce this serious organizational limp.

IN A PRISON HOUSE

The decline in membership is influenced by two main factors. The first is that the NAACP is caught in the grip of the non-partisan political policy, a prison house it shares with labor.

This would be recognized by any worker who thinks in class terms, for he can see himself in the NAACP mirror. Still thinking in class terms, he can ask, indeed: Where is the lead of the CIO which Negroes are ready to follow? The establishment of a partisan policy for the NAACP can only look something like this: "This convention endorses the labor party's program." This would require, quite simply, a labor party with a program to be endorsed.

Labor's program and that of the NAACP practically coincide right now, and it is apparent that this is not enough. Since we have always understood that even labor parties do not fall from the sky, but are born if at all, in struggle, it is not hard to see that the NAACP, which is not a class organization, also requires an internal clearing of the air. This could be achieved only with effort by its worker members. A movement toward a labor party, if it could see one on the horizon to which to give their allegiance, could help them in this task. We suspect that a labor-party card in the breast pocket would ably assist them.

The second reason affecting the NAACP membership is contained in the structure and in the method of administration of the NAACP. The difficulty has been roughly expressed: "The national office tries to hog the whole show." This disability, by the way, the Stalinists are not slow to seize upon to attempt to advance their own special interests.

The NAACP is run from the

national office, and policy is in the hands of a board and officers responsible to each other, for all practical purposes. How this came about and was continued is a long story, extending back 40 years to the origin of the association. The NAACP was organized from without, and it is probably correct to say that in 1909 it would not have been organized otherwise.

Likewise the dominance of the national office is in some respects unavoidable, and it is far from being all bad. The issues the NAACP deals with frequently start locally. Defense cases start on the spot. So do disfranchisement and educational cases, etc., begin as local issues. They are of national importance and frequently require centralized handling.

However, 40 years is long to wait for appreciable progress toward a remedy for the crying need of the association—a vital branch life. It is equally long to wait for an end to a bureaucratically-arrived-at policy, formulated and executed by an all but self-perpetuating leadership.

(To be continued)

Guild Project

The convention of the Newspaper Guild heard some reports which did not impress the publishers as being newsworthy enough to print—nor complimentary enough.

President Harry Martin set the keynote by declaring that most U. S. newspapers during 1950 made a "malodorous record of miserable failure" in their obligation to keep the people informed "fully, fairly and accurately." Guild officers also voiced alarm over the growing trend to monopoly in the press, as more and more papers are merged or abandoned.

The convention voted to create a special committee on a proposal that the union spearhead a drive, in collaboration with other unions and "civic groups," to establish newspapers "dedicated to the public interest" in cities where publishers now have a monopoly.

Canada Too

Canada's military budget—18 per cent of the total budget—is now almost as large as the country's whole budget before the war.

This, in a country which has a population hardly a tenth of that of the United States, is even more serious than the similar growth of the war economy here. More and

RR Union Asks - -

(Continued from page 1)
do, and called a strike on five railroads in the Midwest and Far West.

TRUMAN ZIGZAGS

Then the "police action" in Korea broke out. The president stated that it is not a war, and his press secretary stated that there is no "atmosphere of emergency" as far as the government is concerned. But the chairman of the National Mediation Board (a body which acts under the Railway Labor Act) wired the Switchmen's Union of North America and asked them to call off the strike in view of "current critical developments."

Glover replied that he did not know what developments were referred to, but that if it was the war in Korea the union stood ready to handle any troops or munitions required.

Then in a press conference on July 6 Truman declared that the strike was unjustified and that he would take drastic action unless it was called off.

Why was the strike "unjustified"? In the eyes of Truman, because the union had failed to abide by the decision of his fact-finding board. The president has a right to his private opinion, like any other citizen, on whether or not a union should accept the findings of such a board. But what legal right has he to make that opinion a basis of government action? None, of course. When workers are concerned it seems that the matter of legality can be safely ignored.

At that press conference the president did not say that "drastic action" was justified because we are at war in Korea. He stated that the rail services are needed to move cattle and wheat from the West.

THE UNION FINDS OUT

On that very same day the union called off the strike on four of the five roads. The strike remained in effect on the Rock Island, which is paralleled by other roads. In calling off the strike, the president of the Switchmen stated: "Railroad management has made no move to settle this dispute. Railroad management merely has said, 'Go on strike; we don't care. The government will come in on our side and knock the hell out of the Switchmen's Union.' And, judging from President Truman's remarks today, railroad management has been on the right track.

"Our strike is legal. We have

complied with all provisions of the Railway Labor Act. Well, now we'll just find out whether a legal strike against a railroad is possible in this free country."

We found out next day when Truman ordered the army to seize the road.

Two days after he had said the strike should end in the interest of moving wheat and cattle, Truman changed his tune. His seizure order states, in part: "It is essential to the national defense and to the security of the nation, to the public health and to the public welfare generally, that every possible step be taken by the government for the operation of this railroad."

Even in the face of this action, the Switchmen's Union stood firm. It replied in a public statement that the strike on the Rock Island would continue until "the government seizes the profits of that railroad as well as the labor of free men."

The statement continued: "The president has said that the United States is not at war. Is the democratic president of a democratic country saying that no railroad union can conduct a legal strike in peacetime?"

WARNING TO RR LABOR

The fact is that we are at war, even though the war is at present a small one. But as Truman has evaded his constitutional duty to have war declared by act of Congress, we are not LEGALLY at war. But it seems it is the administration's attitude that even if the government can violate the Constitution, the workers must make the sacrifices demanded of them in wartime.

The immediate reason for Truman's strikebreaking is not the switchmen's strike on the Rock Island. This is a heavy blow to one union as a warning to others who may have the idea that just because the employers and bankers are coining money hand over fist in the most brazen profit splurge in American history they can seek a few economic gains too.

The warning is particularly directed to the trainmen and conductors who have rejected the same findings by an emergency board and whose strike deadline is July 15. Truman is letting them know in no uncertain way that if they should exercise their legal and moral right to strike, he will proceed to throw his weight on the side of the employers.

To date the Switchmen have set an excellent example for the rest

of the labor movement. We wonder just what Truman would do if the Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen and the Order of Railway Conductors were to follow that example.

PUT THE HEAT ON!

So far the labor movement has not fulfilled its duty to the Switchmen. True, both Philip Murray of the CIO and William Green of the AFL sent messages to the Switchmen's Union wishing it a victory in its strike—that was before Truman's actions. Much of the labor movement is just waking up to the fact that railroad workers are far behind the rest of labor in many of their working conditions. But so far the labor movement has been shamefully silent on Truman's strikebreaking.

The reason for this is obvious. Not only have most of the labor leaders enthusiastically endorsed the government's Korean military adventure, but they are ardent supporters of the Fair Deal administration in the coming elections. It isn't likely that these leaders will end their political alliance with Truman just because he breaks a strike. After all, it would not be the first time he has done that!

Whatever may be the reasons for the silence of the labor leaders, there is no reason for the ranks to be silent. If the Korean conflict, which the government pretends is not even a war, can be used by it as justification to break a strike and to put the heat on the unions, what can be expected as the war atmosphere gets thicker? Every militant in the labor movement should give thought to this matter right now, before the government and the employers get too bold in their clampdown on the workers.

Besides giving this question some thought, progressive workers should give it some action. Resolutions introduced in local unions all over the country condemning Truman's strikebreaking, offering support to the Switchmen and urging union officers to put the heat on the government are the least that should be done.

And if that is the least, there is also one step further. The unions could declare that they refuse to handle goods shipped under military dictatorship. (As Glover said, this is supposed to be "peacetime.") If they did so, they would be taking a step of simple solidarity in the common defense of the hard-won rights of American workers.

New York

SOCIALIST YOUTH LEAGUE SUMMER SCHOOL

Six sessions. Every Tuesday night for six weeks

Session 3 on Tuesday
JULY 18

I THE THEORETICAL ROOTS OF MARXISM

7:30-9:00 p.m.

II THE RUSSIAN REVOLUTION AND THE EUROPEAN REVOLUTION 1917-1923

Instructors: Max Shachtman and Hal Draper

9:00-10:30 p.m.

50 cents for each class or 10 cents for each session

at
LABOR ACTION HALL
114 West 14th Street, 3rd floor
New York City

Read THE NEW
INTERNATIONAL