

# LABOR ACTION

Independent Socialist Weekly

JULY 24, 1950

FIVE CENTS

## WILL TRUMAN USE THE BOMB?

Hanging over the Korean war is this question among others: Will Truman use the atom bomb?

The question is in the air. The head of the British Atomic Scientists' Association, Dr. Peierls, has said that it "should be out of the question." The mayors of Hiroshima and Nagasaki and the governor of Hiroshima province have called on the U. S. not to use it.

But the decision is still up in the air. Winston Churchill has made a speech in which he again confesses the bankruptcy of Western capitalism with the admission that "only America's atomic bomb stockpile stands between Europe and subjugation by the Kremlin" (as the N. Y. Herald Tribune reports it, not quoting). A British Tory MP and a U. S. congressman have called for it to be dropped.

Truman has said nothing—in connection with the A-bomb and the Korean war. But he has said plenty on the subject before. Few men have been as brash as he in justifying the dropping of its wholesale slaughter on Japan, even after official government surveys revealed *ex post facto* that Japan was going to surrender even before the big A fell. "And I would do it again," he has reiterated since then.

His justification? It saved American lives, he claims.

On the basis of Truman's defense of the A-bomb over Japan, why should he not order it to be dropped on the North Koreans? American soldiers are being killed in the Korean "slaughterhouse," are they not?

In backhand fashion, American hesitations to use the monstrous weapon in this war cast a light on the enormity of its use in 1945. They also light up the blind alley of U. S. politics of the present time.

Many of the objections to using the A-bomb from the sources mentioned above are based on practical military considerations. Dr. Peierls, for example, argued that it would be "most ineffective" especially because North Korea lacks vital industrial centers. If such were the decisive factors, it would be a purely military decision.

But as a matter of fact, a powerful force restraining the hand of Truman (who even sometimes gives the impression that he likes to pose as Jupiter with the atomic lightning in his grasp) is *political*. The U. S. has few shreds of prestige left in the Far East. Let it drop the bomb and lack of prestige could turn to raging hatred—revulsion not only in the Far East but throughout Europe, let alone the U. S.

And yet, the A-bomb has been so large a part of U. S. foreign policy—for lack of any other appeal it can make—that there is no reason at all for confidence that Washington will not commit the crime.

Men have perhaps recoiled from the A-bomb more as a symbol than on the basis of logic. It is only too easy to write one of those tough-minded Burnham-type demonstrations that an A-bomb is no worse morally than a napalm bomb which burns men alive inside a tank. And yet it is those who recoil who are right.

It is partly because the atom bomb is more useful to slaughter civilians than to kill soldiers. It is partly because it threatens not only lives but civilization itself. It is partly because it epitomizes what modern war has become in all its aspects.

Without depreciating these, it is also true that the *direct* political effect of using the A-bomb in Korea would be the final confession that the U. S. has nothing else to offer to counter totalitarian Stalinism. But that is exactly why its threat is still in the air.

And those lost souls who were against imperialism up to yesterday and now find that there is no alternative to supporting the U. S.—will they be able to think of a "practical" alternative to Truman's decision if it comes?

## First War Sacrifices Hit Housing, Democratic Rights At Home to Gear for War

By MARY BELL

In the same way as a luxury liner is trimmed and stripped down for conversion into a troop transport, the U. S. and its economy are again being stripped down for war, only five years since the last war ended.

Among the first things to be jettisoned are democratic rights, hard-won economic gains of the working people, social legislation in which labor is interested, and government aid toward improving the standard of living. The war in Korea is still undeclared; officially it still has the status of a "police action." But all the anti-working-class accompaniments of war are beginning to make themselves felt hand in hand with this "police action."

• Even preceding his message to Congress on Wednesday, President Truman struck the first blow on the economic field against the country's No. 1 social need—housing. Using his executive powers, he issued directives which will "immediately curb the spending of the Housing and Home Finance Agency, the Veterans Administration and the Reconstruction Finance Corporation in the housing field," according to the N. Y. Times on the morning of Truman's message.

The maximum amount of mortgage insurance allowed on a property will be reduced by 5 per cent,

thus requiring the purchaser to increase his cash-down payment by the same amount. To qualify for FHA loans for modernization and repairs, a 10 per cent cash-down payment will now be needed (none before). Credits for home financing institutions will be reduced "substantially." The starting of new public housing will be held down to not more than 30,000 dwelling units in the first six months of fiscal 1950—a pittance compared with the proclaimed need. Commitments already made for construction loans to educational institutions are suspended.

Truman's message to Congress, scheduled for Wednesday, July 19, afternoon, comes too late to be discussed in this issue. Next week! —Ed.

Against this prime need of the people, Truman's action has been swift. Price rollbacks, profit control and other measures which will be demanded by labor are—and according to administration spokesmen, will be for an indefinite time—merely talked about.

• The dictatorially decreed, legally unchallengeable attorney general's "subversive" blacklist, which has the president's approval, is now being applied to the armed forces.

According to special regulation 600-220-1, either membership or "sympathetic association with" any of the 175 organizations arbitrarily characterized by the attorney general as "totalitarian, fascist, Communist, subversive, or as having adopted a policy to deny others their rights under the Constitution of the United States, or which seek to alter the form of government of the United States by unconstitutional means is grounds for a "prima facie case of disloyalty." Possible consequences of membership or "sympathy" include discharge and imprisonment.

The organizations on the attorney general's list have been given no opportunity whatsoever to defend themselves or even to know the grounds for being listed. This totalitarian technique, plus the "guilt by association" clause, has been taken over lock, stock and barrel by the armed forces. (Turn to last page)

## DETROIT LABOR AND KOREA—

# UAW Leaders Fall in Line

By WALTER JASON

DETROIT, July 16—From boom-crazy to war-worry has been the sudden turn of character of this vast industrial center, with its hopped-up auto production reaching new and dizzy heights, a manufacturers' race to build them while steel and other metals are available.

Just one month ago, auto manufacturers were establishing new production records, with many if not all plants working six days a week, and some departments on a seven-day schedule.

Unable to win genuine wage increases, in relation to the growing cost of living, the auto workers were making out by the fact that on Saturdays they were getting time and a half.

The usual spring rush of sales did not have its summer leveling-off. Cars were becoming hard to get one month ago.

And then came the Korean crisis and the military campaign.

Within a week, car prices shot up from \$200 to \$1,000 above list prices. Either you took a beating on your trade-in or you didn't get an expected delivery. This past week dealers quit taking orders

on some of the low-priced makes—too much trouble.

Some of the major manufacturers like Chrysler suggested the union approve a 9-hour day, six days a week.

As part of the inevitable process, observed everywhere, meat prices took another leap skyward. Garages sold out their stock of tires. Sears Roebuck sold every tire it had last Saturday.

Turning from thoughts of vacations and trips and a good living, the people began to get ready to beat the game. "Ain't gonna get caught this time without tires or a good car!"

It's every man for himself and tough luck for the last one. Surely, no nation was ever as poorly prepared, unless it was France in 1939, for a major political crisis as America today, if Detroit is any reflection of the country.

## LOYALTY OATH AT FORD

Like the military brass hats and the Washington politicians, the labor leaders were caught completely by surprise by events. But some of them knew how to

take factional advantage of the new situation.

Big Ford Local 600 has been quite a thorn in the side of the Reuther leadership. Most of the officers and General Council were anti-Reuther, in a conglomeration of Stalinists, independents, embittered opponents of the past, and the usual run of "outs," who had just squeezed in.

Carl Stellato, the pro-Reuther president, was having his hands full, especially since the UAW was facing speed-up problems and the threat of some important decentralization of Ford production.

Facing this kind of dilemma, Stellato utilized the Korean war to isolate his vociferous Stalinist opponents and make everyone else fall in line. Aided by the Reuther leadership, Stellato introduced a loyalty oath for all 600 officials. It demanded 100 per cent approval of President Truman's program on Korea, it demanded 100 per cent support of all CIO policy, and it threatened any official with expulsion who did not sign a pledge of allegiance to this entire program. Another significant program. (Turn to last page)

"I never saw such a uselessly damned war in all my life," said a "grimy, be-whiskered, bloodshot-eyed officer" on the Korea front, according to an AP dispatch (N. Y. Times, July 13).



MacArthur's Formula—

# "Spit in Their Eye First And Then Talk to Them!"

By WALTER JASON

The auto workers' president, Walter P. Reuther, and his whole political following are seeking to convince themselves that the coming all-out war with Stalinism can be fought, under the present national leadership, as a war of democracy against totalitarianism, and victory is assured.

In any such war, psychological warfare—as the fancy name for political propaganda is called these days—is destined to play a major role in the eyes of the pro-war social-democrats.

On this aspect, we would like to recommend a few quotations by authoritative American leaders as the subject for some thought.

Recently General Bedell Smith, former ambassador to Russia, testified before Congress on the question of a real psychological warfare against Stalinism with the use of the "Voice of America" program.

In passing he made quite a commentary on the thinking of the military leaders of this country during World War II. He said that when he was ordered to add a psychological-warfare staff to his command in World War II "I thought it was a group of crack-

pots. I paid dearly for that, and I have learned." He said his experience in Russia changed his mind about the subject.

"In the army we've talked a lot about morale, but we always translated it in terms of good food for the soldier, good hospitalization, good quarters and the like [an idea that was modern in the time of Frederick the Great—W. J.]. We never thought in terms of the psychological, although we know civil wars are the most violently fought because those are the only wars in which those doing the fighting really understand why they are fighting."

## "SPIT IN THEIR EYE!"

In his otherwise objective article on America's military weakness in the current issue of the Saturday Evening Post, Hanson W. Baldwin ignores that basic point. To "understand why they are fighting," to "believe in it"—it is clear that studies of Trotsky's military views at the military colleges have stuck in the minds of the brass.

The other side of this coin is to make the opponents disbelieve in what they are fighting for; and the psychological failure in World

War II was obvious. How about the coming struggle with Stalinism?

After an interview with General Douglas MacArthur, reporter Jack MacCardle wrote the following: "General MacArthur thinks the West has made a bad mistake in treating the Russians as Orientals. He regards them as Westerners, as Mongols. And, as such, his own formula is to spit in their eye first and then talk to them."

Imagine the effect of that statement beamed on the Voice of America program to Russia and to the Asiatic peoples! The State Department need not worry about broadcasting those views. The Stalinist press throughout the world will do so, willingly and with glee.

Was this just a slip of the tongue, an off-the-record statement? Perhaps just a MacArthur deviation?

Averell Harriman, President Truman's "Harry Hopkins," who has had much personal experience with the Russians, is quoted in the New York Times of July 2: "He considers the Kremlin leaders and the Russians as a whole to be barbarians." What the Stalinists will do with that statement in contrast to Harriman's flattering pro-Russian statements during the last war hardly needs belaboring.

## DIXIECRAT STUFF

The extent to which this chauvinistic and Hitlerian idea (as Professor Pushkarev of Yale has pointed out in the Times of July 16) has gripped all circles of American leadership was illustrated graphically by the usually calm and objective Hanson W. Baldwin, one of the nation's leading military critics.

Writing in the N. Y. Times on Friday, July 14, Baldwin says: "We are facing an army of barbarians in Korea, but they are barbarians as trained, as relentless, as reckless of life and as skilled in the tactics of the kind of war they fight as the hordes of Genghis Khan."

Leaving aside the important example of fear of Stalinism expressed in the analogy to the invincible Genghis Khan, Baldwin insults all the "allies" of America in Korea—unless he is willing to explain that any South Korean who fights well does so because he is not a barbarian, but the North Korean is a barbarian because he does fight well!

When the Dixiecrats used reactionary ideas of this sort to beat down the bill to give Hawaii Statehood, the alibi of the Reuther type was that this did not represent majority thinking in the national government.

What about the new evidence in the form of authoritative leaders speaking Dixiecrat language? We expect only silence from the social-democrats. The new Voice of America will be not the least of Stalin's allies in the future period. Such reactionary ideas are precisely what Stalin's mill, strengthening Moscow's totalitarian hold over its oppressed masses in the world.

As for a war of democracy against totalitarianism? It's hardly an auspicious beginning. Besides, didn't we all go through with that act not very long ago?

**RESERVATION BLANK FOR THE NATIONAL ISL-SYL CAMP**

SEPTEMBER 7-17

Name .....

Address .....

\$5.00 fee inclosed.....

## Democracy Lives On: Rhee Insists Cabinet Visit Him

Where is the South Korean government?

In a UP dispatch dated "Somewhere in Korea" in the N. Y. Herald Tribune, July 14, we are informed that there still is one, in a manner of speaking.

Syngman Rhee "has retired to a small town in South Korea for his personal safety" where he waits "impatiently" to resume his power. When Seoul was abandoned, "an emergency capital was set up in Taejeon, but the president went into hiding."

"The cabinet meets here once in a while," he said. "I insisted on that. Otherwise they could not keep me here."

"Oh," Mr. Rhee added, "we still have a government."

While the headlines scream that the Stalinists are shooting American prisoners, buried paragraphs in the news continue to report the atrocities on the other side of the lines. Firing squads are working overtime in South Korea. Since the war began, "more than 1200 Communist spies and guerrillas" have been executed.

At the same time other dispatches plainly state that the South Korean police chief, Kim Tai Sun, admits that men are still executed on suspicion alone, without even moral certainty, let alone a trial.

"Jittery GIs who have been attacked by 'gooks'—as they call the North Korean Communists—now are understandably inclined to fire first and ask questions later when meeting any distinguished-looking [!] Korean," reports Marguerite Higgins, in the N. Y. Herald Tribune, July 14.

In the British Parliament, Labor MP Emrys Hughes asked the prime minister to see that reports of North Korean atrocities were balanced by the "very substantial" reports of atrocities committed by the South against the North. Attlee replied that the point was "irrelevant."

**SPECIAL COMBINATION OFFER!**

Books and Pamphlets by Leon Trotsky

The Permanent Revolution ..... \$3.50

Markism in the U. S. .... 1.50

The Lesson of Spain ..... .35

Trade Unions in the Epoch of Imperialist Decay ..... .25

Fascism, What It Is, How to Fight It ..... 1.5

**ALL FOR ONLY \$5.00**

Labor Action Book Service  
4 Court Square  
Long Island City 1, N. Y.

## LABOR SCOPE

NMU Curran Leadership Hits Alien Seamen

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 National Council has announced that as of July 21, non-resident aliens will be forced to retire their books in the NMU. To Joseph Curran and the reactionary element among the membership, this may seem an easy way to solve the growing unemployment problem, but such a proposal, which would amputate one segment of the membership, is completely contrary to the fundamental principles of trade-union organization.

In the maritime labor unions today, it must be recognized that there are a proportion of aliens who have been sailing American-flag ships with no intention of ever becoming citizens. However, there are a good proportion of non-citizens who have not been able to complete five years' sea time aboard America-flag vessels, due to decrease in shipping, and who have therefore been unable to obtain their first papers.

There are many loyal NMU alien members who have been sailing foreign ships for some time and this number will be substantially increased when the alien quota reverts to the pre-war figure in June. Had the National Office been responsive to the insistence of ships' crews that a foreign-flag department of the union

Get your L.A. every week! Subscribe at \$2 a year!

## COME TO THE WISCONSIN SUMMER CAMP-SCHOOL!

By the CAMP COMMITTEE

The Socialist Youth League and the Independent Socialist League are sponsoring for the benefit of their comrades and friends a national camp and school during the week of September 7-17. The encampment is being held at the Workman's Benefit Fund's Recreation Camp at Genoa City, located in picturesque Southern Wisconsin, about fifty-five miles northwest of Chicago.

Every feature of this encampment contributes to making it one of the most worthwhile educational and recreational projects held by the SYL and ISL, and it gives promise of being a stimulating and pleasurable ten days. Many comrades and friends from all parts of the country will attend and we will have an opportunity of meeting new and old friends, exchanging ideas, and enjoying a healthy spirit of comradeship.

The camp itself covers an area of 235 acres of woodland, farm area, fields, and camp sites. The living quarters are ample and pleasant, with clean private rooms and modern toilet facilities. Choice foods that are excellently prepared in "old German style" are served in cafeteria fashion in a large dining hall.

Among the camp's attractive features are bowling alleys, dance hall with juke box, a cold-water swimming pond, baseball diamond, indoor and outdoor facilities for holding classes, rathskellar serving the best Milwaukee brews, and the broad expanses in which to enjoy the healthful Wisconsin climate.

There will be a full program of socialist education and discussion, cultural and social activities of various sorts, as well as an extensive recreational program.

Our educational program as it is tentatively set up will consist of a series of five lectures by Hal Draper on contemporary critics of Marxism (including Hook and John Dewey) and a series of five lectures by Max Shachtman including: America in Europe and Social Democracy in Power. A debate will take place between Shachtman and Draper on political-action policy.

A thorough recreational and social program is now being worked out. It will include various sports activities such as baseball, touch football, volleyball, swimming, etc. We also intend to have some social activity each evening—camp fires—weenie roast and folk songs.

The great value of this camp for individual friends and members of the ISL and SYL and the organizations themselves roasts and folk songs.

Why not make this your summer vacation? Fill out the enclosed application blank (including whatever communications, questions and/or suggestions you may have) and mail it with a five dollar deposit to:

Socialist Youth League  
Post Office Box No. 8112  
Chicago, Illinois

The deposit will enable us to make a down payment on the total expense to the owners of the camp. The cost per individual for the entire encampment will be \$40 (including your deposit). \$5 per day will be the cost for seven days or less.

Come up for one of the week-ends if you cannot make the full ten days.

Norman Thomas Group Gives Uncritical Support—

# SP Shelves Socialism in Pro-War Resolution

By PHILIP COHEN

The Socialist Party, in a unanimous resolution of its National Action Committee, made public by Norman Thomas, has jumped wholeheartedly on the war bandwagon in support of American imperialism in Korea.

Unlike most SP resolutions, there are no ifs and buts in this one. Not since its St. Louis resolution of 1917 has it taken such a forthright position on a war. The measure of what has happened to the "party of Debs" (as they nostalgically still like to call it) is seen in the difference between the two documents. In 1917 Debs opposed THAT imperialism war in the name of the fight for socialism. In 1950 Norman Thomas' SP offers unqualified support in a brief statement "without a socialist idea in it."

There is no criticism of U. S. policy other than the phrase "despite the mistakes of our government in the past and the shortcomings [sic] of the South Korea gov-

ernment..." There is no mention of the new Truman doctrine to take military responsibility for Formosa, Indo-China, the Philippines as well as Korea.

That the SP should support the Korean war is itself not in the least surprising in view of its evolution in the past years. Even so, what is noteworthy about its statement is the fact that it does not even bother to offer "socialist" reasons for its stand. The statement could have been written by any pro-war liberal in the country.

Its first paragraph straightforwardly presents the transparent fable about "President Truman's action on Korea in line with the Security Council's recommendations..." This is simply dishonest. The UN okayed Truman's military intervention after the event. The SP not only falsifies this fact but has nothing to say about Truman's one-man decision independent of his own Congress as well as of the UN.

There is no criticism of U. S. policy other than the phrase "despite the mistakes of our government in the past and the shortcomings [sic] of the South Korea gov-

ernment..." There is no mention of the new Truman doctrine to take military responsibility for Formosa, Indo-China, the Philippines as well as Korea.

That the SP should support the Korean war is itself not in the least surprising in view of its evolution in the past years. Even so, what is noteworthy about its statement is the fact that it does not even bother to offer "socialist" reasons for its stand. The statement could have been written by any pro-war liberal in the country.

Its first paragraph straightforwardly presents the transparent fable about "President Truman's action on Korea in line with the Security Council's recommendations..." This is simply dishonest. The UN okayed Truman's military intervention after the event. The SP not only falsifies this fact but has nothing to say about Truman's one-man decision independent of his own Congress as well as of the UN.

ermment..." There is no mention of the new Truman doctrine to take military responsibility for Formosa, Indo-China, the Philippines as well as Korea.

That the SP should support the Korean war is itself not in the least surprising in view of its evolution in the past years. Even so, what is noteworthy about its statement is the fact that it does not even bother to offer "socialist" reasons for its stand. The statement could have been written by any pro-war liberal in the country.

Its first paragraph straightforwardly presents the transparent fable about "President Truman's action on Korea in line with the Security Council's recommendations..." This is simply dishonest. The UN okayed Truman's military intervention after the event. The SP not only falsifies this fact but has nothing to say about Truman's one-man decision independent of his own Congress as well as of the UN.

ermment..." There is no mention of the new Truman doctrine to take military responsibility for Formosa, Indo-China, the Philippines as well as Korea.

That the SP should support the Korean war is itself not in the least surprising in view of its evolution in the past years. Even so, what is noteworthy about its statement is the fact that it does not even bother to offer "socialist" reasons for its stand. The statement could have been written by any pro-war liberal in the country.

Its first paragraph straightforwardly presents the transparent fable about "President Truman's action on Korea in line with the Security Council's recommendations..." This is simply dishonest. The UN okayed Truman's military intervention after the event. The SP not only falsifies this fact but has nothing to say about Truman's one-man decision independent of his own Congress as well as of the UN.

## Out of the Mothballs: Racism Emerges Too

By HENRY JUDD

Everything's coming out of mothballs these days. Our naval vessels, freighters, bombers and C-54s are all being demoted; whatever equipment remained from the last war is being given the treatment. We saw a picture of a machine gun being boiled in water to dissolve the storage grease on it.

Unfortunately, the same may be said with respect to the political and social ideas being advanced by the American camp in this war. They too are emerging from the mothballs. Better if they had been left there.

A sample was the leaflet drawn up by, for and about General MacArthur, published in last week's LABOR ACTION. We note how the GIs and their officers automatically slipped into use of that contemptible term "Gooks" in referring to the Koreans. It was used in the last war to refer to all Asiatics.

We further note that the same total absence of political education, understanding or comprehension of what it is all about exists in the Korean campaign as it did among the GIs who fought in World War II. "We gotta lick 'em, the gooks," seems to be the idea.

In fact, the true nature of the "little hot war" is all too clearly indicated in the attitudes, ideas and opinions it has already created. On the home front, in the big bourgeois circles there is that drooling lust for the inflated war profits and endless war contracts; on the international front, there is that concept of crushing the enemy and clamping a lid tight down upon him before sitting on the lid itself.

## Land:

In Korea, as in all of Asia, land and the peasantry is still the key social question. It took the Stalinist-trained demagogues from North Korea exactly four days from the beginning of their attack to begin a program of mass land distribution and expropriation of the landlords.

Accompanying this, of course, is the usual fatal Stalinist price of a totalitarian dictatorship over the peasantry and the masses of the capital city of Seoul, but the Stalinists showed no hesitation at

instituting the most sweeping social measures for partition of land and landlord property.

The South Korean government (by the way, just where is it now?) indignantly announced—curses on its ironic fate!—that it was "just on the eve" of "sweeping land reforms!" Then came that Sunday dawn. . . . It would be much too rude to query what they had been doing the previous five years.

And, by the by, is it the American intention to patch together the distributed segments of land and return them to the landlords, together with assorted bits of clothing, furniture and property which the Stalinists have handed out to the peasants?

## Reconsidering:

The effects of the Korean war are causing much reconsideration in political and governing circles. We note that Marshal Tito's chief spokesman, hailed as an authority on Marxism-Leninism in the so-called Fourth International press, has thrown out some olive branch feelers to Marshal Stalin, stating that if the marshal-in-chief will only permit his offspring to "live in peace," their quarrel could easily be patched up—a simple family dispute, don't you know.

We would hesitate to predict how Stalin will treat this offer of peace (otherwise known as capitulation), but a friendly word of warning is in order to those socialist circles flirting with Titoism. Given half a chance, Tito will show the real Stalinist stuff of which he is constructed.

The pitiful remnants of the "degenerated workers' state" movement—that collection of individuals who persist in disgracing the name of Trotsky—are confronted by a new crisis. Shall they defend North Korea (the march of "progressive" nationalized property), or shall they take a stand against both camps? Reports indicate a state of conflict and confusion, involving the so-called International Center of this organization.

## Embarrassment:

The frantic efforts of Pandit Nehru of India to bring about some kind of mediation in the Korean "big little hot war" is proving most embarrassing to the American government. Having received the most terrific shock of its political life when the criminal Stalinist onslaught first began, the Truman administration hastily devised the program of pulling something out of the mess by utilizing it as a cover for launching a par-

tial military and economic mobilization.

But such things take time, energy and planning. If, heavens forbid, serious mediation were to begin now, what would happen to the one possible solace and consolation (a stepped-up mobilization) which could still come out of the sorry story of Korea?

At this stage, the possibility of serious negotiations for calling off the whole thing appear remote indeed. We sympathize with the dilemma of Nehru, caught between his realization of American imperialist unpopularity among the Asiatic masses (his own included), and his fear of Stalinist onslaughts elsewhere. He really wants to end it all before. . . .

But with the American government anxious to use this convenient cover for making up lost time, and Stalin just as anxious to administer a terrific beating to the Americans, what chance is there at this moment for the Korean people to find peace and an end to their torment? Only if a clear military stalemate develops, where it becomes plain that the Americans cannot be dislodged (nor, for that matter, conquer the country), is it possible to think seriously of a truce or negotiated peace.

But much can happen before then. We fear that Nehru is chasing illusions.

## "Power-Drunk"? U. S. Has a Headache in Asia

By JAMES M. FENWICK

An article by John G. Wright on United States policy in the Far East printed in the July 10 issue of the Socialist Workers Party's Militant is very neat confirmation of the contention that if politics can be defined as the art of the possible for normal political movements, for the SWP it is the art of the finished program.

... the dominant factor in the world situation right now," says Wright, "is this avowed strategic aim of the power-drunk American imperialists and militarists to gain unchallenged mastery over all of Asia."

Power-drunk? This is said of a country which has just witnessed the debacle of its policy in China, which up to a few weeks ago had written off Formosa, which sees its allies bogged down in Malaya and Indo-China, and is currently being run out of Korea. Power-drunk? Why, up to a few weeks ago the military considered Korea as indefensible in any major war. The fact is that the United

States, far from having an "avowed strategic aim" for the Far East, has been improvising, as recent abrupt switches in policy indicate. It is politically and militarily on the defensive and will remain so in this area for a long, long time.

First of all, the United States has no political program capable of moving the Asian masses to its support, second, it has neither the manpower nor material even to begin to attempt "to gain unchallenged mastery over all of Asia."

## U. S. STRESSES EUROPE

Anyone with political sensitivity knows that a crisis over Far Eastern policy is brewing in Washington. And there is more evidence of a certain demoralization than there is of power-drunkness. It is, to pursue Wright's figure, a period of sobering up.

States, far from having an "avowed strategic aim" for the Far East, has been improvising, as recent abrupt switches in policy indicate. It is politically and militarily on the defensive and will remain so in this area for a long, long time.

This is a purely gratuitous assumption having little relation to reality. The dominant factor is not the aim of United States imperialism "to gain unchallenged mastery over all of Asia" but to defeat Russia in the first instance on the European scene. From the political, economic, and military point of view Europe is many times more important to the United States in the present juncture than is Asia. Were Stalin to gain control of Europe the posi-

tion of the United States would indeed be perilous.

That is why whatever is thrown into the Far Eastern struggle will always be of less importance than what is directed to the European continent. In this respect the motivating argument will be the same as that which gave priority to the struggle against Hitler in World War II. That this poses unpleasant dilemmas for the United States is indubitable, but such are the contradictions currently facing United States capitalism.

Currently the United States has no intention of permitting Russia to bleed the United States white in Asia. The extent of the commitment of the United States in the Far East will form the axis of the impending discussion of State Department policy. But that the major emphasis will be put on Europe cannot be doubted—Barrington, of course, the type of idiocy which the SWP can afford but which United States capitalism, having more at stake, at least in a material way, cannot.

## NOTHING LEFT

In the very same issue of the Socialist Call (July 7) the semi-editorial column written by Associate Editor Merman Singer gets a bit more radical. It actually mentions capitalism and imperialism. Whereas Russia has "acted with dictatorial precision" in Asia, he writes, "American activity has been characterized largely by an ineffectiveness caused by a failure to articulate a clear-cut imperialist policy." If this is not an interesting slip of the pen, it sounds like a demand for a clear-cut imperialist policy! The thought of the whole column is so formless, however, that the sentence remains unconnected with anything before or after it.

The SP's treatment of the war is, finally, topped off by a column by Norman Thomas describing his emotions after he awoke on Sunday, June 25. But he came through the experience unscathed: "Fortunately for me I had a job to do that hot Sunday in Brooklyn, and work helps to keep us sane." Following which he presents some recommendations by which "we Americans" can prevent this sort of thing in the future.

Following the recent national convention of the SP, at which a majority voted down Norman Thomas's proposal to stop running socialist candidates and to support the left wing of the Democrats instead, some of the left-wingers remaining in the organization experienced a brief spell of hope that leftism was on the upswing in the moribund organization. The Social-Democratic Federation had just turned down the SP's plea for a merger. There are no illusions left now.

The Norman Thomas group is well past its crossroads. Unanimous though may be the position of the National Action Committee (a subcommittee of the National Executive Committee, not the full committee), there are still anti-war elements in the SP, especially among the young Socialists. It is hard to imagine that they are going to kid themselves any more about "reforming" the organization.

For these comrades there is no organization in which they can continue the fight against war and capitalism except the Independent Socialist League, which stands out as the socialist opponent of the war by both capitalism and Stalinism.



# 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. ....

# YOU and SCIENCE

### Niels Bohr Appeals for an "Open World"

By CARL DARTON  
As war activities continue to increase in Korea and the United States prepares to enforce a "Pax Americana" throughout the world, scientists pleadings for international cooperation may seem quixotic. But the readers of LABOR ACTION should be the last to point the finger at such scientists no matter how naive the latter may appear. As has been pointed out before in this column, the revolutionary impact of science is tremendous if it can be given socialist content.

However, individual scientists often go to tortuous extremes to avoid drawing the obvious conclusions from their dissatisfaction with capitalism. This is illustrated in the July 7 issue of Science (weekly of the American Association for the Advancement of Science) in an "Open Letter to the United Nations" by Niels Bohr, a Danish atomic scientist of international repute.

Bohr, over 40 years ago, was one of the original workers on the structure of the atom. He escaped from Nazi occupied Denmark to England in 1943. From that time until the use of the first atom bomb in August 1945, he was associated with nuclear research in both England and the United States. After the first weapon use of atomic energy he returned to Denmark and since then has had no connection with any secret, military or industrial project in the field of atomic energy.

During the war years in the United States Dr. Bohr repeatedly pleaded with President Roosevelt and the State Department to recognize the revolutionary political and social implications of atomic energy. The failure of the nations of the world to realize that the solution of the atomic problem required insight and concessions beyond the usual scope of power politics is known to all.

Despite his recognition of the sterility of the UN in securing any agreement to eliminate the danger of atomic armament Niels Bohr still appeals for the nations of the world to attempt to find a way out. As a solution he appeals for the "ideal of an open world, with common knowledge about social conditions and technical enterprises, including military preparations, in every country." Furthermore it appears to him "that the countries which had pioneered in the new technical development might... be in a special position to take the initiative by a direct proposal of full mutual openness."

By "openness" Bohr apparently means an offer to grant the people of all nations access to the industrial and social conditions in their individual countries and the exchange of information which would result in the growth of each country free from the dangers of modern technological warfare.

### They Don't Want Bohr's World

Bohr admits that this may appear utopian but he sees no other way of appealing to the people all over the world who are fighting for their fundamental rights. He writes that only such action can succeed in "avoiding mortal menaces to civilization and for turning the progress of science to lasting benefit of all humanity." And to quote further: "An open world where each nation can assert itself solely by the extent to which it can contribute to the common culture and is able to help others with experience and resources must be the goal to be put above everything else."

The letter is closed with the following appeal: "The efforts of all supporters of international cooperation, individuals as well as nations, will be needed to create in all countries an opinion to voice, with ever increasing clarity and strength, the demand for an open world."

If there was a single government today which would step forward to endorse Dr. Bohr's sentiments and further to substitute "socialist" for "open" in the above quotations, then such an appeal could be a mighty political weapon for peace. Enthusiastic support would be received from the struggling people throughout the East and the rest of the world which would be more effective than even the most modern arms in rallying the Pacific people against Russian-instigated acts of aggression.

It is the real tragedy of our times that as yet there is no powerful third force, let alone an existing government, to appeal for an "open" or socialist world as the alternate to global conflict. Scientists alone cannot build that third force but they can be an important and vital part of it.

Neither United States nor Russia wants Niels Bohr's kind of an "open" world. They want a world open to their kinds of imperialisms and interventions. In their world there is no room for the open mind of free science.

**Get it EVERY week!**  
**A sub to LABOR ACTION**  
**is only \$2 for 1 year**

**LABOR ACTION**  
Independent Socialist Weekly

Vol. 14, No. 30 July 24, 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, 1940, 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

### THE PREDICAMENT OF THE TOLERANT, by Horace M. Kallen. (Harper's, July)

The New School for Social Research professor and author here propounds the riddle: Shall the tolerant, in the name of tolerance, intolerantly suppress those who are intolerant? Or put another way: Should a democratic government suppress movements which do not believe in democracy for others?

The merit of the article is in the way Professor Kallen raises this question. (He scarcely purports to give an answer. What there is of an answer is something along the lines that it is in the nature of a free society that it must learn to live with this predicament.)

But unlike Sidney Hook's intermittent articles on the question, Kallen does not make out that it is only the Communist Party's policies which raise the question. It is, of course, most acutely before American liberals with reference to Stalinism; but Kallen begins, as a matter of fact, with the Catholic Church as his first example.

Since the Stalinist problem is well known, here is his dossier on the Catholic approach.

In his book *The City of God*, St. Augustine wrote: "That persecution is wrong which believing men inflict upon the Church of Christ, but that persecution is right which the Churches of Christ inflict upon unbelieving men."

# WORLD POLITICS

### Statement of Resignation from Danish CP by Three Trade-Unionists

Three leading trade-unionists of the Communist Party of Denmark recently resigned from the party, and the statement which they issued attracts a great deal of attention in Europe. The document is an interesting one, both for the cogent points it makes and for its many elements of naivete. We reproduce it below not as a contribution toward a deeper understanding of Stalinism but as a contribution toward understanding the ways in which Stalinists learn to break. The authors specifically say that they do not recant their views, but there are many things which they were led to see.

The signers are Harry Olsen, Victor Madsen, and M. Olgaard Rasmussen, respectively chairman, treasurer and secretary of the Railroad Workers Section T.

With some surprise we have followed the Communist Party's political development from 1945 up till this present day. We have watched how it has suffered one election defeat after the other, and how this defeat culminated temporarily at the last municipal election in 1950. For Communists it is rather humiliating to note this fact.

In spite of the present economic burden with which the working class is charged (unemployment-taxation—a general rise in the cost of living), in spite of the Courts of Justice's incredible ways of settling the Occupation-time's criminals, it has not been possible for the Communist Party to exercise a definite influence on the future development of the Danish working class. Even the most proletarianized part of the population has not been attracted very much by the Communist Ideology.

Our opinion on this matter is that our key leaders are at fault, and that our key leaders have failed in moments of importance.

The biggest and perhaps most serious mistake has been made in using methods which perhaps were justifiable in countries as Russia, Poland, Rumania, etc. However, considering the Danish worker's mentality, these methods must give repercussions in this country.

Time after time Party orders have been issued, which commanded that the Communist section leaders and members of the executive bodies should follow the slogans irrespective of whether the results would harm the leaders in question and thereby our position in the trade union movement or not.

### "NO MEANS TOO DIRTY"

Therefore we are irritated when we time after another receive information of how we shall act, and the Party demands the orders to be followed closely, irrespective of any harm which these might cause. It is a great mistake when a sectional executive body believes that by following the Party slogan it can dictate the board of a trade union the way the trade union should be managed. Regards must be paid to the local problems within every trade union which must be solved carefully.

We cannot recognize this form for obvious dictatorship, because it is evident that it creates distrust and suspicion among our members. In this circumstance the defeat, or at any rate the considerable reduction of the Communist Party can be traced.

In 1945 we had all chances for winning the confidence of the people because our program spoke the broad population's cause, but mostly because our real politics at that time were honest and could

# U. S. Forces Latin American People To Shoulder Burden of Crisis

By JUAN REY

LIMA, Peru, May 15 (Delayed)—The post-war crisis is severely affecting the Latin American countries. It does so through the drop in the price of products and raw materials for export as well as through the general depreciation of currencies in relation to the dollar. In the first place, there is the fall in prices of Argentine meats and cereals, a basic factor in the Latin American economy, as well as the fall in Chilean, Peruvian and Bolivian minerals.

We have always suffered from the utopian unreality of the political autarchy of Peronism in Argentina and its demagogy on the "economic independence" of the Argentine and all of Latin America. Peronist expansion bases itself on unusual circumstances and the high prices of Argentine agricultural products during the war and post-war period. Now the Peron government becomes very "mild" and is negotiating a loan of \$125 million in Washington in order to save the Argentine economy from collapse as it faces the impossibility of making payments to its North American creditors.

The Yankee credits will serve to cover only the pending Argentine loans in the U. S. and there will be nothing left over to augment the industrial potential of Argentina. Confronted by the devaluation of the Argentine peso, all the social demagogy of Peron falls away, and now the constant strikes (longshoremen), refrigerator workers, etc.) are challenging the Bonapartism of Peron and the official company unions.

The entire weight of the crisis falls on the shoulders of the working masses of Latin America. The fall in prices of Bolivian tin, Chilean copper and the depreciation of the currencies in relation to the dollar diminishes the national income and increases the prices for the articles of prime necessity, thus lowering the miserable wages of the workers. Social unrest, the strikes and the political convulsions in Argentina, Chile, Bolivia, Peru and Venezuela are consequences of "this economic readjustment" inflicted by the big North American monopolies in New York, Chicago, Detroit, etc.

The Yankee capitalist metropolis stamps its seal upon and makes its weight felt in the farthest corners of Spanish America.

And then the party is obviously not aware that the Danish worker is intelligent enough to ask himself and find out why so many of the leading Communists in these countries disappear from their posts.

It would be strange if the Danish workers can not see there is something rotten in the system. Nobody will suggest that Communist leaders turn traitors to their countries, when the Communist Parties achieve complete power in the Eastern European countries. The development shows a tendency of ruthless rivalry for power combined with a lack of organization talent. The result has been a definite dictatorship which has more than just a few points in common with the previous Nazi regime.

Continually it is asserted that we are not directed by the Cominform (or are we?), but when this assertion is maintained, why has a definite Danish policy not been cultivated, which, based on Danish conditions, and on the Danish population's mentality, has made honest use of all the constructive forces which are available in this country? Why has the party not worked on a policy which has convinced the population that here in this country a real democracy could be created, in which any opinion without risk could be voiced? Nobody has any guarantee that an opinion which is not the Communist Party's will not be remembered later on.

The resignation from the party by trade union movement people is not due to an altered outlook, but it is a protest against the fact that the party without any regard to conditions seek to carry their politics through within the trade union movement, and by establishing illegal strikes they put the strikers to heavy economic losses, which cannot be recovered.

It is not unknown either that Communists with different views are dropped, and that people who know the motto: Shut Up And Obey, are favoured instead. We wish to protest in the same way and do this by resigning from the Communist Party.

**For living Marxism—read**  
**THE NEW INTERNATIONAL**

**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**  
**Finschley, London, N. 3, England**

# Readers Take the Floor...

### Einstein's Politics

To the Editor:  
In the July 10 issue of LABOR ACTION Carl Darton concludes his "You and Science" column on Albert Einstein by saying: "Nevertheless, it may well be his greatest contribution that he has foreshadowed the ideal citizen of the socialist tomorrow, where there is no room for amateurs; and a serious participant in political life, where there should be no professionals in the sense that special interests and privileges are accrued."

The portrait of Einstein is, I fear, rather idealized.  
As a theoretical physicist Einstein's place in the history of human thought is guaranteed. As "a serious participant in political life" his work can, with charity, be forgotten.

Einstein was never a serious participant in political life in the sense that he devoted any great proportion of his time to it, as did, say, J. B. S. Haldane, for instance. His political beliefs in themselves have consisted of little more than social-democratic banalities which, while operating in the general capitalist orbit, have often brought him under Stalinist influence.

Before World War II he could be a pacifist—and yet support the coalition against Hitler when war actually broke out. It was Einstein, let us not forget, who on his own initiative traded on his worldwide renown to write Roosevelt in 1939 suggesting the possibility of making an atomic bomb. For that act alone I for one am willing to exclude him from the ranks of those who may reasonably be called socialists.

That he is now struck by horror at the possibilities of enormous destruction opened up by the atomic bomb hardly distinguishes him from millions of other frightened people on the earth. Nor is his belated recognition of the consequences of the atomic bomb much reason for paying serious attention to his current political opinions, opinions which, having ultimately followed the main capitalist pressures in the past, can easily do so tomorrow.

In this he could readily follow the path of another mathematician and philosopher, Bertrand Russell, who also refers to himself as a democratic socialist. Russell was a conscientious objector in World War I, a supporter of World War II, and is now a proponent of a preventive war against Russia. Norbert Wiener, I am informed, is also beginning to move away from his previous intransigent position.

The scientists bear their full share of social responsibility in the present world crisis in which life on the globe faces, if not annihilation, then an unparalleled ravagement. When they abdicate their social responsibilities through a smug isolation from the social-political scene, as most of them do today, they should be attacked for it. And when they enter the political arena to propagate Stalinism, as does Joliot-Curie, or to spread liberal capitalist confusion, as does Einstein, they should similarly be held accountable.

Since their role in society is an important one—especially in the atomic age—their responsibilities are greater than the average, and the judgment passed upon them should be all the sterner. This applies to the Von Humboldt who helped get Marx expelled from France, as well as to the Einstein who bears a good share of the burden of guilt for the present world crisis.

Seen in this light Einstein does not foreshadow "the ideal citizen of the socialist tomorrow," it seems to me, but, rather, typifies the liberal scientist in the period of capitalist decline.

J. M. F.



## THE INDEPENDENT SOCIALIST VIEW

## The Pacifist Tactic — an Exchange

From the Editors of "Alternative"

To the Editor:

We were glad to see in the June 5 issue of LABOR ACTION a reprint of part of the statement of Tax Refusal from the March "Alternative."

Following your quotations from the Refusal statement you say that this type of action leaves the problem quite unsolved. We would like to point out that we have a full program for social revolution. We never implied that refusal to pay taxes was by itself a solution to any of our social ills.

You ask if pacifists believe that persons working in heavy industry should quit their jobs. Most pacifists believe that no one should work in any plant that produces war materials. We believe that any worker finding himself engaged in work that is destructive should do all he can to change the type of work his company is engaged in. Failing this he should quit his job and try to obtain work of a constructive nature. It should be noted that the first plank in the Program of the Committee for Non-Violent Revolution, which publishes "Alternative," calls for the workers taking over production from the capitalists.

Yours for socialism,

Robert AUERBACH for the Editors

## By THE EDITORS

"The problem" which the pacifist Tax Refusal Statement left unsolved, according to LA's comment, was not that of a "full program for social revolution," but only the one which correspondent Auerbach's letter takes up in his last paragraph. The LA comment had no intention of implying that "Alternative" considered tax refusal any basic solution to our social ills.

We think, however, that our correspondent's letter reinforces our criticism of tax refusal as a futile tactic.

We raised a question suggested by the tax-refusal policy: *Should, then, workers also refuse to work in plants which are vital to the carrying on of war?* Our correspondent confirms that "most pacifists," or at any rate the editors of "Alternative," carry their tactic out to this point also. This in our opinion is consistent (which is a lot more than can be said for many people today)—but it is wrong.

In the first place, it should be understood, we think, that this proposed labor-refusal could not be applied only to plants directly manufacturing munitions, airplanes, etc. If the tactic is to remain consistent, it would be just as important, if not more important, to apply it also to plants producing the unfinished, semi-finished and raw materials which are just as important to the production of war goods as the labor in the last-step factories. One may have a greater personal distaste to machining a gun turret than producing the steel which goes into it—but surely this question is not a matter of personal taste.

However, whether the tactic applies only to direct war goods or also to the wider industrial field behind the production of war goods, the essential consideration is the same: the tactic would withdraw precisely the best elements from precisely the field in which they can do the most good—industry, in which they are in daily educational contact with other workers.

## The Power of Example

A proposal for a general withdrawal of labor on a mass scale—in three words—a general strike—would, of course, be a horse of another color, with different considerations behind it. But we need not here go into the criticisms which Marxists have made of the general-strike slogan as a cure-all for war. The fact is that the pacifist tactic of labor-refusal today has to be considered, with regard to effectiveness, as the tactic of a very small group of workers who could be induced to favor it.

What should this small group of workers do? It is quite meaningless to propose that they should try to "change the type of work [the] company is engaged in." They can't. This idea might have meaning for the employee of a small shopkeeper, but war will not be prevented or stopped on these levels. A meaningful policy must at least concern itself with the basic industries of the country, run by giant corporations.

Should they then quit their jobs, and earn a living in some vocation totally unconnected with the war effort, if they can find one? (And of course they have to earn their living, even under capitalism...) But their aim presumably is, or ought to be, to convince OTHER workers to agree with their anti-war views. The tactic advocated by our correspondent only divorces them from living contact with

those workers, without stopping the drive toward war at all.

The thought behind the pacifist tactic is, we realize, quite at variance with this objective result. This thought is roughly: "If everybody acted as we do, war would be impossible. Let us, therefore, take the initiative in so acting, hoping that our example will be an inspiration and a model for all others."

What is admirable in this reaction is an element which is rare enough nowadays, and for which certainly the pacifists have our ungrudging respect: acting on one's conviction, lead where it may. It is the "convictions"—the pacifist tactic—with which we disagree.

We do not belittle the power of example per se—not to the slightest degree. But a would-be demonstration of an "example" from afar has never been and never will be effective—any more than was the example of the saintly hermits who withdrew from man's sinful society in order to live in purity. This did not serve to reform Christian mores. In justice to the hermits, however, it should be added that reforming others was not their only, and perhaps not their main, aim in view: they had their own souls to save. Since many pacifists become irritated when it is suggested that this is also the only result of their own tactic, we mention it here only to point the difference between the goal of individual salvation and the goal of changing the world.

Mass movements are not created and organized and led by examples from afar which are divorced from participation in the life of the masses themselves. The meaning of the example has to be demonstrated to the people through the lessons of their day-to-day experience. The day-to-day experience and life of the working class is spent (most of it) in the factories, and the most important job of one who advocates social change is to be among them. If the pacifist tactic were successful in its own terms, it would empty the plants of workers with anti-war convictions. There could be few greater disservices to the cause of either labor or peace. Distributing leaflets at patriotic rallies—an activity which is certainly useful—is no substitute, though it may understandably give the distributor a feeling of taking "direct action."

## Symmetrical Errors

On the one hand, we have no sympathy with the pseudo-radical who develops the convenient rationalization that the best way to have an effect upon the mass of workers is to take on the coloration of THEIR political views, so that one is not accused of "sectarianism." The pacifist tactic is the reverse of this, and just as wrong: for fear of being tainted by any connection with the war, they advocate divorce from the mass workers' movement (in effect). The hardest road is to fight IN the mass workers' movement WITHOUT yielding to the prevailing backwardness and conservatism of its views, but rather educating for and teaching one's own socialist view. This has always been the Marxist policy.

This policy of socialist education is also today being carried on by only a small group of workers. We are not criticizing the pacifist tactic because it would be followed only by a small number. We are criticizing the tactic because it means that this small number voluntarily deprives itself of the possibility of ever effectively influencing a larger number.

Finally, we wish to emphasize a point which has already been indicated in passing above and which today deserves to be emphasized.

We think the absolute pacifists are quite wrong, as we have explained, but we feel ourselves to have infinitely more in common with them and their ends than with the much larger number of self-styled "socialists," "peace-lovers," "radicals" (tired or still spry), "hard-headed liberals" and other political specimens of our generation who give their "leftist" blessings in one form or another to the greatest crime of our age—the preparation of the third and atomic imperialist war against civilization. We would like to convince the pacifists to fight our way and with us—and vice versa, no doubt—but this is on quite a different plane from the case of those who refuse to fight at all or who fight for the ideas of our enemies.

## 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.

## On Stalinism's Left Flank

## The "Fourth International" Trotskyists Support and Justify North Korean Invasion

By HAL DRAPER

The Fourth International, Trotskyists, whose American co-thinkers are the Socialist Workers Party, have come out flatfootedly as defenders in the Korean war, supporting the North Korean, that is, Stalinist—side in the conflict.

At this writing, the SWP here has so far steered clear of any such commitment, as we pointed out last week. It has preferred dead silence on this basic question which is raised by its own views as much as by those of the Fourth International groups. In fact, if anything, the articles which have appeared in its weekly, the *Militant*, are written so as to appear to be criticizing both sides. We pointed out last week why none of their anti-Stalinist criticisms, however, precludes military defense on the Stalinist side.

While the SWP position, therefore, has so far been ambiguous at best, this is not true of the statement on the war just issued by the leading committee of the Fourth International. The full text of this statement is given below point for point, so that there may be no doubt about context. From this text, we believe, it is clear that they thereby mark another step in their devotion toward pure and simple "left Stalinism."

For the statement is not merely forthright in its support of the Stalinist side of the war in Korea. It takes present a position of virtual UNCRITICAL support. The reader will be able to check this assertion.

In our discussion last week, on the basis solely of the *Militant's* articles, we stressed that the *Militant's* political criticisms of the Stalinist war aims, etc., are not in contradiction with a position of military defense of the Stalinist side. We mentioned what we believed would have to be the political guide for the SWP in this respect. In 1939 Leon Trotsky—still unfortunately and mistakenly basing his politics on his view of Russia as a "degenerated workers state"—took a double-sided position on the then invasion of Finland by the Kremlin's armies. On the one hand, he (and the SWP and Fourth International following him) "condemned the invasion" by Stalin. But since Russia was a "workers state," once war had broken out between this "workers state" and the capitalist-imperialist world, he insisted that Russia must be defended in the war in spite of this condemnation.

## Break with Trotsky's Line Too

In this connection he freely attacked the foreign policy of Moscow as "expansionist" (while refusing to describe it as "imperialist") and ascribed Russia's entrance into the war in the manner it did as due to the drive of the Russian Stalinist bureaucracy to increase its own power, prestige and revenue.

It was this position of Trotsky and the SWP majority which directly led to the split within the organization's ranks, leading to the formation of the Workers Party (now the Independent Socialist League). The opposition countered the policy of "defense of the Soviet Union" with a line of political opposition to both camps in the imperialist war. In the Korean War, the Independent Socialist League has likewise refused to give political support to either American or Russian imperialism.

We mention this in order to note: the statement now presented by the Fourth International does not merely repeat Trotsky's tragic mistake of 1939. It marks a break even with this position. It does not "condemn the invasion"—it JUSTIFIES it, indeed complaining at one point that the Stalinists do not know how to justify their invasion properly. (This is the only criticism of the Stalinists in connection with the Korean war in the entire statement.)

The statement begins by mentioning parenthetically that in general the international policy of the Kremlin is reactionary. The writers, after all, have just been devoting nine-tenths of their time and energy to organizing pro-Titoist sentiment against the Kremlin. Moreover, we are dealing with people who still have to make a formal bow to Trotsky's analysis of the role of the Russian dictators. We are, further, not dealing with out-and-out Stalinists but with left Stalinists. (We have spoken before of the Fourth International's rapid evolution in this direction; with the development of their extreme pro-Titoist line and now the present statement on Korea, we personally believe that the term can be accurately applied to them in full political reality.)

## Whitewash of Moscow

Thus the statement begins (in our own translation from the French text):

"(1) The events which have taken place in Korea constitute a new combination (as was the case with Greece in Europe) of civil war, provoked by real and deep internal causes, with the cold war which continues between the USSR and the U. S. In spite of the reactionary role which the Soviet bureaucracy plays on the international revolutionary field, in each case it is necessary to analyze the situation from a class viewpoint and to adopt a consistent class attitude independent of the formal aspects.

"(2) While the way in which the action of the forces in the service of the North-Korean government against the rotten military-police dictatorship of Syngman Rhee was presented before world proletarian opinion is to be criticized, once this action was launched it took on a precise class meaning: it was a question of overthrowing, with the revolutionary forces of the country mobilized under the leadership of the Korean Communist Party, the feudal-capitalist regime of Seoul which was installed by the American imperialists and

which maintained the arbitrary division of the country by means of terror."

This sentence is as awkward in French as in English translation. The clumsiness, however, has a political reason. The writers are walking around the question of the "forces in the service of the North Korean government"—with a peculiar formulation which is designedly cut large enough to clothe any number of Russians in North Korean uniforms. The formulation is also carefully worded, at the expense of literary style, to avoid saying that the action itself is to be criticized (*criticizable*). It is only the way in which the Stalinists presented this action to world proletarian opinion that is here being wrist-slapped. In short, our writers object to some unnamed features of what the Stalinists are saying, but not to what they are doing.

The same pregnant sentence likewise illustrates what we will find throughout the document: it ascribes to American imperialism alone crimes which were jointly committed by both Washington and Moscow. In English this is called a whitewash. Thus here, everyone knows that the "arbitrary division of the country by means of terror" was decided jointly by Stalin and Roosevelt, and equally maintained on both sides of the 38th parallel. Both sides meanwhile yelled for "unity"—by which they meant conquest of the whole country by one or the other imperialist. The Fourth International Trotskyists falsify even the well-known fact in order to whitewash the side they are supporting, Stalin's brutal totalitarianism.

## What's the North Korean State?

Point 2 continues:

"This corrupt regime [of Syngman Rhee], which is in many respects similar to that which Chiang Kai-shek had established in the last months before his fall, was deeply detested by the Korean masses as was clearly proved only lately in the elections which took place (in spite of their distorted character), as well as by the partisan movement which spread in the South. The extent of the military disaster which it met from the beginning of hostilities is a supplementary proof of the degree of its corruption. The civil war was imbedded in Korean reality, and the overthrow of Syngman Rhee's regime was a necessity for the unity, independence and reconstruction of the country."

The description of Syngman Rhee's regime is perfectly accurate. But its inclusion in the statement serves to raise the question: And what do these people have to say about the North Korean regime under Stalin's heel? The answer is typical of the document: nothing. Not a word. Is it a "people's democracy"? Is it a "Workers' state"? Is it a dictatorship of the GPU? Is it no better than Stalin's puppet regimes elsewhere? There is literally not a word on the nature of this regime which they are defending.

We have seen one way in which the Stalinist war is justified. Point 3 presents another:

"(3) It is possible [sic] that either the Kremlin or Peking, or both in agreement, had put pressure on the Northern government to precipitate the events and to launch an action military in scope. It was, for them, a question of striking back against the pressure which American imperialism was lately putting on Asia once more, through the oppressive measures taken in Japan and in the Philippines and the aid promised in Indo-China, and thus to stop from its very beginning the offensive which imperialism was preparing in this region. Counting on the effect of surprise and the ease of overcoming the feeble resistance of Syngman Rhee's corrupt regime, either Moscow or Peking or both together probably banked on the non-intervention of American imperialism, because of their own speedy action."

Need we point out again—not a word about any pressure or offensive by Russia in Asia? It is certainly true that both imperialists have been doing their utmost to establish control in the region. It is no credit of any kind to the U. S. either in our view or anyone else's that in this imperialist tug-of-war the initiative, superior pressure and dynamism has been Russia's by and large—as James M. Fenwick points out elsewhere in this issue. But particularly in view of this fact, to present the Korean invasion as virtually a defensive reaction against unilateral pressure by Washington is an interpretation which can look comfortable and at home only in the pages of the *Daily Worker*.

## Any Anti-Stalinist Duties Here?

There is more about this one-sided, offensive in the next point:

"(4) This calculation showed itself to be false, since Washington this time had determined to maintain its recent policy of reinforcing 'de facto situations' and had determined not to abandon any region belonging to its sphere of influence. Furthermore, profiting by this occasion which gave it the possibility of posing as resisting 'Communist aggression,' [Which is in quotes, 'Communist' or 'aggression'?—H. D.] Washington launched its offensive in Asia, extending its armed intervention from Korea to the Philippines, Formosa and Indo-China, and around this offensive and under its leadership welding the united front of all the other imperialist powers.

"(5) The precautions taken so far on both sides by the two blocs, Soviet and American, which are carrying on the cold war, to circumscribe the Korean conflict and engage in a new test of local strength signify that both of them find it impossible at the present time to get

involved in a general war. As in Greece, so also in Korea, American imperialism, by getting involved militarily, wants to demonstrate to Moscow that it has to maintain the status quo and that a compromise is possible only on the basis of sharing the spheres of influence already established, which in the Far East means the line indicated by the recent speech of Truman."

The next point gets out to tell socialists what their political duties are in this situation. Look hard under this head for our subjects' proposals on a socialist's duties in combating the admittedly reactionary regime of Moscow!

"(6) However, in spite of the localization of this new test of strength between the two blocs, and in spite of the possibilities of compromise which still remain open, it would be tactically mistaken to minimize the dangers of this situation in our propaganda among the masses, and to fail to call upon them for more energetic vigilance. Our movement has the duty of denouncing the imperialist character of the American intervention in Asia and to carry on a campaign—in the U. S. as well as in the other imperialist and capitalist countries—for the withdrawal of their troops from Korea and against any intervention in the other Asiatic countries: Korea for the Koreans! Formosa for China! Viet-Nam for the Viet-Names! In this connection our movement will denounce the role played by the UN, under the domination of American imperialism, which serves as a legal cover for all of the imperialists' acts of banditry, and it will dissipate all illusions about the ability of such an organization to 'defend peace.'"

## Neat Trick

It seems there are no anti-Stalinist duties worth mentioning in connection with the Korean war. But hold! we are dealing with left Stalinists—

The last point of the statement comes through with a punch. Did we say that our Trotskyists of the Fourth International were giving virtually uncritical support to the Stalinist side of the Korean war? As we have seen, there is not yet any reason to withdraw this statement. Perhaps some dim or brighter realization of this fact has been lying heavy on the writers' stomachs, through the first six points:

"After all, we are supposed to be Trotskyists, arch-foes of Stalinism and all that . . . we have got to say something real nasty about them . . . Shall it be about their threat to Trotsky's heir and successor, Marshall Tito? . . . No-o-o, why bring that up after we've worked up such a lather about the anti-imperialist mission of 'the forces in the service of the North Korean government' . . . Shall it be about the Kremlin's 'expansionism,' which by no means is to be confused with 'imperialism'? . . . No-o-o, that might give aid and comfort to the petty bourgeoisie . . . Shall it be about the 'block of four classes' and such? . . . No-o-o, slightly outdated . . . Got it! There's this peace-petition campaign around the so-called Stockholm petition which the Stalinists are peddling . . . What's the difference if this campaign started even before the Korean war? . . . All the better; the less it has to do with the Korean war, the less it will get in the way of peddling the defense of North Korea! So—

"(7) Our movement will denounce, on the other hand, the peace campaign [No quotation marks this time—H. D.] of the Kremlin and the Stalinist parties for signing the Stockholm appeal, which disarms the masses in the effective struggle against war, and which disorients them on the significance of events like those in Korea and on the correct attitude which it is necessary to adopt with regard to these events."

That's it—denounce them as PACIFISTS . . . Neat trick, eh? . . . Who says they're war-mongers, imperialists, etc.? They're pacifists, that's what . . . That's the trouble with these forces in the service of, etc . . . Sheep in wolves' clothing . . . Now we can end point 7 and the statement with a bang and not with a whimper: let's accuse the Stalinists of sabotaging the defense of North Korea!

"[Point 7 continued] The piling up of papers and signatures shows itself incapable of stopping the march of imperialism toward war, which is now spreading through all of the colonial countries, while this campaign [for the Stockholm petition] spreads a climate of petty-bourgeois pacifism among the masses, in contradiction with events such as those in Korea, where civil war is necessary and justified, where it must be carried on, and where it must be carried through with the aid of the international proletariat to the total defeat of the Korean reactionaries and the imperialists helping them."

Signed: the International Secretariat of the Fourth International.

## Look in the Mirror!

It is to be seen whether the SWP here in this country will fall in line with their political co-thinkers of the Fourth International. Since in the above statement they cannot fail to see their own politics mirrored, what can possibly stop them from doing so? Could it be the pressure of bourgeois public opinion and "petty-bourgeois opportunism" on these most moral people?

Finally, the political physiognomy of the Fourth International which is set forth in its Korean statement

(Continued on page 7)

## Stalinism's Flank —

(Continued from page 6)

hears on more than the Korean war. To be sure, we do not believe that if a movement is wrong, even tragically and grotesquely wrong, on one point, then every other view it holds is automatically impugned. The connection between two mistakes must always be demonstrated in its concreteness, and not assumed through a kind of "guilt-by-association." But in this case there is a connection which leaps to the eye between the Fourth International's position on the Korean war and—on another question.

That other question is its pro-Titoism. The connection we mention at this point is that of method. The method which animates both positions is—the whitewash. There is an exact parallel between the way in which these gentlemen whitewash the Stalinists in the Korean war and the way in which they whitewash the Tito-Stalinist regime in Belgrade. Men who are capable of producing the monstrous statement we have quoted in full—how could they be expected to recognize Stalinism in Tito-Yugoslavia?

## The Handy Way To Subscribe!

LABOR ACTION  
Independent Socialist Weekly  
4 Court Square  
Long Island City 1, N. Y.

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

NAME ..... (please print)  
ADDRESS .....  
.....  
ZONE ..... APT. ....  
CITY .....  
STATE .....  
 Bill me.  
 Payment enclosed.

## New York

SOCIALIST  
YOUTH  
LEAGUE  
SUMMER  
SCHOOL

Six sessions. Every Tuesday  
night for six weeks

Session 4 on Tuesday  
JULY 25

I

THE THEORETICAL  
ROOTS OF  
MARXISM

7:30-9:00 p.m.

II

THE RUSSIAN  
REVOLUTION  
AND THE EUROPEAN  
REVOLUTION  
1917-1923

Instructors: Max Shacht-  
man 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



One Answer to Apathy and Bureaucratism in the Negro Movement—

# Will NAACP Involve Members in Its Fight?

By KATE LEONARD

Last week we gave our understanding of the reasons for the decline in membership in the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, pointing to the structure and bureaucratic control of the organization and its non-partisan political policy as influential factors.

To point toward a way out, it is necessary to carry the first of these reasons further. It is important to make clear that it is not the program of the organization but its policy which limits its tasks to a restricted field, which contributes both to the weakness of the locals and, in the vicious circle, to the bureaucracy of the administration.

The early - NAACP conducted militant propaganda coupled with resort to the courts. It was correct to ask this earlier NAACP and its leadership, "Why did you limit your activity so largely to the field of legal defense?" Today the NAACP has widened the field of its operations.

Legal defense has grown into legal attack: witness the Texas

white-primary case or the recent Sweatt-Henderson decisions of the Supreme Court. The NAACP has entered the political arena and aligned itself with labor. It is just as correct in this different context to call for a widening of the program of action into areas requiring greater membership participation and mass activity.

To illustrate this in just one area of the NAACP's work: Thurgood Marshall, the NAACP's director of its legal department, recently gave his opinion that while the decision of the Supreme Court in the Henderson case dealt only with interstate transport, carriers would find it impossible to enforce different sets of regulations for passengers traveling within a state and those traveling between states. Delegates to the recent convention were instructed to make a comprehensive check on segregation practices by interstate carriers in their home areas and report their findings. Persistent and planned violations of Jim Crow custom and Southern state law in travel are well within the NAACP's program, are they not?

Possibilities of this kind are sufficiently numerous. Many of them can be initiated locally. It is in this vein that local activity can be extended, profitably for the organization. The day may come, for example, when recruiting campaigns do not consist exclusively of selling the national organization to the potential recruits. Activated, alive branches would have their way, sooner or later, on policy and on leadership.

The NAACP convention, in reaffirming its non-partisan policy, called upon both major parties to mobilize their strength behind the FEPC, demanded anti-filibuster legislation, urged increased registration of Negro voters, etc. Its board of directors approved a recommendation that a meeting be called this fall of interested organizations to plan united action "against those politicians in Congress who sold us out on civil rights." They are determined "to express our disapproval, irrespective of political party, of those who failed to keep their word."

It looks as if, within the harness of the non-partisan policy, the

NAACP will attempt to put the emphasis upon the "punishment" phase of the "reward your friends and punish your enemies" policy. Such an emphasis has very definite limits of course, as has the policy proper. We would think that, partly because the coming elections will be local congressional elections, there will be some dividing of the Negro vote, a result that did not follow from the non-partisan policy held to formally in 1948.

The convention passed a resolution "instructing the directors to end Communist infiltration in the organization and empowering them to expel any branch under Communist domination." (N. Y. Times, June 24.) This resolution instructed the directors to investigate the ideological composition of the members and leaders of the branches. If necessary the directors are ordered to suspend and reorganize, or lift the charter of and expel any branch which, in the judgment of the board of directors came under "Communist or other political control or domination."

## ANTI-CP DRIVE

This action is not all of one piece. In taking this action, the NAACP is responding to the national drive against the Stalinists, a drive which was non-existent before, say, 1945. When this has been said, there is, however, more to say. In its attitude toward the NAACP, the Stalinist party has run the gamut from vilification to something it has described as "strong but not antagonistic"—always for its own ends. In recent years the NAACP has been a Stalinist concentration, again for the CP's own ends.

The NAACP is within its formal rights in eliminating the Stalinist influence in the organization. It is to be regretted—as too often it has been in unions—that the method proposed is bureaucratic; but even here it can be pointed out that the bureaucracy, not invented for this purpose, can hardly be extended in any likely consummation of this directive. If the board of directors is all over this proposal, long practice put them there.

There is a real distinction to be made between members and leaders of branches, and this despite the fact that membership in an organization of the type of the NAACP differs from the right of membership in a union. The NAACP would be plain foolish were it to proceed against individual members of the organiza-

tion because they are, were or are alleged to be under Stalinist influence.

Fortunately there are indications that this will not be the case, signs such as the NAACP's denunciation of the government's loyalty drive, defense of postoffice employees fired for "disloyalty," the impossibility of the NAACP's subscribing to the doctrine that association between white and Negro people is ipso facto subversive.

## COMBATING SEGREGATION

Finally, when the NAACP speaks of "Communist or other political control and domination," this for the present is window dressing, as it was when it excluded all political tendencies from representation as groups from the Washington Mobilization earlier this year. Their concern is with the Stalinists. It is at the same time the seizing of an opportunity to reaffirm the non-partisan stand—did not the organization all but abandon it as recently as 1948?

The 1951 convention of the NAACP is scheduled for Atlanta. In the year that will pass before the NAACP makes its second trip to that "Athens" of the South, the organization plans to concentrate heavily upon its campaign against discrimination and segregation in education.

To date its campaign has resulted in the Sweatt-McLaurin rulings which the NAACP appraises as follows: They have clearly made all forms of discrimination in graduate and professional education unconstitutional. Also the NAACP has succeeded in putting two crimps in the style of the Southern regional education plan.

Suits have already been brought to extend the Sweatt ruling to undergraduate schools. On the propaganda and on the legislative fronts the NAACP opposes extension of federal funds to segregated schools. At the lower school level in the South, the NAACP's legal action is at this time limited to actions for injunctions enjoining local school boards from discriminating against Negro schools; in other words, demanding equalization of facilities.

The NAACP states its position on education: "We are going to insist on non-segregation in American public education from top to bottom—from law school to kindergarten." The words are brave and reconstructive. All aid and power to the NAACP in this endeavor!

# Gear for War — —

(Continued from page 1)

thermore, anyone who refuses to sign the army's loyalty oath is automatically suspected of disloyalty.

"Every soldier a stoolpigeon!" is the sense of further directives in the Special Regulation which "instructs every member of the armed forces that it is his duty to report disloyal or subversive activities of any member of the military services."

• With a minority criticizing its action as "unconstitutional" and describing the legislation as a "concentration camp" measure, the House voted this week to give the attorney general the power to jail 3,000 aliens, lumping together the criminal and "subversives." Representative Emanuel Celler protested that the bill would lead to the establishment of "Devil's Islands."

It is argued by the bill's supporters that it affects mainly those whose native countries have refused them visas, in other words, those who have the greatest citizenship difficulties. These people cannot become citizens of the U. S. because of their heretical views, and now they cannot remain as aliens, at least in freedom. This piece of legislation makes an appealing exhibit beside declarations of the U. S.-supported Human Rights Committee of the United Nations, which aims for equality of all races and nationalities.

## FEPC A VICTIM

• A Fair Employment Practices bill appears to have been given the coup de grace for the duration in the current session of Congress, with a majority of the labor-supported Democratic Party voting against closure. The "little hot war" will furnish sufficient pretexts for the indefinite postponement of this measure.

There is some evidence to indicate that the army and navy have relaxed their Jim-Crow restrictions since the last conflict. The Negroes and other minorities are thus less restricted in their right to die than in their right to live.

• A shockingly crude episode of military censorship was enacted by United States army authorities when General MacArthur ordered a United Press and an Associated Press correspondent off the Korean war front.

The facts in their stories were undisputed. One of the news bureaus was told by MacArthur's subordinate, General Echols, that "it was his opinion General Mac-

Arthur's headquarters had taken action against Mr. Kalischer in a move to get all foreign correspondents to soft-pedal stories of the American defeat." Yet was it not the government that recently proclaimed the necessity of a "propaganda of truth" to combat Russian influence?

• The stresses and strains are being felt on the material side, too. Remember the arguments following the end of World War II that with the revocation of price controls and governmental restriction, normal competition would force prices down? The profiteers prevailed, controls were lifted and spiraling prices set in. This trend is being reinforced by the new war.

Senator Wayne Morse of Oregon stated recently that a government investigating committee would find "A uniform national pattern, a jiggering up of the price structure on some of the basic commodities." Housewives have already found it.

On the basis of past performance, it is only reasonable to assume that price control will come only when even higher levels are reached, and only when counterbalanced by a wage freeze and a no-strike pledge.

## LABOR TAILS ALONG

The leadership of the big unions, has no distinct program in the field of foreign policy and military matters distinct from that of the Truman administration which by and large it supports. As we go to press, Walter Reuther becomes, as in the last war, a partial exception to this statement, with his presentation of a new version of Truman's Point Four program, of which more next week.—Ed.]

The wage freeze and the no-strike pledge were exacted from it fairly easily during the last war, the only opposition coming from the militant rank and file of many of the big unions. Without having been able to have the Taft-Hartley Law removed from the books, labor now faces compounded restrictions.

That the labor leadership feels a certain sense of deprivation is indicated in its appeal to W. Stuart Symington, chairman of the National Security Resources Board, for labor representation in the policy and administration of the war program. But, unfortunately, this demand is not accompanied by a labor program—to end the profiteering in war, to insure labor's democratic rights, to protect civil liberties, etc. Only the United Mine Workers spokes-

man raised the question of the propriety of complete cooperation with the government on the part of labor while the Taft-Hartley administrator, Robert Denham, "follows a policy of harassing and persecuting labor."

And Symington has rejected even the labor's leaders' modest request that a labor man be put in as vice chairman of his board. There is evidence that the labor leadership itself will engage, at least initially and in part, in the task of policing itself. The AFL Railroad Yardmasters have foregone their right to strike against sixty-six railroads and have turned to mediation. A similar decision was taken earlier by the Trainmen and Conductors, representing 250,000 railroad employees.

The American labor leadership handed itself over to the government and compromised with the profiteers in the last two world wars. It is in the process of doing so again. The continuation of power blocs, of the division of the world into spheres of influence, of wars themselves, are to a significant extent the result of its political default.

# UAW Leaders — —

(Continued from page 1)

vision of this war program was the pledge of each official not to circulate or disseminate any literature contrary to the official government and CIO policies.

After a vigorous debate for three hours, the General Council approved the Stellato program by a sufficient majority to make it mandatory.

A few days later, a former chief steward at Kaiser Frazer was run out of the shop for bringing in Stalinist "peace" petitions.

In a large steel local, Philip Murray put in an administrator and prevented the elected president, accused of being pro-Stalinist, from taking office.

A UAW spokesman assured newspaper correspondents that the union would carry out a no-strike pledge in event the war crisis breaks out full-scale.

Thus events of the past two weeks contrast with the actions of the UAW in 1941, when an emergency war conference of the union adopted an "equality-of-sacrifice" program, and the mili-

tant ranks stirred in rebellious mood over the prospect of war profiteering and the lukewarm program of the union officialdom to meet it.

## HAVE THEY A PROGRAM?

Of course, the total smashing of Stalinist influence is now a simple task, for their general unpopularity is aggravated, as the Reuther leadership uses the wave of chauvinism to inflame the workers.

But the difficult task of solving the problem of labor's role and function in the rapidly growing war economy is not going to be quite so simple for the Reuther leadership.

During the past two weeks the "brain-trusters" and others have been trying to work out a program, and Reuther has been dashing into Washington, all to no avail. As yet, labor has not been able to achieve for any of its leaders even the funky role of Sidney Hillman in the last war.

As for inflation, not a word from labor. Acquiescing to Truman's foreign policy it offers no

hope for a war-worried world, let alone for its own ranks.

Meanwhile the ranks in the shop get jittery and irritated as the prices shoot upwards. Unquestionably General Motors workers will get a two or three cent raise this September under the escalator clause. But what about Ford and Chrysler? How can Chrysler workers fight and win wage increases next summer if the UAW already has an unofficial ban on all strikes? Especially big ones.

Walter Reuther is coming up with a program to answer these and other burning issues. In advance it may be said that the essence of it will be to make the conflict a "social-democratic" war against Stalinism. A program of guns and butter! It may also be said that it will share the same fate as all his other programs from mass production of housing in aircraft plants to the Reuther plan for plane production in 1942.

The coming days are going to be very trying for an ill-prepared, subservient labor movement, unless it regains its organizational independence and declares its political freedom.