

# LABOR ACTION

Independent Socialist Weekly

DECEMBER 11, 1950

FIVE CENTS

**THE RUSSIAN STATE BUDGET:  
Sidelights on Stalinist Exploitation**

... page 6

**New Crisis in U. S. Foreign Policy**

... page 3

**U. S. Tightens Squeeze on Bolivia**

... page 3

**Jewish 'Returnees' in Germany**

... page 4

## Peoples of World Must Raise Demand Now: Withdraw All Troops! Stop the Korean War!

### UAW Promises Vote by Ranks On Any No-Strike Pledge

By WALTER JASON

DETROIT, Dec. 4—The top leadership of the United Auto Workers (UAW) made an important policy announcement at the state-wide Reuther caucus meeting held this past weekend here. It is bound to have widespread ramifications in the CIO movement and gives a clue to union action ahead.

Walter P. Reuther, UAW-CIO president, told the 200 secondary leaders of the auto union that the entire leadership had decided NOT to give any no-strike pledge in event of total mobilization WITHOUT first holding a rank-and-file referendum on the question.

Furthermore, Reuther said that the UAW-CIO had informed Washington that the union would not give up either the escalator clause or the annual improvement factor.

Of course, these policy pronouncements were endorsed without any argument. This pledge of the Reuther leadership seems like quite a big order for it, but apparently Reuther figures that the uneasiness and unrest in the shops signify a mood of belliger-

ency among the ranks and he is going along with it.

It appears that the UAW leaders are somewhat dissatisfied with the results of the CIO convention, where their cautious tactics kept them quiet and made them seem to be merely part and parcel of the Murray machine.

In recent weeks Emil Mazey, UAW-CIO secretary treasurer, also has stated that the union would not give a no-strike pledge to the Truman administration.

Reuther also repeated his demands for labor representation at all levels of war production planning. The many rebuffs that the CIO leaders have received in recent times have not sat well with Reuther, who takes himself far more seriously than Washington does.

Both Mazey and Reuther were quite critical of any phony "equality-of-sacrifice" program, since most UAW ranks as well as the leadership remember what a mockery that program was in World War II.

In terms of UAW internal structure, the most important new point in the Reuther program was the idea of a one-dollar-a-month dues increase.

## Generalities Galore at CIO Confab

By R. F. SARGENT

CHICAGO—The 12th national convention of the CIO held here recently hewed to a line of demanding from the government and industry that they accept labor as an equal partner in the expanding war mobilization program and in the conduct of foreign affairs. This approach closely paralleled the convention's attitude toward its policy on political action, as reported in last week's LABOR ACTION, on which the CIO did not budge one inch from its customary support to and dependence upon liberal politicians.

This convention witnessed the formal and outward "patching up" of differences between CIO President Philip Murray and Auto Workers' President Walter Reuther, with the result that Reuther's voice was the one most prominently heard on questions of foreign and domestic policy, and Murray even found it pos-

sible to refer to Reuther as "distinguished."

The Foreign Policy Declaration "endorsed fully the proposals of our government to check Soviet imperialism" all the way down the line—United Nations, North Atlantic Pact, Marshall Plan, Point Four, Gray report, Schuman Plan, etc. The only thing really new in it was the great emphasis laid this year on the need for "bold new policies" to gain the social support of labor abroad behind American imperialist policy, backed up by the demand for increased participation by labor in formulating and administering foreign policy.

As a matter of fact, the declaration states flatly: "The most serious defect in American foreign policy is the absence of American labor from its highest councils." This is really remarkable considering the state of U. S. foreign policy today, as the result of policies supported by the

By ALBERT GATES

The military intervention in Korea by the United States, it is clear now in these days of reckoning, did not bring peace any closer but has deepened and extended the war. At the very start of the war, the statement of the Independent Socialist League said: "Any victory gained in Korea on such a basis [war] can only have reactionary consequences. . . ."

"Far from ensuring world peace, it will only bring closer the date of the Third World War, of the decisive conflict for world dominion between the capitalist and Stalinist blocs in which the peoples of this globe will be at least as much threatened by utter devastation as by imperialist conquest.

"Far from encouraging the peoples to resist the ravages of totalitarian rule by their own democratic strength, it will stimulate the chauvinistic madmen who are already urging that a preventive war be launched against Russia by inundating it quickly with atom bombs."

This is what has been reaped.

Hundreds of thousands of Chinese Stalinist troops have crossed the border of Korea to defend their "national interests." This preponderant mass of troops is driving the U. S.-UN forces rapidly back toward their starting point. Pyongyang, the North Korean capital, has already fallen, and the Chinese Stalinist army threatens to cross the 38th parallel to the South. A major military disaster now looms for the Western powers.

The world trembled at the very thought of such a war. The Western European nations have already voiced their desire for peace and a cessation of the war. In consequence, British Prime Minister Attlee has flown to Washington to meet with President Truman. There

is no question but that Truman's thinking-out-loud on the use of the atom bomb—perhaps in this present conflict—brought a new fear to the peoples of the world who want an end to the war.

Trygve Lie, the secretary general of the UN, called together the representatives of those countries which have recognized the Mao government to meet with its General Wu in the hope of finding some formula to bring peace to Korea.

The UN itself awaits the outcome of the Truman-Attlee discussion before voting on a resolution to condemn the Chinese intervention. In the meantime, the president and other administration spokesmen declare their determination to stick it out in the Far East to the very end—yet with no clear vision of how to meet the overwhelming mass of Chinese troops. There is not a single sign that these and other

statesmen know how to bring an end to the useless slaughter, which aids and can only aid Stalinist totalitarianism.

Here, at home, the bitterest reactionaries in the country, the "isolationist" Republicans, the spokesmen and apologists for the miserable and discredited Chiang clique, known as the China Lobby, all shriek for a broadening of the war.

General MacArthur, whom Max Lerner so aptly calls "our proconsul in the Pacific," and who has made one political blunder after another in the Far East, now blames the UN for the present disaster, allegedly because he was not permitted to take the initiative against China!

Senator Knowland, a MacArthur spokesman and friend of the China Lobby, demands the immediate bombing of China, an ultimatum to Mao and the expulsion of Russia from the UN! Behind these men stand the Hearst and Scripps Howard presses which also call for a deepening and expansion of the war.

ROAD TO WAR

It is clear that the war in Korea must stop before it is too late! This means the withdrawal of all troops from that land, for in truth the overwhelming mass of fighters are neither North Koreans or South Koreans, but the troops, tanks, planes and weapons of China, the United States, Great Britain and other UN countries. In the background stands Stalinist Russia, reaping all the political benefits of the conflict.

It seems only yesterday that the Big Four powers met successively in Cairo, Teheran and Yalta and there divided up their respective interests and spheres of influence. That is how they set up the brave new world! There was nothing fundamentally new about it. It was merely a continuation of the time-honored method of imperialism.

Korea was artificially split at the 38th parallel with Russian and U. S. interests established. The idea that this division was

"We have got to quit supporting dead horses like Chiang Kai-shek."  
(Turn to last page)

(Turn to last page)

# S. F. BAY AREA Shachtman Debates Landauer on Role of United Nations at U. of California

BERKELEY, Cal., Nov. 27 — Over 250 students of the University of California crowded into the YWCA Cottage this evening to hear a debate between Max Shachtman of the Independent Socialist League and Carl Landauer, professor of economics and member of Americans for Democratic Action.

It was clear that the students were hungry for political discussion. The repressive atmosphere at the university, created by the Regents' "anti-Communist oath" policy and the vicious state Levering Act, was partially broken by the extremely enthusiastic response of the students to the first real political debate for over a semester. The large student audience was unanimous, at least on one point: opposition to the sickening fear and timid uniformity which has seized the university in the past year. Here, at least, was some fresh air!

The meeting was held in a hall right outside Cal's famous Sather Gate, which has been a symbol of free speech and radical politics for many years. The Regents' infamous Rule 17 prohibits any real political meetings on campus, but the big-business police-minds who now control the university cannot rub out student interest in politics. The students voted for open discussion by filling the hall to the rafters.

### JOINTLY ORGANIZED

One of the most compelling aspects of the debate was its sponsorship. The Socialist Youth League and the liberal Students for Democratic Action—rival organizations—co-sponsored the meeting. This was important in a campus absolutely permeated with the smell of Stalinist front-group activity.

The two organizations put out joint leaflets and shared expenses but had their separate literature and separate speakers at the meeting, and the audience was asked to fill out interest blanks to indicate which organization they were interested in. Such open united-front activity had raised the prestige of both organizations and set the tone of the entire debate.

The question for the evening had the highest and most immediate political significance: "Is the

United Nations a Viable Force for World Peace?" Both speakers were qualified by a long history of active participation in politics.

Professor Carl Landauer, who took the affirmative, was a long-time member of the German Social-Democratic Party and was a member of its Munich executive committee in 1923 when Hitler attempted his first putsch. He was forced to leave Germany in 1933 to go to America, where he became an economist and historian of socialism at the University of California.

Max Shachtman, national chairman of the Independent Socialist League, has long been an active leader in the American socialist movement, and as an editor, author and speaker has contributed outstandingly to its growth.

The debate occurred under the most difficult circumstances. The hysterical purge atmosphere in California permeates every crevice of the university. Professor after professor had been approached for the debate but turned down the invitation. Some said openly that they feared the Hearst press and the Regents; others offered less honest reasons. The moderator for the evening was Professor Gerald E. Marsh, chairman of the Speech Department and assistant dean of the College of Letters and Sciences. He is one of the few remaining prominent men at the school not frightened into silence by the drive for unanimity and conformism which has seized the faculty as a whole.

### IS UN "PEACE-LOVING"?

Professor Landauer, although admitting that there were imperfections and blemishes in the structure and operation of the UN, offered it as a "hope" to the students. He insisted on experimentation and flexibility, and considered the UN as one of the techniques for that mutual cooperation between nations which would ensure peace. To him, the key question was the getting-together of the peace-loving nations of the world, led by the United States, to put a stop to the forcible aggression of the warlike countries, led by Russia.

He pointed out, furthermore, that the policies of the UN were determined, at the present time,

by the United States. These policies are peaceful and friendly therefore, in his view, the United States does not economically exploit other nations and its foreign policy is not imperialist. He insisted that capitalism and Stalinism could live peacefully in the world if only "the Soviet leaders under Stalin would give up the Leninist interpretation of Marxism."

Shachtman presented precisely the opposite view. He attacked the UN, to an appreciative audience, as "completely undemocratic from top to bottom" because of the big-power veto and the representation of reactionary and totalitarian states. The imperfections of the UN were deep and lasting and not merely "warts" to be removed by a verbal flourish.

In a speech that was interrupted several times by hearty applause, he demonstrated that the United Nations was absolutely powerless before the American-Russian conflict. Not only wasn't it a Viable force for world peace, but it was being used to provide a cover for American imperialist intervention in Korea.

Shachtman denounced the UN and its member nations as a reactionary force standing in the

## NEW YORK New Mayor Shows His Colors—Bosses Fight for Tammany Rule

By TONY TOWERS

NEW YORK, Dec. 5 — The first round in the battle for the control of Tammany Hall is over, with Carmine DeSapio still sitting on the throne though somewhat insecurely. His would-be ouster, newly elected Mayor Vincent Impellitteri, showed that he had learned all the tricks of the trade in his many faithful years of service in Tammany Hall before his break in the recent election to run as a so-called "independent."

In their first move to gain control of Tammany Hall, the Impellitteri forces attempted to oust DeSapio as the Manhattan Democratic member of the Board of Elections. They wanted to name

their own man to be elections commissioner, a juicy political plum of a job, paying \$12,000 a year. DeSapio as the head of Tammany Hall was to be deposed as a warning to all others who didn't want to fall in line, and then Impellitteri and his supporters could move in to reorganize the Democratic Party in Manhattan.

But DeSapio rallied unexpected support to himself—particularly since the main charge hurled against him could also be hurled against most of the nearly 12,000 county committee members who were to name the Democratic elections commissioner. That charge was that he had failed to back Impellitteri and instead had stomped for the losing Democratic-Liberal candidate, Ferdinand Pecora.

As one committee man plaintively put it, if that's enough to make a man lose his job, all of us are in the same boat and we'd all better look out for our jobs. These are the boys and girls who enjoy the patronage rewards, and their souls were somewhat divided between their gratitude toward DeSapio for past patronage and Impellitteri for future patronage.

### JUST ANOTHER BOSS

The Impellitteri spokesmen, who but yesterday were campaigning on a platform against corrupt, rotten machine bossism, are openly demanding that the Democrats with city jobs follow them or else the hatchet will descend on them. Rarely have campaign slogans been so quickly exposed.

Impellitteri, the anti-boss candidate—the candidate who owed "no obligation to any man, political boss, or machine"—lost no time in showing his true colors. Barely 24 hours after his election, in one of his first official acts, he announced the appointment of Frank Sampson, former Tammany chief who supported his candidacy, as his administrative assistant, or as it is more popularly known, his patronage secretary.

Sampson, like Impellitteri, is also a graduate of the Tammany school; he too owes Tammany Hall all that he ever got; former Mayor O'Dwyer hoisted him to Tammany leadership and later dumped him. His alliance with Impellitteri, another disgruntled Tammany politician, was a natural, and they are

On Sunday night, November 26, Max Shachtman also spoke at a public meeting organized by the Independent Socialist League on "The Coming World War." He outlined the basis and nature of the U. S.-Russian conflict and looked ahead to the consequences of the war in the U. S. The meeting was well-attended, and questions from the floor were lively and interesting.

were clearly not shared by the audience. His whitewash of American imperialism placed him solidly in one of the two big camps, and therefore his opposition to the "blood and tears" of war fell rather flatly on the assembled crowd. But when he attacked the recognition of Franco Spain in the UN he was roundly applauded.

The audience responded with enthusiastic applause to Shachtman's condemnation of General MacArthur and the American drive to rearm Germany and Western Europe in preparation for World War III. Most of the students had never heard Shachtman before but he made a most excellent impression on the entire audience.

It is possible to say without a doubt that this was an anti-war audience and that Shachtman came much closer than Landauer to expressing its hatred and disgust with power politics, imperialism and the impotence and hypocrisy of the United Nations.

### SEES NO MAJOR WAR

Prior to the North Korean invasion in June, the indefensibility of South Korea in any large-scale action, given the existing world-armament relations, was a platitude of Pentagon thinking. At the time of the United States intervention nothing had occurred to cause a revision of this basically correct estimate other than a change in intention toward North Korean activities. Militarily the operation has been conducted on a shoestring; politically, on something less than that. As we have written elsewhere, the committing of Chinese Stalinist troops was bound to make all this painfully obvious.

Despite the pressure of the cocky proconsul MacArthur and of the more ignorant of the congressmen who act on the basis of a simple reflex to a particular situation, United States imperialism is not likely to plunge into a major operation in China.

There are several reasons for this. The most immediate is the pre-vious of the costs of such an operation—casualties are already over 30,000, which is equivalent to two full divisions. Linked to this is a growing recognition that even if China, along with other Stalinist forces in the Far East, were to be defeated, the U. S.'s main enemy, Russia, would still remain untouched.

Further it is being more generally understood that Western Europe, with its machinery and manpower, must be preserved—a consummation which cannot be achieved if the locus of United States effort is the Orient. These simple facts will be pounded home by Western European capital, which, though debilitated, has by no means lost its sanity.

### WEST EUROPE BALKS

Given a belief in the general effectiveness of the pressure of reality, it can also be asserted with more or less certainty that the seriousness of the international situation plus the reduction in the MacArthur mystique which is taking place, will cause many of

## Read THE NEW INTERNATIONAL

Subscribers — Attention! Check your NAME—ADDRESS—CITY—ZONE—STATE appearing on the upper left-hand corner of page one. If there are any mistakes or if anything is left out of the address, especially the ZONE NUMBER, cut out your name and address and mail it to us with the corrections clearly printed.

14-15 If this number appears at the bottom of your address, your subscription expires with this issue. RENEW NOW!

# THE NEW CRISIS IN U. S. FOREIGN POLICY

By JAMES M. FENWICK

With chilling fatality the full consequences of United States policy in Korea are—not unpredictably—becoming manifest.

Began as a military intervention authorized neither by Congress nor the people, the abrupt reversal of policy effected last June has, in conjunction with a merciless Stalinist imperialism, brought a half-unbelievable world to the edge of World War III.

As this is written, the crumbling of UN forces under the Stalinist avalanche, the apparent transgression of Stalinist China toward gestures of conciliation, the extreme reluctance of Western European capitalism to precipitate the cataclysm, the lack of United States preparedness the desire to recoup prestige in the Orient, and the threat to European security latent in a large-scale action in China have combined to reduce the governing echelons in Washington to paralysis and hysteria.

Truman's customarily inept off-the-cuff remarks concerning the employment of the atom bomb (whose military utility in Korea would be slight and whose political effect would be devastating) is symptomatic of the impasse into which United States foreign policy has floundered.

### GERMANS WANT NO WAR

It is true that the Social-Democratic Party did not pronounce itself against rearmament in principle. What Schumacher proposed was that certain preconditions had to be met before the matter of rearmament could be discussed. "One of these," as Anne O'Hare McCormick has pointed out, "is the presence of sufficient Allied force, with the Germans, to make a German army more than a futile gesture. Another is that a general election or at least a plebiscite should be held on the question. The third is full equality for the German forces, 'division for division and corps for corps.'"

This is bad enough from the United States government's point of view—especially the proviso concerning the election—but the reality is even grimmer, for all pre-election polls indicated what the elections reflected in distorted form: the almost total lack of desire of the German people to engage in another war. The vote is all the more significant in that it is not the product of Stalinist pure-and-simple defeatism. The CP vote, as a matter of fact, declined from even its previously very low point.

Not the least interesting aspect of the elections was the revival of political interest which was noted by United States commentators. The post-war revulsion against "politics," which abated somewhat when industrial production was allowed to revive, would seem to have been further overcome. As evidence of this we have in these pages previously noted the encouraging emergence of *Freie Tribune* (The Free Tribune), published in Dusseldorf, and *Pro und Contra* (Pro and Con), published in West Berlin, two socialist papers seeking to steer a course between the two giant imperialisms.

### EYES ON AFRICA

The crude frustration-aggression pattern of U. S. politics, particularly as displayed in recent weeks, has set the more sophisticated Western European politicians to wringing their hands and crying out upon the United States to try to seek some sort of *modus vivendi* in Asia and to concentrate upon the key area, Europe. In the long run it is a hopeless quest, of course, but in terms of short-range capitalist politics (as distinguished from MacArthur's gang-honor concept) it is the more realistic approach.

### LABOR ACTION BOOK SERVICE

can help you build your own Labor and Socialist Library... Send for free book list 4 Court Sq., L.I.C., New York

the irresponsibles of the Republican Party to yield to the indicated trend.

The Korean intervention therefore emerges as a blunder. What remains for Washington is a salvage operation. Whether even that is possible at all depends upon the intentions of the Chinese Stalinists, who are, if they wish to do so, in a position to run the UN forces out of Korea altogether.

The concretization of a European orientation, however, is not proving to be a routine exercise for United States politicians. A large number of Western European countries are having difficulties in recognizing the messianic mission of the United States.

Though they have been overshadowed by the Korean events the recent elections in Germany underscore the enormous difficulties the United States is having in building up the capitalist anti-Russian bloc. In the states of Heasse, Württemberg-Baden, and even in normally conservative Bavaria, the German Social-Democratic Party last month greatly increased its influence at the expense of the Christian-Democratic Party in a series of elections where the issue was posed as rearmament versus non-rearmament.

### SEES NO MAJOR WAR

Prior to the North Korean invasion in June, the indefensibility of South Korea in any large-scale action, given the existing world-armament relations, was a platitude of Pentagon thinking. At the time of the United States intervention nothing had occurred to cause a revision of this basically correct estimate other than a change in intention toward North Korean activities. Militarily the operation has been conducted on a shoestring; politically, on something less than that. As we have written elsewhere, the committing of Chinese Stalinist troops was bound to make all this painfully obvious.

Despite the pressure of the cocky proconsul MacArthur and of the more ignorant of the congressmen who act on the basis of a simple reflex to a particular situation, United States imperialism is not likely to plunge into a major operation in China.

There are several reasons for this. The most immediate is the previous of the costs of such an operation—casualties are already over 30,000, which is equivalent to two full divisions. Linked to this is a growing recognition that even if China, along with other Stalinist forces in the Far East, were to be defeated, the U. S.'s main enemy, Russia, would still remain untouched.

### WEST EUROPE BALKS

Given a belief in the general effectiveness of the pressure of reality, it can also be asserted with more or less certainty that the seriousness of the international situation plus the reduction in the MacArthur mystique which is taking place, will cause many of

going to accelerate the implementation of such aspects of the currently fragile Atlantic Pact as are workable, it is also going to add several appendixes to the pact. More and more attention is being paid to the Middle East and to Africa in order to secure manpower, bases and raw materials for the war against Russia—and to deny these to Russia. We can have already seen intimations of it in recent weeks—expect collisions with the legitimate aspirations of the 'colonial peoples of Africa. It will be South America's turn soon.

To sum up, then, our estimate of the most likely evolution of events:

The Korean intervention has proved a blunder from which the United States is being forced to extricate itself with inevitable loss of prestige. Stalinism will therefore fall into more victories in the Far East for lack of a viable, political program and insufficient military power on the part of the United States. The United States will attempt to peg down the big prize—India. Reality will turn off the spigot of most of the irresponsible Republican criticism of the Truman foreign policy. Europe will become the point of concentration in orientation, if not, for manifold reasons, in actual realization. There will be a new drive for allies, this time extending to the Middle East and Africa, which is bound to aid in the political awakening of this vast continent.

Like the hunter who got hold of the grizzly bear by the tail, the United States finds itself unable to hang on and in mortal danger if it lets go.

## LATIN AMERICA

# U. S. Tightens Squeeze on Bolivia

By JUAN RAY

SANTIAGO, November—Bolivia is a striking and typical example of the meaning of U. S. policy in South America.

This poor and backward country produces a strategic mineral, tin. Because of the troubled situation in Malaya, the world's other great tin source, Bolivia's 35,000 to 40,000 tons of tin have a basic importance for U. S. and British industry, especially for their war economies. But the capitalist monopolies have turned Bolivia's advantageous situation into a source of misery for the Bolivian people.

As a result of the post-war crisis, the price of tin fell to 70 cents a ton, in U. S. money. The State Department's representative, the "clever" Edward Miller, declared that the U. S. does not need South American raw materials. American technical advisors arrived soon after and "advised" the Bolivian government to devalue its currency from 42 pesos per dollar to 60-100. Thus the cost of Bolivian tin would be lower for the U. S. (during the war it sold at 98 cents a ton), and U. S. commodities could be imported into the country at higher prices. The cost of this "advice" would be paid by the Bolivian working class and middle class, through a 100 per cent rise in the cost of living.

The government and the mine owners accepted the U. S. advice and devalued the national currency. Previously the dollar officially cost 42 pesos, and 60 pesos on the black market. Now it was 60-100 pesos officially, and 200 on the black market. The advice of the U. S. and UN technical counselors was excellent—for the mine owners and the Yankee monopolies.

## West Coast Branches of ISL Hold Lively Regional Conference

By SCOTT BYER

OAKLAND, Cal., Nov. 30 — On November 12, at 6 p.m. the first West Coast Conference of the Independent Socialist League came to a close. The conference was attended by delegates and friends of the ISL from California, Oregon, and Washington. The conference had opened Friday night with greetings to the delegates by the conference chairman, Stan Weir, and Max Shachtman national chairman of the ISL.

Following this a discussion was held on the present political situation, nationally and particularly on the West Coast, which has come about as a result of the Korean war. It was during this discussion that special attention was given to the fact that on the West Coast there have been more violations of civil liberties than in other sections of the country.

The following morning organizational reports were given by representatives from each of the West Coast branches so that the delegates and friends from each area could criticize and learn from each other's activities. Next, the situation in and condition of the labor movement on the West Coast was discussed. This was followed by a discussion on the Independent Socialist press, spotlighting the question of how it could be improved and how best to circulate it.

The Saturday morning session started off with the consideration of organization among the youth, and following this a discussion was held on political action. It was on this latter question that there was lively disputation among those present. (The main points of view on this question have appeared in the pages of LABOR ACTION and the ISL discussion bulletin, *Forum*, December 1950.)

Christian conscience in wartime, he said, "seems to have chiefly the effect, certainly important but scarcely decisive, of making Christians do reluctantly what military necessity requires." (N. Y. Times, Nov. 28.)

The remaining time on the conference agenda was used to plan a better integration of the work of the ISL on the West Coast. A motion was enthusiastically passed proposing that West Coast conferences be held annually and that plans for a combination West Coast conference, summer camp and school should be considered. The conference then closed in the traditional ISL manner, with the singing of the *Internationale*. Before adjournment, the conference wired its greetings to Natalia Sedov Trotsky.

It would be impossible to write an account of this conference without reporting that it had an obvious positive effect on the spirit of all those attending. Yet, during the entire Conference, there were no attempts made to exaggerate the successes made by the ISL in the last period nor to talk away any of its failures. The delegates soberly discussed and exchanged ideas and criticisms during each topic on the agenda and returned to their respective branches better equipped to carry on the fight to build the movement for socialism.

### Reluctant Sinners

While a commission of prominent Protestant clerics and laymen adopted a report which called use of the atom bomb justifiable if the other fellow uses it first, a minority report by the Rev. Dr. R. L. Calhoun of Yale Divinity School had a caustic comment.

Christian conscience in wartime, he said, "seems to have chiefly the effect, certainly important but scarcely decisive, of making Christians do reluctantly what military necessity requires." (N. Y. Times, Nov. 28.)

## PERON AXIS GAINS

The intervention of the U. S. ambassador so open and public that a storm of indignation arose in the press. Did Florman interfere on his own initiative? That is hard to believe; we rather think he acted on instructions from the State Department. The result of this policy is revolt and indignation by the people and greater political antagonism to the Yankees. The MNR (Nationalists) and the PIR (Stalinists) have come to a political agreement, on the basis of which they will fight for the nationalization of the mines, agrarian reforms and nationalization of foreign trade. This pact has great political importance because it is backed by Argentine Peronism, and Peron dreams of exercising economic control over Bolivia.

### PARADOX

But the State Department, its Edward Miller and their American technical advisors had not reckoned on the Korean war, which changed the world situation, the economic life of the U. S. and the price level of raw materials. The price of tin rose from 70 cents to \$1.50 a pound. But the Bolivian peso has not risen, nor have commodity prices fallen; on the contrary, all prices are rising daily.

The paradoxical situation is such that, at the time when the price of tin is at its highest point in the economy's history, the poverty of the country is deeper than ever, as is the misery of the Bolivian people. Such is the result of the pressure—pardon, the "advice"—of the American counselors. Such is the U. S.'s "aid for backward countries."

But that is not all. To allay the indignation of the workers and middle class, the government put through a bill according to which the mine owners were to turn over to the national treasury all license fees for the export of minerals. The mine owners revolted and cut down tin production. Naturally, the dollar rose to

## CHICAGO

# SYL Hears Drake on African Movement

By BILL MEITZNER

CHICAGO, Nov. 27—Yesterday, at the regular weekly public meeting of the Socialist Youth League, University of Chicago students heard Saint Clair Drake speak on "Nationalist Movements in Africa." Drake is a professor of sociology at Roosevelt College and co-author of *Black Metropolis*.

The problem of national aspirations among the African peoples becomes particularly important for the Western European nations, said Drake, in the present period of East-West conflict. Africa is a major source not only of raw materials but of people, whose support in a war against Russia becomes a question of primary political importance.

But the cause of national independence is itself faced with certain problems which must be overcome, and it is with these that Drake was concerned.

He was concerned, he said, principally with the British colonies, Kenya, Rhodesia, etc. The Eastern uplands are suitable for European settlement and the subsequent introduction of a European-type government. Control is sought throughout the establishment of a "white dominion." Here the struggle takes place along racial lines on the questions of land and the political franchise.

In the West, British colonial domination is secured by a small proportion of European population. Here control involves the absorption of native institutions into the ruling apparatus and playing off tribe against tribe. The nationalists are faced with the problem of overcoming the old tribal consciousness.

### HAVE NO CLASS VIEW

In Kenya, the nationalists are subject to two internal pressures to which they must give expression if they wish to succeed.

One which Drake considered important is represented in the development of religious cults pressing for independence. These frequently hold an anarchist position.

The other is the trade-union movement. Unions are illegal in Kenya, and the usual punishment for strike leaders is exile to the Seychelles. Because of the lack of a liberal or a non-Stalinist-left force in Kenya, this has come under the domination of the World Confederation of Trade Unions. Drake accused the West European trade-unionists of being bound to the state apparatus of the Western European nations and failing to support the struggles of the Kenya workers.

However, Drake believed that

since the nationalist movements are not oriented in a class sense (unlike the socialist movements of India and Burma), they can make better use of the East-West conflict, by playing either against the other, to achieve independence. Yet, he said, independence will be the last thing to be achieved in an alliance with Stalinism, and the African nationalist leaders really never consider such a move (apparently, just as they never consider taking up the workers' struggle from a non-Stalinist-left point of view).

Drake summed up with four generalizations which he drew from the situation of the nationalist movements in British Africa. First, the movements are confronted with the need to overcome tribal lines in establishing the national state. Second, they operate under restricted political freedom—no press, visas, etc.—which makes for little communication and no continental unity. Third, they have a purely nationalist orientation in a world divided between Stalinist and capitalist imperialist powers. From this he arrives at his last generalization, the recommendation that the nationalist movement could utilize the present, world struggle by playing one side against the other to achieve independence.

# 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

## Socialist Medicine Needs 'Doctors' Control'

By CARL DARTON

Socialism has been described as a planned society under democratic workers' control. The vital lesson of the past 30 years is that economic and social planning without workers' participation and control is a mockery of the aims of socialism, whether such planning is under the guise of a "welfare state," fascism, Stalinism, or a Labor government.

This is illustrated by the experience in England, described in an open letter appearing in the New Statesman and Nation to Aneurin Bevan, the Labor Party minister of health.

The letter, signed by "Consultant," disclosed that as the result of poor planning, "Long-established local hospital facilities have been broken up so that a working-class mother who once could take her sick child around the corner to the hospital" now must spend much time and cash traveling from one hospital to another. "Different specialities has been segregated so that no single hospital will provide a single integrated service."

There is nothing in the tone of the letter to indicate that the writer bears any personal grudge or has any particular axe to grind, for he writes "more in my professional capacity as a specialist than as an old socialist." "Consultant" is much in favor of the National Health Service Act but is greatly distressed that "Medical Advisory Committees composed of the specialists of the local hospitals are feeling frustrated and unhappy, more planned against than planned. . . ." The Hospital Boards, appointed from the top, have repeatedly ignored the plans and programs worked out by the advisory committees composed of the working hospital specialists.

The present status is thus portrayed as satisfactory neither to the general public nor the practicing staff. The cause is laid to lack of workers' control.

In a statement both candid and clear "Consultant" declares: "The one single factor which is disturbing everything is the complete failure to consult the men and women who will actually have to do the work. The Regional Hospital Boards have learned nothing from the experiences of the other nationalized services. Central control, the ignoring and overriding of local views, the feeling of the man on the job that he has no share in deciding his own functions, all these lead to frustration and mediocrity. I now really understand, for the first time, the emotional state which leads miners' and dockers to strike against authority which has improved their standard of living immeasurably. It is because the essential dignity of a man in his work is threatened."

### The Sense of Participation

It is only necessary to add that nationalization without workers' control is thus approaching a state long reached by capitalism—the infringement on the dignity of a man at his job.

Here in the United States many workers and scientists on large-scale operations have a deep feeling of discontent as a result of their lack of participation in the planning of technical projects. This despite the hypocritical schemes of management to develop a "sense of participation," the emptiness of which is very apparent.

Often the frustration of scientists is merely felt as a vague longing for "professional status"; but here and there one finds individuals who link this discontent of non-participation not only with the low wages they receive but also with the social waste of their efforts and accomplishments. Others will learn from reading of such experiences as the British medical specialists', quoted above, that participation on the job means something to all workers and its lack involves a real economic loss to the community.

Real participation would mean, under socialized government ownership, that groups of workers (say, in the atomic energy laboratories), would collectively plan their own projects, establish their working conditions, elect group leaders, and participate freely in genuine labor unions and in political life.

And you can bet your life that atomic energy would be applied to peaceful rather than destructive purposes.

The simple fact is that for every worker, manual and professional, socialism must make a difference on the job. This, even a so-called "left-wing socialist," Nye Bevan, does not seem to understand.

### NOT IN THE HEADLINES . . .

A year's subscription to LABOR ACTION brings you a living socialist analysis of news and views on labor, minority groups, national and world politics—\$2 a year.

LABOR ACTION Independent Socialist Weekly Vol. 14, No. 50 December 11, 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: BRonsides 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, 1879. 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

RESISTANCE IN THE IRON CURTAIN COUNTRIES, by Arthur Karasz. (Annals of Amer. Academy of Political and Social Science, September.)

"The working classes [in the Iron Curtain Countries] react to planned misery by extreme passivity. Even the leaders of the regime are forced to admit it, and we often hear of the severe admonitions given to the working classes by Matyas Rakosi and Antonin Zapotocky, the respective dictators of Hungary and Czechoslovakia, neither of whom has yet succeeded in completely stopping the leakage of news. The leaders complain of 'formalism in competition' by which they mean that 'socialist competition'—the most important means of cutting down wages—is not 'voluntary' enough; that it has to be planned on upper levels, while the workers merely comply passively with orders. The leaders also complain of 'demagoguery in wages,' and admit that it has spread even to the higher ranks of the party. It is characteristic of the system that a pro-worker tendency should now be called 'demagoguery,' and referred to as such in the 'auto-criticisms' of the trade-union leaders themselves.

"Rakosi and Zapotocky are silent about the sabotage being carried out by exasperated workmen; and they do not mention the strikes, one of which took place in the fall of 1949 in the important mines of Salgotarjan, Hungary, and was broken only by the threat of Russian military forces.

"The hidden assistance of the workman makes itself felt in the growing inefficiency of labor. Being badly paid, since 'he works for himself,' the workman profits from each chance to work less or to create higher wages for himself. In consequence each of his steps has to be controlled, and his production has to be 'planned' for a whole year in advance. If he does not meet the minimum requirements established by the individual plan, he may be condemned to death."

(A footnote by Kalasz at this point states: "The Hungarian decree of February 17, 1950, concerning the Protection of Economic Planning, gives unlimited authority to the regime to liquidate anybody for not having achieved his quota.")

"Planning has gone so far as to establish even the norms of each machine for the year beginning May 1, 1950. The question is unanswered as to what would happen in the case of a machine which did not fulfill the norm: would the manager or the workman be arrested? Both are in continuous danger.

"Planning itself is as disorganized as if disorganization were planned. In the fall of 1949 the orders of the Hungarian government concerning the construction of public buildings were changed 170 times. Similar complaints appear daily in the papers. This recent difficulty is called 'gray sabotage,' and results in high expenditures, in less of time, and often in useless production."

# WORLD POLITICS

## Jewish Returnees from Israel Face Discrimination in Germany

The following "Letter from Germany" is reprinted from the Jewish Newsletter, published by William Zuckerman, issue of October 27, and is presented here for its general interest.—Ed.

A mood of depression, frustration and despair is predominant among the Jews still in Germany to a greater degree than ever since the height of the concentration in the Displaced Persons camps. The feeling of bleak hopelessness is so heavy that it can almost be touched. Almost everything else is a vast unknown.

There are no accurate figures as to how many DP's are left. Nobody knows their plans fully. No one can tell how many have gone to and returned from Israel; or where the others are going. The general despair is equaled only by the lack of precise facts.

With the outbreak of the Korean war, a near frenzy swept the camps. Here it seemed was the opening gun in a new world war, with Germany a self-evident battleground in the clash between Eastern and Western forces. And here were the remaining Jews caught as in a trap, immobilized, incapable to move through the many legal and other restrictions, paralyzed by their own frustrations—doomed, they agreed.

With the turn of events in Korea, this influence has somewhat abated. The other forces still remain to bedevil their lives. There is, for instance, the Anti-Subversive Bill that was passed by the United States Congress recently and which clamped down hard on the planned immigration of Jews who wanted to come to the United States.

### TRY TO FORCE THEM BACK

Moreover, there is a widespread feeling that the American Jewish organizations are not exerting themselves to do something about this situation. The prevalent attitude is to get them to go to Israel, even those who have no wish to do so—even those who have gone and returned. Nevertheless, the pressures and the threats remain.

Periodically, the announcement is made that the Central Committee or the Jewish Agency or the Joint Distribution Committee or other offices set up for their help, will be closed down. There is even a widespread rumor that in a new exodus

from behind the Iron Curtain, Jews are taken out in sealed cars that remain sealed until their occupants are actually on board boats going to Israel. True or not, this rumor is believed, and it adds to the sense of helplessness.

The disgruntlement takes many forms. There have been occasions of rioting and sit-down strikes. Most of all, there is a dull submission to fate, a death-like apathy.

The plight of those who had gone to Israel and who had returned (most of them illegally) is particularly difficult. The formal Jewish agencies reject them. The tendency of the IRO is to regard them as no longer qualified for relief or even to look on them as Israeli citizens who are the responsibility of the Israeli government. This is no comfort to the returnees, of whom over 800 are known to be wandering around Germany (and by common consent that figure is regarded as a low unofficial estimate).

### CAMPAIGN OF HUMILIATION

Others remain in Germany to wait and wait for the restitution of property that has been so long talked of. Some have made a determined effort to readjust themselves to German life out of intimate personal inclinations and associations and out of a desire to continue Jewish life in a center in which it had flourished for centuries. A large number are trying to lose themselves rapidly in the general community and to wipe out the memory of their Jewish identity. For all of them the practical problems of living, securing documents or planning to emigrate, is overwhelming. To top it off, there is a deliberately inspired process of humiliation. Recently, a World Jewish Congress representative made the proposal that Jews who remain in Germany and who do not wish to go to Israel be excommunicated and denied every help and consideration from their fellow Jews abroad. This is a measure of the fanaticism that poisons away at a dispirited, life-weary group of people. Its impact adds to the heavy mental and physical burdens that they carry.

In short, Jewish life in Germany is, for the most part, a life of apathy and of waiting—bereft of even the comfort of knowing what is being awaited.

A GERMAN CORRESPONDENT

## THE PRO-TITOISM OF THE SOCIALIST LEFT—20

# The Positive Outcome of Titoism

By HAL DRAPER

The aim of this series, as our first article stated, has been limited to combating the illusions about the Tito regime so widespread among the pro-Titoist left—that is, primarily the independent Marxist groups in Europe but not confined to them. In closing this detailed study of the political nature of the Yugoslav state under the new phenomenon of Titoism, however, it is necessary to say something about the relation between this socialist pro-Titoism and the positive outcome of the Tito-Stalin break about which we have written often enough previously.

Let us make clear once again that the pro-Titoism we are discussing centers around illusions on the Tito state and ruling bureaucracy.

The Fourth International Trotskyists' view of Tito Yugoslavia as a workers' state, a "dictatorship of the proletariat," a "socialist democracy," is only the most extreme form. More widespread is the less clearly formulated opinion that, whatever it may be, the Tito regime is not a form of Stalinism but something else; that it has at least taken important steps toward real socialist democracy; that it is "on the road"; and that the attitude of socialists (again, toward the Tito regime) must be one of sympathetic pressure toward a clarification and extension of what has been so well begun. Rock-bottom to this approach is the idea or hope that the Tito state bureaucracy—i.e., the leaders of the Communist Party—can be expected to lead the nation toward a full flowering of Leninism and socialist democracy, if it is considered that they have not done so yet.

As might be expected, this conception—nowhere clearly formulated except by the official-Trotskyists, nowhere even examined politically and theoretically by its possessors, existing amorphously more as a mood than as a political theory—is represented as the "positive" approach to Titoism. It is one of the pernicious traditions of the movement, preserved mostly for its usefulness in scoring a poor debater's point at the expense of thought, that "favorable" necessarily means "positive" and "hostile" means "negative."

The fact is that the pro-Titoism of the left is an obstacle and a road-block to the possibility of a positive utilization of the Titoist break with Moscow. It is easy to explain why.

### Eyes on Bureaucracy or the People?

We are not speaking of how to convert the Tito-Stalinist bureaucracy to Leninism or Marxist socialism. Anyone who sets that at the center of his perspectives for the positive utilization of Titoism is going down a different road.

With regard to the positive outcome of Titoism for socialists, as distinct from its meaning for semi-Stalinists like the official-Trotskyists or like the neo-Stalinist breed who colored the late Wallaceite movement, our eyes are not on the conversion of Tito, Djilas, Kardelj, and Rankovic, but on:

(1) The effect of the Tito break on the Yugoslav workers, including rank-and-file Communists, and on the masses in the other satellites behind the Iron Curtain; and

(2) Its effect on Stalinist workers in Western Europe, America and the rest of the world.

Within Yugoslavia, the break with Moscow meant one thing to the Titoist bureaucracy and another to the masses.

The bureaucracy saw only the necessity of adapting the country to a national-Stalinism. The masses saw a road open to an end to the dictatorship and to real "people's democracy" (which means only socialist democracy). Precisely because there was no revolution, because the break occurred only on top with the masses as passive if applauding spectators, there was no immediate question of a surge-through from below on the strength of the impulsion. The people waited. They are still waiting. Their leaders' speeches provide them with democratic demagoguery aplenty, but not with workers' democracy.

Meanwhile, as we have explained, the urgent crisis of the regime, political and economic, impels Tito to the dangerous expedient of seeking to fashion a "whip against the bureaucracy" by limited appeals for action from below. Stalin in Russia went through such a stage also. Time and again, in such situations in past periods, the Russian bureaucracy appealed to the people to be vigilant against the bureaucrats and, to write letters to the newspapers to "expose" flagrant acts, went on a spree of purging "bad" ones, set up controlled "control committees" to control the bureaucratic controllers, made heart-rending speeches about the evil effects of bureaucratism and called on the people to report "bad examples."

### Playing with Fire

Well, no matter how the leaders intend it, don't such speeches give the people "ideas"—that is, stimulate the people to act themselves, and set them in motion against the real bureaucracy?

Of course! The Stalinist dictatorship cannot control the gangrene of bureaucratism from above. It must either suffer the gangrene to spread and devour it, or appeal below for help. Either way it digs its own grave—and most of all when it shuttles between the alternatives.

In a discussion article in LABOR ACTION, Comrade Paul Roberts asked: "Do you really believe those [Yugoslav] leaders are stupid enough to think they can safely continue to tell such things to the workers while planning to do the opposite? And if by a miracle they are that stupid, do you think they could ever get away with it? . . . the effect of such words would be a tremendous blow at the stability of any Stalinist regime."

Comrade Roberts has hold of an important idea—by the wrong end. His formulation is lamentably naive, to be sure: Stalin, in his time in Russia, told "such things to the workers" and much more; and under cover of precisely such demagoguery consolidated his power. In the early stages, he could not have consolidated himself without doing just what Comrade Roberts thinks is out of the question!

And he got away with it. Other rulers have trodden on the edge of precipices and gotten away with it, right up to the very last time they tried it. It was not guaranteed, and it is not guaranteed for Tito. The important idea in Comrade Roberts' naive question is that Tito is playing with fire, like so many others before him.

The latest occasion when Stalin played with the same fire was 1936 when the new "democratic constitution" was introduced, with "universal secret suffrage" in everything. One way of describing what happened is to say that the step created illusions among the Russian people. It would have been better, certainly, if the Russian

workers had had no illusions, had been able clearly to see through the maneuver, and had fought the regime. But in many a situation, even active illusions can be a danger to the regime that creates them. This is exactly what Trotsky pointed out about the new Russian constitution. It was a maneuver to exorcize the danger of an open political crisis, he wrote:

"In introducing the new constitution, the bureaucracy shows that it feels this danger and is taking preventive measures. However, it has happened more than once that a bureaucratic dictatorship, seeking salvation in 'liberal' reforms, has only weakened itself. While exposing Bonapartism, the new constitution creates at the same time a semi-legal cover for the struggle against it. The rivalry of bureaucratic cliques at the elections [which never materialized in Russia—M. D.] may become the beginning of a broader political struggle. The whip against 'badly working organs of power' may be turned into a whip against Bonapartism. . . . There is no peaceful outcome for this crisis. No devil ever yet voluntarily cut off its own claws. The Soviet bureaucracy will not give up its positions without a fight. The development leads obviously to the road of revolution." (Revolution Betrayed, page 287.)

I would repeat this word for word, for Yugoslavia—with Tito's workers' councils specifically in mind, among other things—with the obvious qualification that no progressive outcome of any ensuing ferment is possible without the creation of a socialist vanguard.

Let us imagine for a moment that our socialist pro-Titoists can get the ear of anyone inside Yugoslavia: As the bureaucracy plays with fire, they assure the people that the bureaucratic rulers are really fine gentlemen, sincere democrats, valiant enemies of totalitarianism, etc.; Yugoslavia is a "workers' state," or "on the road," or what have you.

And this is called a "positive" approach to Titoism!

### Two Kinds of Pro-Titoism

The case is even clearer outside of Yugoslavia.

When a Stalinist worker goes Titoist, that is an important progressive step forward—for him. It can mean the beginning of his evolution into a Marxist socialist. It is a step in the right direction. It would be necessary, sympathetically and intelligently, to push him further along the road—or more accurately, to push him to take the road to our ideas and to bar the road to Stalinism in any form.

But this can be done only by telling him the truth about Titoism and Stalinism, by utilizing the step he has taken to get him to take the next step which breaks him from Stalinism in any form—not by jelling him in the Titoist ideology. The disastrous effect of socialist pro-Titoism is that it does the latter, insofar as it does anything.

Case in point: the Freie Tribune group in Germany. It is, as I understand it, largely formed of ex-Stalinists. It is also apparently enthusiastically pro-Titoist. That fact is not at all dismaying; on the contrary! Out of such a group, which has broken with the Stalinism they know and which is not under the control of any totalitarian state bureaucracy, the healthiest evolution can ensue. It is only to be regretted that the impact of Titoism in Western Europe has not produced more and larger groups of this character—which therefore, by definition, would at least begin by being pro-Titoist; and the virulent anti-internationalism of the Tito regime bears the major responsibility for the fact that the ranks of the Western Stalinist parties have not been shaken apart by "Titoist deviations."

I use this group only as an example, on the basis of a limited knowledge of it. What is certain is that the possibilities for its political development should not even be discussed under the same heading as the possibility of a democratization of the Titoist rulers in Yugoslavia.

The effect of pro-Titoism on such elements is to act as a BRAKE on their development.

Yes, for a Stalinist worker to go Titoist is a step forward. For a revolutionary Marxist to go Titoist is a retrogression. They are going in different directions. And until the pro-Titoist euphoria passes in Europe (there are already signs of it, especially as a result of Tito's foreign policy) no socialist approach to the utilization of Titoism will be possible, except a positively harmful one.

It can be admitted without hesitation that it may be easier to get the ear of a Titoist worker by telling him that the object of his illusions is really what he thinks it is—that is, by replaying the records stamped out by the Belgrade propaganda office. It is a well-known method of being "realistic" (add: "positive" and "sympathetic"). The ear will be gotten but it will do socialism no good.

We have known many a self-styled socialist in the United States who got the brilliant inspiration that the way to convert workers to socialism was to tell them that the Fair Deal or New Deal is socialism. . . . ride on its coattails. . . . why antagonize people by attacking it? . . . Most of those we have known wound up by joining the Fair Deal party. The angler fell into the water.

That this is what pro-Titoism has meant for the official-Trotskyists is well known. They have become more Stalinized than ever. It is not because they are stupid, though that hypothesis cannot be excluded. It is only because, with an initial push in that direction provided by their "workers' state" theory, they followed through consistently.

We are confident that the development of the Tito regime will cause others to draw back, with or without a re-examination of their previous course. To that end this series of articles has been dedicated.

The question of the development of and recent changes in Yugoslavia

Titoist political theory will be dealt with in a forthcoming article in The New Internationalist. This will take up particularly the views being forged by the Tito bureaucracy on the reasons for Russian degeneration and on internationalism.—H. D.

Reserve the date for the New York ISL NEW YEAR'S EVE PARTY Sunday evening, December 31 Labor Action Hall 114 West 14 Street, N. Y. C.

# The Russian State Budget

## Sidelights on Stalinism: Higher Direct Taxes on People and Hidden Entries

By Vs. FELIX

On June 17 the then newly elected "Supreme Soviet" (parliament) of Russia confirmed the new state budget for 1950, which listed 433,167 million rubles for income and 427,937 million rubles for expenditures. At the end of the several days' debate on the draft budget, presented by Minister of Finance Zverev, the government agreed to increase the budget by 1,125 million rubles. As compared with the budget for 1949, these figures are 4,100 million less under income and 15,600 million bigger under expenditures.

The decrease in the state income for 1950 is the result of the decrease in the turnover tax, which in turn (as explained by Zverev) is "the result of the decrease in prices and the increase in the real value of the ruble." But Zverev did not at all explain the reason for the increase in direct taxes on the population; as a matter of fact, this burden on the shoulders of the workers has increased by as much as the prices of production have been lowered and the ruble made dearer. The new budget has confirmed our view [published in previous issues of *Vpered*—Ed.] that the decrease in prices reflected government manipulation only and not any alleviation for the workers.

It will throw light on the new budget to compare it with previous ones. The accompanying box shows the budget for six years—pre-war 1940, mid-war 1943, and the post-war years.

From this table, anyone can see that there has been a vast increase in the direct taxes on the population. In 1950 they are almost four times higher than the pre-war taxes and one and a half times higher than even during the war period (1943).

It must be added that all the other taxes and sources for the state income, though indirect or secondary, are also levied upon the people. For instance, it is well known that the state loans are compulsory for Russian citizens. The turnover tax is also a form of exploitation of the toiling population.

In addition, as the Russian press confirms, the productivity of labor has risen 13 per cent, the value of production has decreased 7.3 per cent, prices have decreased 31 per cent, and the value of the ruble has accordingly gone up. It is thus clear that the increase in direct taxes is a yoke over the workers' shoulders.

### Bureaucracy Takes a Third

Looking at the planned expenditures shown in the budget, we can see that the expenditures on the state apparatus have risen more than 100 per cent as compared with pre-war. This means that, even according to official figures, the state bureaucracy devours almost one third of the direct taxes on the population (13.9 billion rubles). But this official figure is very insignificant compared with the real share of the national income thus consumed.

The military expenditures planned for the year are one and a half times higher than pre-war. They now amount to two-thirds of the expenditures for the mid-war year of 1943. But it must be said that the 18 per cent officially earmarked for the armed forces is a falsified figure. Both in recent years and at present, the major part of Russian industry is working for the army—beginning with all the plants which are known by numbers only (e.g., Plant No. 84 and 105 in Kharkov, Ukraine) and down to the needlework shops which produce handkerchiefs for soldiers only. It must therefore be borne in mind that a great part of the budget which is ticketed for industry and national economy (164.4 billion rubles this year) in actuality goes for the army.

Another interesting phenomenon in the 1950 budget is that planned income via direct taxes on the people is higher than income via state bonds and loans. This was not true before the war; it dropped up for the first time in 1947 and continues today. It might have been thought at first that

Sources	Income					
	1940	1943	1946	1947	1949	1950
Turnover tax	105.9	91.1	191.0	256.1	291.3	239.1
Income tax on enterprises	21.7		16.2	18.7		39.8
Direct taxes on population	9.4	28.6	22.7	27.7	36.0	36.4
State loans	11.5	29.0	25.5	22.4	?	31.8
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>180.2</b>	<b>210.0</b>	<b>322.0</b>	<b>394.2</b>	<b>437.0</b>	<b>433.1</b>
Expenditures						
	1940	1943	1946	1947	1949	1950
Armed forces	56.9	125.0	72.6	67.0	79.2	79.4
State apparatus	6.8	?	11.6	12.8	13.5	13.9
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>174.3</b>	<b>210.00</b>	<b>304.1</b>	<b>374.1</b>	<b>412.3</b>	<b>427.9</b>

Sources: 1940, 1946, 1947—*Bolshaya Sovyetskaya Encyklopediya*, Volume "SSSR," page 1072. 1943—*ibid.*, page 1070. 1949, 1950: *Pravda*, June 14-18, 1950.



it was the result of currency reform, but now—three years after that currency reform took place—one cannot avoid the conclusion that it is the result of conscious intention. Possibly it means that the Stalinist bureaucracy is not satisfied with the results of compulsory loans (which are "voluntary" only on paper) and that it has therefore gone over to direct and un concealed appropriation of the product of labor through increased direct taxes.

### Hidden Items

There is another point to be made which is not less interesting. Under national economy and social-cultural expenditures the following sums are allotted: 1940—99.2 billion; 1949—277.9 billion; 1950—285.1 billion. When these sums are added to the expenditures for the army and state apparatus [given in the accompanying table] it can be seen that the total obtained does not correspond with the total expenditures listed by the budget. The discrepancy is as follows:

- 1940—11.6 billion.
- 1949—41.7 billion.
- 1950—49.5 billion.

Where are these moneys going? There is nothing said in the official budget about them. It is possible that these represent reserve funds, a normal component of a budget. But then why is nothing said about it? And what are these reserve funds spent for?—We can ask: Do these billions, or any part of them, go for support of Russian imperialism abroad?

In the same way, if we compare the figures given for the source of income with the figures for total income planned, we see that there is a big discrepancy here too. Thus, for 1940 the difference is 31.7 billion rubles, for 1947 it is 69.3 billion, and for 1950 it is 86 billion. Where does this income come from? Again nothing is said about it in the official budget. Is it possible that it comes from the exploited satellite state, the countries of the so-called "People's Democracies"? In view of the official silence such an hypothesis is likely.

In any case, for the worker and kolkhoz-man, the source of the budget is his labor and his life.

(Translated from *Vpered*, No. 12, 1950.)

### Deadhead Law

Among the most indignant enemies of labor-union featherbedding are the railroads. A report by the Post Office Department and the U. S. General Accounting Office, brought to light by Senator Humphrey, proves that the railroads have one of the softest featherbeds in the country.

They got a law through Congress in 1916 which makes the P. O. pay them the full rate not only for cars carrying mail but also for empty cars making deadhead return trips. "No private shipper and no other government agency is subject to such a requirement," Humphrey pointed out. The deadhead cars cost the government 30 million last year.

Besides, a partial checkup showed that 20 per cent of the claims filed by the railroads were fakes.

By LEON TROTSKY

## Marxism in the United States

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

### The 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.

# Readers of Labor Action Take the Floor...

## Rejoinder from Rudzienski on War Policy

To the Editor:  
 I am under obligation to answer the questions posed by the editorial comment on my last discussion article on war policy [see LABOR ACTION for October 16].

In the first place, I must state that I am not for "critical support" to the Marshall Plan, the Atlantic Pact, U. S. imperialist policy in Europe, etc. That is the problem of the American bourgeoisie, to determine how it will conduct its war against Stalin. The war of the bourgeoisie is not our war. We could support, critically or not, only a policy and a war of a working-class government in the U. S., even if it were a government of the CIO-AFL. But American socialists and their friends in the entire world cannot support (not even critically) to the policy and the war of the capitalist government without abandoning independent socialist policy.

This does not mean that we cannot take advantage of the capitalist war against Stalin to further our own aims, nor that we must break off our socialist war against Stalin just because the bourgeoisie is fighting him. On the contrary, the inevitable international war enhances the probability of Stalinist defeat and thus the probability of our victory.

What is "quixotic" in the Third Camp policy of the ISL? It is the traditional defeatist policy against the war, inherited by the Bolsheviks and adapted to a different historical situation. Marx and Engels knew nothing of a defeatist policy against war; on the contrary they believed that war can play a part as a revolutionary factor (sometimes). A socialist war policy has to be subordinated to the fight for social revolution and for socialist power. The ISL position is quixotic insofar as it maintains the pacifist faith that the war can be avoided by the pacifist action of the masses. From this point of view the ISL helps the hypocritical "pacifist" claims of Stalinism, whose aim consists in covering up war preparations against the U. S. and masking Russian policies of conquest and annexation against the small peoples of Asia and Europe.

### WAR CAN'T BE STOPPED

In reality, the war is inevitable, and no action of the masses can impede it. It is our obligation to tell the truth and only the truth to the masses. It is also true that a Third Camp will not be created or arise, because the principal forces of capitalism are divided into two camps. Right after the defeat and destruction of Stalinism by the war, the independent socialist camp will indeed arise, but not as a "third" camp—rather, as a "second" camp, directed against capitalism. The socialist alternative is possible only after the destruction of Stalinism. The destruction of Stalinism even by the war, by the American bourgeoisie, will have progressive consequences if the working class will be able to take advantage of the war (and not be frightened by it) for its own policy.

What does the "independent socialist war against Stalin" consist of? It consists in restoring a true Marxist policy on the war; that is, in abandoning the pacifist policy, the utopia of the Third Camp, and in telling the masses the truth that the war is inevitable under present conditions of world politics and economy and the division of the working class between the Stalinist and bourgeois camps. We must tell the masses clearly:

- (1) That the war is inevitable and that it can play a progressive role, if the working class can take advantage of it for its own policy.
- (2) Stalin and his empire is the

principal enemy of the working class and his destruction is the first aim of workers' policy all over the world.

(3) The working class cannot support the capitalist war against Stalin, because this is not our war, being conducted by a capitalist government, enemy of the working class. But the working class will continue its own war against Stalin, today by ideological and tomorrow by armed means. To ensure its class independence, the American working class cannot make "internal peace" with the bourgeoisie but must continue its strike policy, its fight against capitalism, its defense of the democratic and social rights of the American people which are menaced by the "anti-red" campaign. In opposition to capitalist war policy American socialists should critically support the anti-Stalinist fight of the official workers' movement (CIO-AFL) and also its fight against monopolies and the capitalist government.

(4) The aim and consequence of the third world war must be the socialist transformation of the world, indeed through the destruction of Stalinism and the weakening of American capitalism. A workers' government in the U. S., even in the form of a CIO-AFL government, should be the consequence of the war.

Certainly we cannot today fight Stalin with any other weapons than ideological ones, but if we clearly adopt this policy, we cannot only influence the American social-democrats, liberals and the big trade-union movement, but then we can win independent British socialists, Spanish revolutionaries, the circles of the Fourth International and the best

elements of the Stalinist and Titoist workers to such a policy of independent war against Stalin.

In this way we will not be isolated and we can win the foremost ranks of the British-American working class movement (which today has a decisive role in world policy) toward conducting its spontaneous class struggle against Stalin as against capitalism.

A. RUDZIENSKI

We provide space for the above second rejoinder by Comrade Rudzienski since we had expressed the opinion that his views needed clarification and his present article attempts to provide such clarification.

Comrade Rudzienski makes clear we are glad to see, that he is not for support or critical support to the Atlantic Pact, Marshall Plan or to the U. S. in event of world war. But we confess that we do not see any more than before how these (to us) correct views square with his repeated formulations on the war which we discussed previously, some of which are contained in his present article too. We find his comments of "defeatism" and pacifism both irrelevant to the ISL's position and at best vague in themselves.

What does emerge clearly about his views is his insistence that we must tell the people that nothing they can do can stop war, and his apparent belief that a third world war will or can provide the only possible basis for socialist victory. We disagree with this completely.

At any rate, it is also clear that this is about as far as our discussion with Comrade Rudzienski on the meaning of his views can get right now, so it is ended for the present.—Ed.

## Vet Casts a Cold Eye on Korea Gear

To the Editor:

It seems that the lot of the GIs, in any army and in any war, never changes. Starting two weeks ago there appeared in the newspapers a story about how the GIs now fighting in sub-zero weather in Korea would get their winter gear "within a matter of days." The next day in a United Press dispatch President Truman stated that General MacArthur had "assured" him that the soldiers in Korea had plenty of winter gear. And in the same dispatch Senator Saltonstall said what had been said the day before "that they would get the warm clothing in a couple of days."

On the following day a series of articles appeared in the papers with conflicting stories as to why the GIs were being left out in the cold with the brass monkeys. Some stated that it was due to difficulty on the supply line, disrupted rail traffic, and all the rest. Another stated that one-third of the equipment had been "stolen" from the warehouses in Pusan by South Korean big-shot racketeers who are Asiatic masters of the black market. All the usual denials were printed with this article.

Any man who got "educated" during his hitch in the last war can read between the lines of these stories; either there has been some pretty poor planning, or someone or some people have been busy at things other than "winning the war." Racketeers or enlisted men do not raid a warehouse and make off with "a third of the clothing."

In the last war we didn't need any warm gear in the North African and Sicilian campaigns. When we got into Italy and into the mountains we really needed it and

we were stuffing our shirts with paper and rags to keep out the cold before it arrived. Many's the time when I had the shakes so bad that I was chipping enamel off my teeth, that I said to whoever would listen, "not only do they make you fight this goddamn war, but they don't care what's happening to you while you are doing it, just as long as you stay in there and continue to fight." I'll bet there are a lot of guys saying the same thing today in Korea. They are right and I'm adding my voice to the chorus, that is, if you will print this.

Oakland, Calif.

### Preventive-Warrior?

To the Editor:

Please stop sending your paper to me. As you know, we are living here at about 50 miles from the Iron Curtain and have therefore unquestionably a more real idea of the difference between Russian totalitarianism and American capitalism. It is a difference between death and life—and we prefer to live and we are not at all inclined to follow your suicidal policy of neutrality in any cold war or hot war between Russia and America. Under the American occupation we have more freedom than most of us ever have known and we would very much prefer to stay occupied rather than to be "freed" by Russia or any "Third Camp." I am afraid you will not understand that. Go live in Eastern Germany or only in Western Berlin for a while and it would not surprise me if you came back as a partisan of the idea of an outright preventive war against the slave regime in Russia.

Wiesbaden, Germany

## BOOKS and Ideas Margaret Mead's "Sex and Temperament" — An Unwitting 'Satire' on Present-Day Society

SEX AND TEMPERAMENT IN THREE PRIMITIVE SOCIETIES, by Margaret Mead. Mentor Books, 224 pages, 35 cents.

By PHILIP COBEN

This pocketbook reprint (originally published in 1935), by the well-known anthropologist-author of *Coming of Age in Samoa* and the recent *Male and Female*, really merits the blurb quoted from Joseph Wood Krutch: "Very soon the reader will find himself forgetting anthropology as a science and chucking with pure delight over a book which combines the charm of *Gulliver's Travels* with that of *Alice in Wonderland*." It sounds like a powerful bill to fill but we endorse it—with one demurrer. It is not at all necessary for the reader to forget that it is anthropology, that is, a "science of man and mankind."

The reference to *Gulliver's Travels* hits the nail on the head. Swift's masterpiece was a satire on man's society. His method was to cast a backlight on social institutions as we know them by forcing us to view them through the unfamiliar eyes of a quite different society and thus get a fresh view on things we have taken for granted. It has been a common enough device of social satirists, and indeed provides the fictional framework of many literary Utopias (Bellamy's *Looking Backward*, for instance).

But this also describes part of the impact of a good deal of anthropology. As mind-openers Swift's Houyhnhnms and Brobdingnagians are not more effective than Dr. Mead's Arapesh, Mundugumor and Tchambuli. Less so, of course, because the reader of *Gulliver's Travels* can always

comfort himself with the afterthought that it is, when all is said and done, a moralistic fantasy. The disconcerting thing about Dr. Mead's three primitive societies is that they do exist as she describes them. *Sex and Temperament* is a satire on our present-day society.

### THE THREE CASES

The author's own interest, as the title indicates, centers around a particular thesis but the impact of the book is much wider. The thesis is this: the differences in temperament ascribed to the sexes exist only because of social conditioning in a particular society and in no way inhere biologically or psychologically. The Marxist will recognize this as a special case of a more inclusive truth: 99 per cent of what is ascribed to "human nature" is the result of such conditioning in a particular society.

Dr. Mead's laboratory was in New Guinea within a 100-mile area. There she investigated three tribes which might have been specially invented to illustrate her point. The contrasts are so pat that the book would have been scorned if they had been specially invented for purposes of fictional satire. (As she explains in her preface to this edition, her account was viewed with suspicion anyway for this reason.)

Among the mountain Arapesh the anthropologist found a tribal society in which the social attributes of gentleness, mutual help and non-aggression were so taken-for-granted as the basis of living that the people could not quite understand how men could live otherwise. The type who would become a successful capitalist in the U. S. became a neuro-

tic misfit, more than likely ostracized to boot. The socially approved "temperament" contained many of the characteristics which our society traditionally ascribes to women.

Among the Mundugumor she lived in a society in which dog-eat-dog violence and treachery, again common to both the men and women equally, were the norms.

Among the Tchambuli, sex differences in temperamental behavior were recognized—but in reverse as compared with our society.

### FOR TRUE HUMANISM

The detailed pictures of these tribal communities (most detailed and most interesting in the case of the Arapesh, who irresistibly bring to mind W. H. Hudson's *A Crystal Age*) will have to be gotten from the book. Dr. Mead makes no attempt to investigate or speculate on the social roots of these differences, in spite of her emphasis that they are socially conditioned. It is enough for her, as far as her thesis goes, that they exist. Nor does she provide much material to aid the reader in such speculation: there are only casual references to the tribes' development in time.

Needless to say, it would be unfair to expect her to be able to do so without spending far more years with each tribe than she was able to do. If a criticism is to be made, it would be that she does not seem to realize that the problem exists; at points she appears to assume that a people choose the kind of society which "suits" them and that's all there is to it. Thus (but only by implication) while rejecting "hu-

man nature" explanations for sex differences in temperament, she might be accused of assuming the same type of naive explanation for societal differences.

In her "Conclusion," she relates her investigation to our own problems. "The knowledge that the personalities of the two sexes are socially produced is congenial to every program that looks forward toward a planned order of society," she writes, adding quite truly that this means, however, congenial either to a Nazi-type program of *Kinder, Küche, Kirche*, or to a progressive program in which the full potentialities of the human personality could flower without being distorted by preconceptions of what is proper or improper to each sex.

"We must recognize that beneath the superficial classifications of sex and race the same potentialities exist, recurring generation after generation, only to perish because society has no place for them. . . . If we are to achieve a richer culture, rich in contrasting values, we must recognize the whole gamut of human potentialities, and so weave a less arbitrary social fabric, one in which each diverse human gift will find a fitting place."

But if artificial restrictions in opportunity based on socially-produced "sex differences" limit the horizon for the full development of individual endowments, how much more important is it to understand that the limitations and distortions imposed by class and economic differences are a hundred times more important? For the socialist, a classless society is in the long run justified as the noblest aim of man only because it is a necessity for a true humanism.

## "THE CASE OF COMRADE TULAYEV"

A Novel of Modern Russia

by VICTOR SERGE

\$3.00

Order from:

LABOR ACTION BOOK SERVICE 4 Court Square, Long Island City 1, N. Y.

# Withdraw All Troops in Korea

(Continued from page 1)

necessary to insure the future unity of the country was preposterous on the face of it. The United States became the sponsor of a vicious reactionary regime that never did have the support of the people of South Korea. Stalinist Russia organized its half of the country in preparation for just the kind of assault the North Koreans launched against the Rhee government.

He outmaneuvered the United States completely. Win, lose, or draw in the military conflict, he had already won a political victory. Russian troops did not fight. The onus was on American military intervention.

## SEE NO HOPE IN WEST

It is a fact indeed, as the Stalinists demagogically cried, that Western capitalism has always stood in the way of colonial independence and progress. What this imperialism has granted in the way of independence to colonial nations was given after great resistance, and grudgingly at that. And now, it is the voices of the China lobby, General MacArthur, the Hearst press, the reactionary congressmen and their capitalist inspirers and supporters that ring loudly and familiarly on the ears of the peoples of Asia. Their memories are long.

But more than that, they see no future hope in Western capitalism which is incapable of offering a progressive program of liberation to Asia, a program of real security, democracy and peace.

All of this, the cunning, exploitive regime of Stalinism understands. It takes advantage of the miserable program of capitalism to advance its own interests in Asia and to further its own imperialist expansion. It talks of land for the peasants and colonial independence as it prepares to tighten its own grip upon these countries, exacting every last economic and political advantage for its assistance, direct and indirect. It prepares a new kind of exploitation of these peoples, the exploitation of bureaucratic collectivism.

The tragedy of our times is that the greater the necessity for a socialist reorganization of the world, the greater the necessity for the end to all exploitation, class rule and oppression, the greater the need for freedom and an end to militarism and war, the weaker is the independent movement of labor for socialism, which alone can guarantee these things.

Ask yourselves why it is that the peoples of Asia do not flock around the banner of the United States or of the UN? Isn't Stalinism totalitarian? Isn't it an exploitive system, a system of police terror, the direct antithesis of democracy, security and peace? And yet the peoples of Asia do not recoil from the grasp of Russia and Stalinism.

## AMERICA'S FRIENDS

It is true that old socialist traditions, the tradition of a liberating Russian Revolution is still strong throughout the world. Stalinism exploits these traditions to the limit. But more important than that, as we have already indicated, is that the peoples of Asia see no hope in any program of Western capitalism.

It is not that the United States has no friends in Asia, but as the New York Times lamented, "our friends" in Asia are very unpopular with the masses. They are the old ruling classes!

The peoples of Asia do not want to fight for American refrigerators and the American standard of living for Americans. They want something for themselves!

A genuine program of progress in Asia, a program that could finally put that great continent on the road to economic security, genuine democracy and peace would destroy Stalinism quickly. But it is exactly that kind of program that capitalist imperial-

ism is incapable of championing. It is a program of socialist progress and it is the only road to a victory over Stalinism.

It is a deception to think that military action, diplomatic bluffs and rough threats are enough to preserve peace and halt the march of reactionary Stalinism.

That is why the need to end the Korean war and to prevent its explosion into a world-wide conflict is an indispensable need for mankind, the premise for any future progress of the world.

The lessons of history are clear enough! The First World War solved not a single social problem. It threw the world back as it failed to bring peace and security to the nations and peoples. It merely prepared all the causes for the outbreak of the Second World War. And what did the late victory over the Axis produce? A new prosperity for the world? A new peace? A new security for all the peoples of the world?

Not at all! It merely reorganized the rivalries for a new world struggle, and in much less time than between the First and Second World Wars! Why should anyone in his right mind believe that a Third World War will

finally solve the problems of the world and bring a lasting peace? That is the greatest myth of all. But it would be a tragedy to have to prove it all over again.

## SOCIALISM'S NEED

The truth is that the people of the world see no genuine alternatives in Stalinist and Western imperialism. There is no free choice for them except the socialist choice.

We have said that the real forces of progress, the various movements for socialism, are weak. But throughout the world there are dozens of organizations, countless thousands of socialists, thousands more who understand and desire this only hopeful social alternative. The weakness of the movement for socialism is its failure to stand out as an independent third force or camp, and to boldly proclaim its socialist program and socialist solution to the great problems which confront the world.

All the labor movements of the world are a great potential reservoir in this struggle for genuine peace and progress. But they can win these things only by establishing their political and social independence from capitalism, imperialism and Stalinism. They can do that only by striking out

boldly with programs and activities to advance the total interests of the great mass of people.

In Western Europe, in England, France, Western Germany, the peoples have been jolted by the prospects of a new world war. They have just lived through a dress rehearsal of such a war and draw back in horror from it. There is a great fear in that part of the world that such a war will be fought without their consent and that they will be drawn into it against their will.

The same is true in Asia, particularly in India. They feared the crossing of the 38th parallel and India would have nothing to do with it. They feared the approach to the Manchurian border and warned against it, decried MacArthur's certainty that the Chinese Stalinists were bluffing.

One hundred Labor Party members of Parliament demand that British troops be withdrawn from Korea if U. S. bombs are dropped in Manchuria. President Truman's declaration that he has the power to decide the use of the A-bomb, and that as a weapon of war it is always under consideration, caused a further shudder throughout the world, including the United States.

It is this temper of Western Europe, of India, it is this universal revulsion against the atom bomb and the prospect of a new world slaughter which alone has stood in the way of the present outbreak of the Third World War. It is upon these tens of millions of people the world over that the hope for the future lies. It is such a movement that could break Stalinism, propel into motion not one Tito but dozens, and begin the destruction of this enemy of the people. It would destroy the myth of Stalinist invincibility.

In Europe that road is one of immediate Western unity, a pooling of the economies and peoples on that part of the continent. In Asia, it also means the unifications of the nations and their vast populations. Such unity could bar all future wars and lay the basis for a tremendous growth of a cooperative society.

That is a socialist program against war. It is not the whole program, but it is an important beginning. It would certainly bring an end to the grave danger of the Third World War and put the peoples of this planet on the high road toward real security, progress and peace.

# Generalities at CIO Confab --

(Continued from page 1)

shek in China, and we had better take a look at Mr. Rhee in Korea, because if his anti-social, anti-labor, anti-people policies continue, we will have fought in vain in Korea . . . ought to have less and less striped-pants and stuffed-shirt diplomacy, and begin to get the kind of people into the State Department who understand the problems of the peoples of the world . . . let's work at this job of foreign policy, because what good is a collective bargaining agreement, what good is an escalator clause in the cost of living, what good is a wage increase if we have total war?"

## SLAPS AT ECA

Other speakers on this subject brought out more details, especially Delegate Martin of the Newspaper Guild, a CIO representative on the ECA staff.

Martin lashed at the "apostles of the status quo" in France, Italy and Western Germany in particular, which are "as selfish as reactionary, as feudalistic as any that the world has ever known . . . who have sold out their people before and will sell them out again if it should ever become essential to the preservation of their own skins or even merely compatible with the continued cramping of their own pocketbooks. . . ." For these countries he found the resolution's proposed "bold new steps" most applicable.

Delegate Livingston of the UAW, who gave a somewhat critical report on returning from abroad recently, barely managed to get the floor from Murray, who apparently was fearful that the criticism of the way the Marshall Plan was shaping up would get out of hand; but Livingston didn't add much fuel to the tiny fire. Murray had contented himself with previously speaking on the subject by rereading the telegram of greetings to the convention from President Truman, trying to make it appear that the platitudes contained in it really covered the criticisms of the speakers, and then piously appealing for political peace from McCarthyism in America.

Wholly insufficient as the Foreign Policy Declaration is, in its criticisms, wholly misoriented as it is in that it gives (a now slightly critical) support to American imperialism, it will be interesting to see what, if any, further action is taken by CIO in line with even such limited disapproval as was shown.

On the Economic Mobilization resolution, Textile Union Vice President Rieve spoke first, followed by Reuther. The former said little, poorly. The latter said little, well.

## PROMISSORY NOTE

Here is some by the latter: "This is a fight to get both guns and butter . . . we have got to tell the people in Washington that this is not a matter of butter or guns, it is both . . . raise our production sights . . . they have priced out of the low house group in America [by Regulation X] 80 per cent of the people who need new houses. But there is no ceiling on penthouses and fashionable apartments in Park Avenue. . . . We are not going back with another Little Steel Formula, where prices are up here and wages are frozen down here, and we ought to let the boys in Washington know that we are not going to disarm ourselves in the labor movement with that kind of arrangement. We ought to tell them that we are going to maintain the economic power that we have, which is our only defense . . . don't come to the labor movement with pious and patriotic declarations about the need of sacrificing until you are prepared to make the high priests of Wall Street make that. . . ."

"As CIO representative to handle production matters in the Department of Commerce I told President Murray . . . and Secretary Sawyer . . . I am unwilling to serve as window dressing behind which people can do as they please and use the good name of CIO. . . . We are not going to come, hat in hand, as second-class economic political citizens begging for jobs. . . ."

These vaguely militant generalities are worth recording if only to present the promissory note to Reuther when the date falls due.

Reuther's whole plea amounts merely to a verbal "insistence" upon being treated decently. Once the labor movement has won its spurs on the field of American politics—and this convention did what it could to see that that doesn't happen soon—it will have no need for such bitter eloquence. It will simply take over.

## LOOK WHO'S TALKING!

The secretary of the Resolutions Committee, President Joseph Curran of the National Maritime Union of all people, read off the resolution on Civil Liberties and Internal Security.

Since no one discussed the resolution but Emil Mazey, no one took the opportunity to request an explanation from Curran on the state of civil liberties these days in his own union—where, with an iron hand and the help of the New York police department and assorted goon squads using the utmost physical violence, Curran has literally suppressed ALL opposition to his dictatorial rule.

This resolution outlines the CIO's opposition to the McCarran Subversive Activities Control Act, citing its "registration provisions which 'tread dangerously upon freedom of speech and belief, since they depend upon political tenets rather than actual conduct. The concept of freedom of speech, enshrined in the First Amendment to the Constitution, requires that everyone be free to hold whatever beliefs he will and to advocate whatever he chooses, so long as he does not act illegally or incite to violation of law. This old and sound tradition of our democracy is flaunted. . . ."

"Another portion of the statute provides for internment—on evidence which may be kept from the internee. . . . The provisions for internment on secret evidence owes more to the practices of the Bourbon monarchs than to the principles of democracy. . . ."

Further, "At its last convention the CIO pointed out that the government's loyalty and security programs transgressed in many respects traditional American conceptions of procedural fair play. Those deficiencies have, unfortunately, not been corrected." In this case CIO might ask itself why Truman should bother to correct them when he knows well that he has CIO support in any case!

## DOUGLAS TAGGED

Mazey of the UAW, in discussing the resolution briefly, took the occasion to strike out at "many of our friends—and I say 'friends' in quotes—[who] were not around or did not have the intestinal fortitude to take positions and fight for democratic measures; and I refer specifically to one of the gentlemen who gave us a lecture here yesterday afternoon."

This slap was directed against Senator Paul Douglas, Fair Deal Democrat of Illinois, who gave the main speech of the numerous "outsiders" opening the convention the previous day. Douglas did not even deign himself at that time by approving the need for a new labor-

law to replace Taft-Hartley but which would also embrace anti-labor features of the T-H Act. Douglas gave the most sophisticated version of Fair Deal political philosophy—this was the only overt derogatory mention made of his speech.

It would not do to overlook another resolution, which occupied the position of Resolution No. 1 at this convention. It was entitled "Philip Murray" and exceeded all previous extravaganzas in praising his ten years of CIO leadership.

This outpouring of idolatry of "the leader" set the tone for discussing all that followed. One of his henchmen on another occasion stated: "We in the United Steelworkers of America love our great leader; he has been more than a leader to us, he has been like a father to us. . . ."

Murray followed a practice at this convention, as at others, of pacing back and forth on the platform while disputed points, or ones where controversy might arise, were on the floor. An aisle is cleared for this purpose among the other officers on the platform. His intervention then is all the more dramatic—and meanwhile intimidating to his opponents.

At one session the delegates heard Mordcai Johnson, president of Howard University, who pleaded earnestly for one and a half hours to an attentive audience for an immediate ending of all colonial imperialism, backed by a \$250 billion loan program to backward nations—all to be done through the UN and as a measure not only of justice but of combating Stalinist imperialism. He received a very prolonged standing ovation. One of his listeners was afterwards heard to observe that for a while the delegates forgot that they now are porkchoppers and remembered their days during the depression, when they had to fit paper to cover the holes in their shoes!

Next week's LABOR ACTION will conclude this convention report with the discussion on the resolution on "The Principles of TVA"—which was the only resolution disputed and opposed by a number of delegates.

## Get ALL your books

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

We can supply you!