

LABOR ACTION

Independent Socialist Weekly

AUGUST 14, 1950

FIVE CENTS

UAW Hits Vigilanteism in Plants
... page 2

Persecution of 'Jehovah's Witnesses'
... page 3

Cops Break Up Stalinist Rally
... page 3

East German Stalinism: the SED
... page 6

British Unions Ease Wage Freeze
... page 5

How U. S. Policy Helps Kremlin Propaganda: In UN, on Franco, on Democratic Liberties

This past week the news headlined by the press has underlined in glaring fashion, we think, an outstanding characteristic of the political and propaganda battle being waged between the U. S. and Russia.

Without belittling the importance of the Korean shooting war for both sides, the fact is that the war itself is only one stage on which the preparations for World War III are taking place. In the rest of the world, in Europe and in Asia, the two blocs vie with each other to win the support of the peoples to their side, politically and morally.

Russian totalitarianism is winning hands down, so far—as this week's news illustrates.

We do not believe that this is basically because of the incompetence, blindness or ignorance of the leaders of U. S. capitalism, however justified may be the specific criticisms of the commentators who think Washington merely needs a better education in world strategy.

A despotism more brutal than any the world has ever seen is actually making long strides in convincing a large part of the world that it, the Kremlin, is the "lesser evil" as far as peace and progress are concerned! It is succeeding in this above all in Asia.

Its success in this Big Lie is not due to the cleverness of its propaganda, let alone its truth. It is succeeding in this because the United States itself is convincing the peoples, by its deeds, that the Stalinists' claims are justified.

It is convincing them by its policy in the UN debates, by its loan to Franco, by its reversal on the discredited Chiang Kai-shek, by its increasingly crude assaults on democratic liberties at home, by its support to the most reactionary elements in every part of the world.

It is convincing them, not because its propaganda broadcasts over the world are bungled, but because it has little to say in them that the peoples want to hear. Not because it is doing nothing to carry "our message of democracy" to the peoples, but because it has no message of democracy.

Because the peoples are right in looking on the U. S. as upholder of the banner of capitalist imperialism in the first place and of democratic

sentiments only in the tenth place.

Because for the leaders of American capitalism this struggle is one to defend its own capitalist interests in the world, and its acts show this every week.

Because it has and can have no social program, except the continuance of capitalism, with which to combat Russian demagoguery. And the peoples of the world have had their bellyful of capitalism and its works.

That is the old system which has led the world to its present ruin. Stalinism is the new system which threatens to lead the world to a new barbarism. Asia has not had its experiences with Stalinism as yet to open all eyes. We, as socialists, know what it means. But it cannot be stopped merely by "exposures." It can be stopped only if the people can fight for a world which offers something other than the shambles of today as against the yet-unclear menace of tomorrow.

At the same time, the democratic-capitalist "lesser evil" itself takes on more and more of the coloration of its despotic rival.

Western capitalism cannot stop Stalinism—except through a purely military holocaust which will, before it is through, leave precious little to justify its victory, even for those to whom it is still a "lesser evil."

Support of U. S. foreign policy is grist to the Stalinist mill.

That is an essential part of the reason why we are political opponents of the war policies of both camps in this war and in the big war which is looming. That is why we are in favor of devoting all socialist energies to building the basis for the "Third Camp" of the people, who wish a world of socialist democracy, not capitalism or Stalinism.

Let those who think Western capitalism is a meaningful "lesser evil" try to get Washington "straightened out." We will be with them in every possible fight for every democratic aim that they set. But it will not convert this war into a "people's war."

Democratic rights at home, a democratic foreign policy abroad—let them try to get capitalism to change its spots. We will see who is really fighting for democracy: the war camp or the "Third Camp" Socialists!

ON FRANCO—

U. S. to Finance Fascist Ruler

By MARY BELL

Liberals, socialists and genuine anti-fascists of every variety the world over were outraged last week when the Senate of the United States, now embroiled in Korean war under the aegis of democracy - versus - totalitarianism, voted 65-15 to extend a \$100 million loan to Franco.

Was not this undertaken by the government of the country which proclaimed the Four Freedoms in the late war against the Axis powers? Is not Generalissimo Franco the political blood-brother of Hitler and Mussolini? Did he not use Nazi and fascist arms in the result against the Spanish republican government to crush the

(Turn to last page)

ON DEMOCRATIC LIBERTIES—

Court Okays Smith Gag Act

By STAN GREY

In what was undoubtedly the most important civil liberties case of the last eventful year, the U. S. Court of Appeals affirmed the constitutionality of the Smith Act and upheld the conviction of the eleven leaders of the Communist Party for conspiracy to teach and advocate the overthrow of the U. S. government by force and violence. This resounding blow against civil liberty conclusively demonstrates what has been increasingly evident in a series of decisions over the last year, namely, that the cold war has replaced traditional constitutional liberties as the basis for judicial decision.

The fact that the main opinion

(Continued on page 7)

IN THE UN—

Who Won the Propaganda War?

By PHILIP COBEN

In sharp contrast with the gleeful anticipation which preceded the UN Security Council meeting when it became known that Russia's Malik had reversed himself and would once more sit down to talk, the results of the four-day battle of words are being generally, soberly and correctly appraised as a political defeat for the U. S. by most responsible commentators.

The consequence has been a deal of soul-searching in answer to the question "Why?"

"Didn't we have the truth on our side? Didn't we have parliamentary procedure on our side? Didn't we have the votes on our side?"

And yet:

"UN Score: We Won Votes, They Won Propaganda" is a headline in the N. Y. Times. The verdict was pretty plain, at that.

On the eve of the Security Council meeting, a large section of the U. S. press was chortling

(Turn to last page)



Franco

UAW Heads Hit Vigilante Attacks on Alleged CPers

The top leadership of the United Automobile Workers (CIO) sent out a letter on August 5 to all locals calling on the membership of the union to stop throwing alleged Stalinists out of the plants.

At least five or six such incidents have occurred in different parts of the country which have been reported in the papers. Most of them seem to have involved plants where the UAW has contracts. The leadership has moved to quiet some of the most dangerous situations before, but this is the first action taken on a national scale to stop a disgraceful development in the union.

The letter, signed by Walter Reuther, Emil Mazey, John W. Livingston and Richard Gosser, read in part: "...walking of alleged Communist Party members out of plants deprives individuals of their democratic rights and is the weapon of totalitarianism themselves. It is not a weapon of democracy. . . . We cannot defeat the Communists or the adherents of any form of totalitarianism by falling into the trap of using their own tactics. . . ."

"The constitution of our union offers democratic means for dealing with members of our union who are guilty of conduct detrimental to the best interests of the union. We call upon all members of our union to practice in fullest measure the democratic policies of our union and nation. . . ."

"We urge that the officers of all local unions convey this message to our members and take every precaution to see that incidents do not occur. The best way to safeguard our union and our democratic rights is to see to it that we ourselves observe all democratic procedures."

STILL A QUESTION

These portions of the letter (a full text is not available as we go to press) are excellent and should get the support of every real militant in the plants. It is safe to say that in the majority of cases these strong-arm methods are not being used by unionists who have a long record of combating the Stalinists in the days when they were a real power in the union. This is not the work of unionists who have distinguished themselves in militancy toward the employers who hate the Stalinists or their trade-union misleadership as well as for the fact that they represent a totalitarian anti-working-class movement.

Two Jingoists in UAW Plant Appeal to N. J. Witchhunt Law Against Union Members

Anti-democratic violence against Stalinists in the United Automobile Workers (CIO) took on a new twist when three members of Local 595 in Linden, New Jersey, signed a complaint against two Stalinists before a local magistrate on August 4.

On the previous Monday workers had thrown Calvin De Filippis and Louis Fischer, two admitted Stalinists, bodily out of the plant, injuring them in the process.

Fischer and De Filippis then brought assault and battery charges against three members of the local. These in turn signed a complaint against them based on a state law which makes it a high misdemeanor "to advocate or teach by any written or printed matter whatsoever or by oral speech that the citizens of this state should not aid, abet or assist the United States in prosecuting or carrying out a war." The statute provides a penalty of not more than seven years in prison and a fine of \$100 to \$200.

The charge was based on the contention that the two UAW Sta-

linists had distributed leaflets urging "Hands Off Korea," and that the literature promoted subversive and destructive measures against the nation and the state.

Such workers have defeated the Stalinists in fair-and-square democratic union struggle. The ones who now show how tough they are are the kind of men who never opened their mouths when it took real courage to fight the Stalinists and who are now caught up in the general "anti-red" hysteria which has its source in the most reactionary and anti-labor sections of the nation.

NO 'LEGAL' PURGE!

In the past the UAW has been known for the fact that leadership which disagreed with the group could issue leaflets and even organize meetings to express such disagreement without any fear that measures would be taken against them. It was precisely by the fullest use of such tactics that Walter Reuther and the whole present leadership of the union were able to get a majority in the ranks and throw out of office the Thomas-Addees-Stalinist coalition which had run the union for years. In their day, as an opposition, they freely denounced a dozen policies adopted by the leadership of the union and backed by what was then the majority of the members.

But what degree of real democracy remains in an organization if people, whatever their views, can be expelled as "detrimental to the union" for circulating political literature with which the majority disagrees?

It is quite clear that a union has a right to rid itself of members who scab, act as informers for the employers, or urge members to leave the union or to join a rival labor organization. But when union members try to convince their fellow workers of some political program which is different from that of the majority, the only

democratic way to combat such activity is to convince the members that the political program advocated is wrong and should be rejected. And that goes whether the minority are Stalinists or anyone else.

A properly educated membership would not have permitted a few misguided individuals in their midst to act as they have done. The union leadership is doing the right thing in taking action to prevent the repetition of such incidents. But real trade-union democracy as well as by individual violence, as is demonstrated by a constitution and practices of a dozen AFL unions. It is to be hoped that the militants in the UAW and the union leadership itself will not permit the old and proud tradition of democracy in the UAW to be undermined in the course of the continued struggle against the Stalinists.

Consistent defenders of democracy in the union should be the first to condemn such resort to witchhunt legislation passed by reactionary legislators even though it is directed against the Stalinist followers of Moscow's totalitarianism.

The local has adopted a resolution backing the United States in the Korean situation, and Fischer, De Filippis and two others have been suspended by the membership for failing to adhere to the union's resolution and for "activities detrimental to the union." A union trial committee will hold hearings on the suspension in the near future.

It remains to be seen whether the local will go through with its own procedures and the court action now pending despite the UAW leadership's letter to the locals condemning the forcible expulsion of Stalinists from the plants.

MICHIGAN LABOR NOTES Detroit UAW Walkouts Point to Bitterness on Wage Freeze

By WALTER JASON

Detroit, Aug. 7—The United Auto Workers Union leadership finally came out with a blast against the vigilante-type action in some auto shops against "Communists."

The directive to all local unions was signed by the four top officers, who said: "Members of the UAW must not participate in unlawful acts, such as walking alleged Communists out of the plants." Its directive added: "The constitution of our union offers democratic means for dealing with members of our union who are guilty of conduct detrimental to the best interests of the union."

A worker in the Buick plant in Flint was accused of passing out "subversive" literature and was dragged out of the plant, according to newspaper reports. Local union officials were reported to be against the mob action, and they promised the worker protection.

There was no reprimand of Carl Stellato, president of Ford Local 600, whose inflammatory speeches against "Communists" have been stirring up the reactionary elements in the UAW-CIO for a wild witchhunt.

Detroit, Aug. 7—Reports from many plants indicate that the United Auto Workers' ranks are beginning to stir restlessly and the mood in the shops is bitter and ugly as the cost of living goes upward and talk of a wage freeze increases, while the UAW leaders remain silent about these burning issues.

A flurry of small walkouts, many of them unreported in the press, has developed in the past two weeks.

An indication of UAW rank-and-file feeling is the defeat of all incumbents in Chrysler locals, except one, who were connected with the leadership of the recent 100-day strike.

There was no reprimand of Carl Stellato, president of Ford Local 600, whose inflammatory speeches against "Communists" have been stirring up the reactionary elements in the UAW-CIO for a wild witchhunt.

The directive to all local unions was signed by the four top officers, who said: "Members of the UAW must not participate in unlawful acts, such as walking alleged Communists out of the plants."

A worker in the Buick plant in Flint was accused of passing out "subversive" literature and was dragged out of the plant, according to newspaper reports.

Local union officials were reported to be against the mob action, and they promised the worker protection.

No details of the incident, including the character of the literature, were available.

CONGRESS BLOC TRYING TO STOP HAWAII BILL WITH 'ANTI-RED' ACT

By LARRY O'CONNOR

A movement is under way in Congress to rush the Mundt-Ferguson "anti-subversive" bill ahead of consideration of statehood for Hawaii and Alaska. This maneuver is designed by its supporters to kill two and possibly three birds with one poisoned arrow.

The move is spearheaded by Senator Eastland of Mississippi, but its success depends on the cooperation of the Republican-Southern Democratic informal coalition.

The Southern Democrats do not want Hawaii or Alaska in the Union because this would mean four additional senators who can be expected to line up against the Dixiecrats on the question of civil rights for Negroes. They figure that if they can get the Mundt bill before the Senate it may kill consideration of statehood for this session.

The Republicans are nibbling at the bait for two reasons. Most of them want the Mundt bill on the books. But even if it is not passed (Democratic leaders and the president have been opposed to passing it on technical grounds) they would like to be able to charge the administration with indifference to the "red menace" in the coming election campaign.

DIXIECRATS VS. HAWAII

Both factions in this maneuver show not only the most cynical disregard for the civil liberties which would be assaulted through passage of this bill and for the interests of the common people of Hawaii and Alaska, but also the propaganda use to which Stalin will be able to put their scheme on a world scale. This maneuver, if it should succeed, will be worth at least several divisions of Koreans to the Kremlin, and for the following reasons.

Hawaii has a vast majority of non-white citizens, with people of Japanese and Chinese ancestry in large numbers. This is precisely why the Southern Democrats do not want them in the Union. The statehood bill has already been kicked around for a long time. Further postponement of it is an offense not only to the peoples involved but by proxy to all non-white peoples, who will not miss the point.

And the Mundt-Ferguson bill, which this maneuver proposes to shove ahead of the statehood question, is one of the most oppressive pieces of legislation ever to come before the Congress. Allegedly it

would "only" force the Communist Party and all allied organizations to register their leaders and members and to clearly label their literature. In actuality such a bill would effectively outlaw any and all organizations which were forced to register.

Mundt has tried to assure one and all that the bill is directed solely against the Stalinists and that no other political organizations need fear it. Yet anyone who has watched the attorney general place on his "subversive list" numerous organizations which are and always have been strongly opposed to the Stalinists can rightly fear that all organizations opposed to capitalism can in due course be menaced.

To remove any possible doubt on this score, Senator Mundt himself told a gathering in Illinois recently that "communism and socialism are merely different stages" of the same "dread disease" which he wishes to fight.

Although the president's message did not mention the Mundt-Ferguson bill specifically, it is plain that the above remarks should apply to it. However, that remains to be seen. As part of the political maneuvering on the civil liberties issue, Senator Mundt has already stated that he welcomes Truman's support, "belated though it comes." He stated that the message endorses the essence of his bill.

The Russians do not need a Mundt-Ferguson bill in countries which they control for the simple reason that any individual who opposes or criticizes the government, however mildly, is immediately shot or thrown into jail or into a slave-labor camp. But that will in no way prevent them from making hay all over the world over the fact that, should this bill become law, men and women will go to prison for their ideas.

Actually, that is only one reason for opposing the Mundt bill. The primary reason is that the bill endangers the civil liberties of all who have the courage to criticize and oppose the capitalist system as well as the system of the Stalinist advocates of totalitarianism. And that means that it endangers the civil liberties of everyone. For when those who dare to oppose the system are silenced, who will have the courage to raise his voice against ANY evil in it?

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.

Jehovah's Witnesses' Protest Persecution

NEW YORK, Aug. 6—A vigorous protest at "mistreatment like that extended by a police state to its visitors" was directed by the convention of Jehovah's Witnesses against the U. S. government's persecution of its member who traveled from countries abroad to attend its assembly.

This religious movement, which has rallied a large number of zealous around the vision of a "theocracy" on earth following "Armageddon," held its last session today with 110,000 in and around Yankee Stadium. On Friday they had adopted the statement of protest in which they related:

"...thousands of Jehovah's Witnesses were detained at ports of entry. Their visas authorizing entry into this country were stamped by the officers, shortening the period of their stay to August 15, 1950, in many cases." Many of these visitors had booked passage

N. Y. Cops Bust Up CP Rally in Union Square

By L. G. SMITH

NEW YORK, Aug. 2—Some 5,000 people were denied the constitutional right of free speech and peaceful assembly by the forceful action of the New York City police department here today. The fact that these people are Stalinists who themselves do not believe in free speech or any other democratic rights for their opponents in no way justifies the action of the New York authorities.

Early this week the "New York Labor Conference for Peace," a Stalinist organization which embraces most of the Stalinist front groups and Stalinist-controlled unions in this area, applied for a police permit to hold a "peace" rally in Union Square.

The permit was refused by the police commissioner on the ground that such a rally might lead to public disorder. The Stalinists then sought a court order to compel the commissioner to grant the permit. The order was refused them this morning. However, before applying for the court order, they had insisted that the rally would be held "regardless," at 5 o'clock this evening.

By the appointed time thousands of people were walking up and down the sidewalks around Union Square. Some 1,000 city police, including tens of mounted cops, were patrolling the area, and keeping everyone out of the square itself.

Bridges' Bail Revoked on U. S. Request

By GORDON HASKELL

Harry Bridges' bail was revoked by Federal Judge George B. Harris on Saturday, August 5, on the ground that Bridges "is inimical to the security of the country."

Bridges, who is international president of the CIO longshoremen's union, was convicted last April of perjury when he swore he had never been a member of the Communist Party at his naturalization hearing in 1945. He has been out on \$25,000 bail since that time.

The government instituted action to revoke his bail when he persisted in following the Stalinist line in opposing American intervention in Korea and demanding that the United Nations rely on a cease-fire order to the North Koreans.

In the hearing before Judge Harris, however, Bridges stepped off the Stalinist line in an exchange with his lawyer reported in the daily press. He is reported to have said: "I know the Russians are operating behind the scenes in Korea. I have no doubt the Rus-

sians are helping arm, and may be directing, the North Koreans. I am against both sides doing it."

"The aspect of the revocation of Bridges' bail of main interest to the labor movement, and to all Americans concerned with the preservation of our civil liberties, is contained in the government's motives as revealed in statements made by the judge.

The judge did not charge Bridges with any overt act, or even the proposal of any overt act, which might hinder or impede the war in Korea. His statements boil down to the simple proposition that since Bridges is pro-Stalinist he is a danger to the country and hence may not stay out of jail on bail.

"I'm led to believe," said the judge, "he [Bridges] is probably one of the most cogent figures in the Communist Party in America today. . . . As such his allegiance cannot be to the United States of America. His conduct since the beginning of the Korean crisis, and

back after that date and others were planning to attend their group's school here."

"They had their passports lifted and they were denied the usual entry privileges," continues the statement. "Many were required to have the society and others put up bond to guarantee their prompt leaving the country. Others were released on parole in the custody of the society. A number of brethren . . . were taken to Ellis Island on arrival at New York and were detained there in custody of the government for varying periods of time."

DENY PACIFISM

While the Jehovah's Witnesses had been in hot water with the government also during the last war, they pointed out that Washington's policy was worse today than then.

"We cannot explain fully to you brethren that have suffered from these indignities the change of policy. We have held international conventions in the United States before, even during World War II. Brethren from Canada and Mexico and other foreign lands attended those assemblies and were not subjected to such discourtesy and mistreatment. This was during total mobilization. But now, without mobilization, the reason for such extraordinary measures for the 'protection of our borders'—the expression of the authorities—has not been stated by the officials. When pressed for a reason for their arbitrary action they have stood speechless and without explanation."

The statement denied that the movement believed in pacifism, this being the official ground for the government's mistreatment. It even stated that the sect had no objection to the government directive "to restrict and curtail visits by foreigners who were extreme

conservatives in the campaign against the civil liberties of the Stalinists.

Both of the above statements are accurate descriptions of aspects of the Stalinist movement. Yet neither of them justify the abrogation of the civil liberties of the Stalinists of which this police action is an example.

MOUNTIES AT WORK

At about 5 o'clock, the crowd which was packed solidly on the sidewalk on 14th Street between Broadway and University Place set up a chant: "We want peace; open up the park. The police cordoned immediately started to clear the whole block. Mounted policemen forced their horses onto the sidewalk and rode at breakneck speed through the tightly packed crowd, amid the shrieks of women and curses of men."

This procedure was followed for the next hour on the sidewalks of all streets between Broadway and University Place and 14th Street and 11th Street. Wherever a crowd gathered, mounted police rode through them, and foot cops forced them to move rapidly along.

The police had obviously been instructed not to use their clubs, and most of the foot police were not equipped with the long riot sticks. However, individuals who refused to move along fast enough or who talked back to the cops were beaten up. The crowd was peaceful throughout, and made no attempt to resist any but the most brutal shovings and blows by the police.

There is a growing tendency in the country today to condone any and all violations of the civil liberties of Stalinists on two grounds: (1) They form a conspiratorial organization on behalf of Russia. (2) They are enemies of democracy and civil liberties, and should be suppressed wherever possible. At least these are the two reasons given by liberals and others who today shout an increasing inclination to join

the plainclothesmen distinguished themselves by shoving and striking those who did not move fast enough to suit them; and to this observer it seemed that they picked out Negroes in the crowd for their special attention.

By 7 o'clock, these tactics had succeeded in dispersing most of the crowd in the area. However, two hardy Stalinist had climbed to the top of lamp posts on Broadway and 13th Street, and it took one of the fire department's ladder trucks to dislodge them, while the police tried to keep the curious crowd as far away as possible.

What excuse is there for the refusal of the police to grant a permit for this Stalinist rally, and for their action in dispersing a crowd which at no time showed an inclination to do anything but walk up and down the sidewalks and shout slogans.

There is a growing tendency in the country today to condone any and all violations of the civil liberties of Stalinists on two grounds: (1) They form a conspiratorial organization on behalf of Russia. (2) They are enemies of democracy and civil liberties, and should be suppressed wherever possible. At least these are the two reasons given by liberals and others who today shout an increasing inclination to join

the conservatives in the campaign against the civil liberties of the Stalinists.

Both of the above statements are accurate descriptions of aspects of the Stalinist movement. Yet neither of them justify the abrogation of the civil liberties of the Stalinists of which this police action is an example.

With regard to the first point: It is true that the CP is a fertile field for the recruitment of Russian spies and saboteurs. But this is an activity of selected individuals recruited from the Stalinist movement. It has no relation to the holding of public meetings or the other normal political activities carried on by the vast majority of Stalinists. Surely no one will claim that a demonstration in Union Square over the spurious Stalinist "peace" campaign is a likely place for espionage activity or for the recruitment of spies.

With regard to the second point: It is true that the CP does not believe in civil liberties for its opponents in the United States, and that it suppresses all such activity where it has the power to do so with much greater ruthlessness and brutality than that shown by the New York police force. That is an argument which must be used to combat the CP, to brand it an anti-democratic, anti-labor movement, to

AID TO CP LINE

With regard to the second point: It is true that the CP does not believe in civil liberties for its opponents in the United States, and that it suppresses all such activity where it has the power to do so with much greater ruthlessness and brutality than that shown by the New York police force. That is an argument which must be used to combat the CP, to brand it an anti-democratic, anti-labor movement, to

convince all sincere people who may be attracted by its demagogy that they should have nothing to do with it.

But it is not an argument for doing to the Stalinists what they would like to do to others. . . . It should be clear that the New York police action had only one motive: They wished to prevent a large political demonstration which would be used by the Stalinist press throughout the world to "prove" to their followers that in the United States there is a large movement opposed to the war in Korea.

Yet, as is usually the case with the "practical" policy of fighting Stalinism with force instead of with the power of a superior program, this action will prove ten times as valuable to the Stalinists as a peaceful demonstration.

Now the Stalinist press throughout the world will be flooded with pictures of mounted policemen riding down a peaceful crowd, tearing up paper signs which advocate peace and oppose the H-bomb, and beating up civilians. This will be twice as valuable as Malik's fulminations in the United Nations.

The suppression of the civil liberties of the Stalinists cannot serve democracy. It can only be a step in the suppression of democracy for all dissidents in America, and an aid to the world movement of totalitarian Stalinism.

ship. Whether or not its present action against Bridges will actually result in some hostile unionists being won to his support on the grounds that the government is making a martyr of him remains to be seen. But be that as it may, the reasons given for the revocation of his bail are another plank in the scaffolding of a structure which rises as a potential threat to the civil liberties of all of us.

LEAVE IT TO THE UNION

If the matter were left to the membership, where it properly belongs, it is quite likely that in a short while they would remove the Stalinists from control of the union and Bridges with them. In fact, the sentiment is now so strong that it seems Bridges has not even dreamed of trying to get the union to take any action along the lines of the WFTU resolution read by the judge.

But the government seems determined to take the matter out of the hands of the union member-

pacifists, communists and subversive persons." In denying pacifism, it explained that "we maintain strict neutrality . . . unpotted from the world. . . ." But the members of Jehovah's Witnesses claim exemption from the draft on the ground that each is a minister, and have run afoul of the government in the past by refusing to recognize government obligations which violate their consciences.

CONTRAST WITH NAZIS

The JW statement also made a telling comparison between the attitude shown to its German visitors and to "certain Nazi sympathizers on their visits to this land" since the war. Among the latter it named Martin Niemoller, a Lutheran pastor, as a "Nazi sympathizer" during the war, and a U-boat commander, and the Roman Catholic Cardinal Preysing, as a "collaborator with Hitler." It contrasted the treatment shown

The JW German representative, who had spent 12 years in a Nazi concentration camp, and (perhaps with a trace of satire) quoted Truman's speech of July 22 about "the spirit of the Sermon on the Mount."

The Witnesses' statement could not "explain fully" the harsher policy against civil liberties being followed by Truman's administration now than in the days of total war, but it is clear from all that has been happening that the government, faced with the opposition of Russian totalitarianism and its Stalinist agents, is far more jittery and nervous and is playing with the idea that it too must throw democratic rights overboard to strip for war. The fact that the Jehovah's Witnesses are not even remotely tainted by Stalinism, but only by its own peculiar kind of religious utopianism, underlines the "indiscriminateness of the measures being adopted."

Both of the above statements are accurate descriptions of aspects of the Stalinist movement. Yet neither of them justify the abrogation of the civil liberties of the Stalinists of which this police action is an example.

With regard to the first point: It is true that the CP is a fertile field for the recruitment of Russian spies and saboteurs. But this is an activity of selected individuals recruited from the Stalinist movement. It has no relation to the holding of public meetings or the other normal political activities carried on by the vast majority of Stalinists. Surely no one will claim that a demonstration in Union Square over the spurious Stalinist "peace" campaign is a likely place for espionage activity or for the recruitment of spies.

With regard to the second point: It is true that the CP does not believe in civil liberties for its opponents in the United States, and that it suppresses all such activity where it has the power to do so with much greater ruthlessness and brutality than that shown by the New York police force. That is an argument which must be used to combat the CP, to brand it an anti-democratic, anti-labor movement, to

convince all sincere people who may be attracted by its demagogy that they should have nothing to do with it.

But it is not an argument for doing to the Stalinists what they would like to do to others. . . . It should be clear that the New York police action had only one motive: They wished to prevent a large political demonstration which would be used by the Stalinist press throughout the world to "prove" to their followers that in the United States there is a large movement opposed to the war in Korea.

Yet, as is usually the case with the "practical" policy of fighting Stalinism with force instead of with the power of a superior program, this action will prove ten times as valuable to the Stalinists as a peaceful demonstration.

Now the Stalinist press throughout the world will be flooded with pictures of mounted policemen riding down a peaceful crowd, tearing up paper signs which advocate peace and oppose the H-bomb, and beating up civilians. This will be twice as valuable as Malik's fulminations in the United Nations.

The suppression of the civil liberties of the Stalinists cannot serve democracy. It can only be a step in the suppression of democracy for all dissidents in America, and an aid to the world movement of totalitarian Stalinism.

ship. Whether or not its present action against Bridges will actually result in some hostile unionists being won to his support on the grounds that the government is making a martyr of him remains to be seen. But be that as it may, the reasons given for the revocation of his bail are another plank in the scaffolding of a structure which rises as a potential threat to the civil liberties of all of us.

LEAVE IT TO THE UNION

If the matter were left to the membership, where it properly belongs, it is quite likely that in a short while they would remove the Stalinists from control of the union and Bridges with them. In fact, the sentiment is now so strong that it seems Bridges has not even dreamed of trying to get the union to take any action along the lines of the WFTU resolution read by the judge.

But the government seems determined to take the matter out of the hands of the union member-

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

Available:
BOUND VOLUMES
 of
Labor Action
 1945 to 1948
 \$3.00 a volume
 Order from:
 Labor Action Book Service
 4 Court Square
 Long Island City 1, N. Y.

The ISL Program in Brief

The Independent Socialist League stands for socialist democracy and against the two systems of exploitation which now divide the world: capitalism and Stalinism.

Capitalism cannot be reformed or liberalized, by any Fair Deal or other deal, so as to give the people freedom, abundance, security or peace. It must be abolished and replaced by a new social system, in which the people own and control the basic sectors of the economy, democratically controlling their own economic and political destinies.

Stalinism, in Russia and wherever it holds power, is a brutal totalitarianism—a new form of exploitation. Its agents in every country, the Communist Parties, are unrelenting enemies of socialism and have nothing in common with socialism—which cannot exist without effective democratic control by the people.

These two camps of capitalism and Stalinism are today at each other's throats in a world-wide imperialist rivalry for domination. This struggle can only lead to the most frightful war in history so long as the people leave the capitalist and Stalinist rulers in power. Independent Socialism stands for building and strengthening the Third Camp of the people against both war blocs.

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

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

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

INTERESTED?

Get acquainted with the Independent Socialist League—

4 Court Square Long Island City 1 New York

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

I want to join the ISL.

Name

Address

City

State



Bank of America Thumbs Its Nose at Court

You'd see headlines if two big labor unions did it. But this is a report on the recent doings of two big corporations.

The Louisville Gas & Electric Company asked the Kentucky Public Service Commission to allow a boost in gas rates. The commission said no. The company then defiantly announced it would raise its gas rates anyway.

The Federal Reserve Bank is prosecuting the Bank of America, biggest bank in the world, on charges that it is monopolizing banking in Far Western states by taking over independent banks and making them branches. In the midst of these proceedings, this huge banking system headed by Giannini moved to take over 22 more banks. The Federal Reserve Board protested and a federal circuit court ordered Giannini to stop the deal.

The Bank of America took over the banks anyway. The judge gave Giannini 30 days to undo the deal or face jail for contempt of court. Giannini ran to Washington and asked Supreme Court Justice Burton to stay the circuit court decision. Burton held a hearing and said no.

But at last reports the big Giannini system is still holding on to the 22 banks.

The Profit Record May Be Beaten

The current price boosts are taking place in the face of record-breaking profits.

The Wall Street Journal has been filling pages of recent issues with figures on increased profits, as the corporations report on their operations for the first six months of 1950. As July ended, the Journal came up with the announcement that corporation profits in the three months of April, May and June exceeded profits for the same months last year by 46.5 per cent.

The profit leader is none other than General Motors, which made headlines last January when it reported the largest profits ever made in a single year, \$656 million for 1949. It looks as if that will be beaten! In six months of 1950, GM has already piled up profits of \$485 millions.

U. S. Steel made \$119 million in the first half of 1950, compared with \$94 million in the same period of 1949. The DuPont chemical company came through with \$122 million as compared with \$86 million; Standard Brands (food) \$4.8 million, from \$3.7 million; U. S. Rubber \$10.3 million, from \$6.6 million.

Which explains why there will be a ferocious battle to block an excess-profits tax on the 1950 take.

Senators George (Dem.), Byrd (Dem.) and Brewster (Rep.) have already set themselves up in Congress as the front-line defense against any such profanation of the private-profit system.

The railroads are also sharing in the bonanza. In June, 1949, the New York Central cleared only \$93,240 but in June of this year it got \$3.6 million. The Pennsylvania Railroad showed a loss last June—this June \$5.2 million profit.

Meanwhile at the New York State Federation of Labor convention, AFL Secretary-Treasurer Meany stated that as in the last war, organized labor "will give a no-strike pledge when the time comes." But, he asked: "How about a no-profiteering pledge by the National Association of Manufacturers and the U. S. Chamber of Commerce?"

Meany knows the answer to that one, even if it did reportedly bring down the house. The AFL leaders may have to whip the boys off the picket line but the profiteers will go marching on.

Next—A Labor Party!

by Jack Ranger

A Hard-Hitting, Meaty, Simple Presentation of the Need for an Independent Labor Party

25 cents a copy Independent Socialist Press, 4 Court Sq., Long Island City 1, N. Y. Order from: Independent Socialist Weekly



LABOR ACTION

Independent Socialist Weekly

Vol. 14, No. 33 August 14, 1950

Published weekly by the Labor Action Publishing Company, 114 West 14 Street, New York City 11, N. Y. GENERAL EDITORIAL AND BUSINESS OFFICES: 4 Court Square, Long Island City 1, N. Y. Telephone: IRonsides 6-5117. Subscription rate: \$2.00 a year; \$1.00 for six months, (\$2.25 and \$1.15 for Canada and Foreign.) Re-entered as second-class matter May 24, 1949, 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

THE GOVERNMENT LOYALTY PROGRAM, by L. A. Nikoloric. (American Scholar, Summer 1950)

The entirety of this excellent and informative article might well be reprinted, as a picture of how the loyalty purge program works. It gains added weight from the fact that the author is a Washington attorney with the well-known firm of Arnold, Fortas & Porter. Without doing justice to it, we present only a small section.

Nikoloric is pointing out that the loyalty boards' hunt for the "potentially disloyal" inevitably leads them to persecute any dissenting opinion.

"Hence, to find a potentially disloyal American, find a man who expresses dissatisfaction with the established order of things—a man who believes in racial equality, socialized medicine, labor unions, equalization of economic opportunity, or increased government activity in economic affairs—particularly if the believer is not of Anglo-American stock. These things are 'left-wing'; so is communism. A fortiori, a man who believes in them may become in the future a Communist agent."

As one of his illustrations, he cites the following excerpts from transcripts of various loyalty boards.

- 1. Q—Was your father native born? A—Yes.
- Q—How about his father? A—Yes.
- Q—Your mother, was she native born? A—Yes.
- Q—How about her parents? A—Yes.
- 2. Q—Have you ever had Negroes in your home?

3. How large a unit do you have supervision over?

A—Approximately twenty people right now.—Any difference in color?

A—Not at the present time... all white.

We have had a colored man in other years.

Q—Professional or clerical? A—Professional.

4. Q—Are you in favor of the Marshall Plan?

5. Q—There is a suspicion in the record that you are in sympathy with the underprivileged. Is this true?

6. Q—Did you see X soliciting funds for strikers?

7. Q—In your recollection do you recall ever discussing any topic which might be sympathetic to Communist doctrine?

A—Yes.

Q—Would you care to state what it was and who it was made to?

A—I have been sick for years, and so I have discussed what they call nationalized medicine.

8. Q—Did you ever hear any political discussions at X's home?

9. Q—Did you ever attend any political forums at X's home?

10. Q—Are your friends and associates intelligent, clever?

11. Q—When did you become a member of the Communist Party?

Q—If you are, as you say, a loyal American, why do you persist in denying that you were a member of the Communist Party?

"In fairness," concludes Nikoloric, "it must be stated that these questions are taken out of context. This does not, however, dispense the obvious interest of the board in these matters. In every hearing I have attended, these or similar questions have been asked. These questions are not unusual or the exception; they are routine..."

WORLD POLITICS

British Trade-Union Leadership Eases Up on Wage-Freeze Policy

Pressure from below has forced the leadership of the British trade unions to ease up on the wage-freeze which it and the Labor Party government has been imposing on the unions. The General Council of the Trade Union Congress adopted the freeze formula in November, 1949, and it was endorsed by a small majority at a special conference of executives of affiliated unions in January, 1950.

At its June 28 meeting the General Council issued a statement yielding significant ground. The following comment is from the London Socialist Leader.

By WILFRED WIGHAM

The General Council, in a curiously frank circular, virtually admits that its advice then was foolish, and makes the face-saving claim that "the rigidity of the policy formulated under the shadow of devaluation was a short-term policy." The statement goes on:

"It is already clear that in the view of several of our affiliated organizations the freedom of collective bargaining, which was our first condition, has been affected to some extent because certain employers have used the policy enunciated as a reason for refusing to consider the merits of claims submitted through the normal processes of collective bargaining."

Many rank-and-file trade unionists could have—and did—told the General Council last November that "certain employers" would make use of the General Council's kind advice for their own purposes of a bigger share for profits and a smaller share for wages.

The June 28th statement reveals also that the General Council has found out that workers like to preserve what living standards they have been able to win in the past.

"There are, moreover, two developments which make impracticable a scheme of rigorous control operating generally on wage rates between the cost of living figures of 106 and 118, quite apart from the difficulties on unions with sliding scale agreements. In the first place, although the cost of living figure has risen much more slowly than many people anticipated, there arises quite naturally a desire to preserve living standards."

The General Council makes the government share in its face-saving: "In addition, the relaxation of rationing and controls of various commodities has given an impression that we are rapidly climbing out of our difficulties and that the need for restraint no longer exists."

It is not unreasonable to conclude that the change of attitude by the General Council has been forced on it by the workers whom it is supposed to represent in an advisory capacity: by the unofficial strikes,

the branch resolutions pouring in to the head offices of the unions, and by the decisions by national conferences of a number of unions reversing the vote in favor of wage restraint given by their executives in January.

The determined stand taken by some of those unions which have sliding scale agreements (in which wage rates rise or fall with the official cost-of-living index figure) against the amazing suggestion that they should abrogate those agreements—a stand also recognized in the General Council's recent statement—was also a contributing factor to the ending of the "rigorous restraint" policy.

The General Council still urges "reasonable restraint in all personal claims on production." Employers, both private and state, will continue to make use of this advice. They have, however, never abandoned in practice their imposition of rigorous restraint on wages, and in some cases this has been backed by arbitration tribunals.

This has been exemplified in the past two weeks by the nationalized boards of two great industries—the railways and coalmining.

IN THE MINES

The Coal Board greeted the annual conference of the National Union of Miners on July 3 with a rejection of the union's claim for more pay for lower-paid workers. The NUM Executive had at the last moment reduced the original demand for an increase of 2s 6d a shift to 2s. The increase is estimated to cost 10 to 12 million pounds, and would affect 400,000 day wage miners. Basic pay for miners in the pit is five pounds 15s, and on the surface five pounds.

The conference by an overwhelming majority on July 4 passed a resolution declaring that lower-paid workers' earnings were insufficient for a reasonable standard of life and that there should be immediate steps to increase them.

The Coal Board has consistently refused to revise the cost-of-living bonus since the introduction of the new cost-of-living index in June, 1947.

Immediately the rejection became known, hurried pit-head meetings were called in some coalfields and 6,000 miners in Lanarkshire went on strike on July 3. Over 10,000 were out in Scotland next day. By July 5 there were 14,695 men out from 57 pits in Scotland and 7,000 in Wales. On July 12 the Daily Herald reported 17,000 on strike in Scotland and that most of them had voted against "back-to-work" calls by union leaders.

The Coal Board has not given up the rigorous restraint policy—for the workers, that is; the members of the board are not in a similar financial situation: in their case restraint has never been exercised.

THE PRO-TITOISM OF THE SOCIALIST LEFT—3

A 'New Road to Socialism'—via the CP

By HAL DRAPER

What follows from the pro-Titoism we are discussing?

The two groups in the Fourth International Trotskyist leadership (discussed last week) exhibit an answer to the question. The insoluble dilemma which they face also applies to any of the pro-Titoists outside their group, to the degree that the latter have tried to think the question through.

The swamp into which the Pablo group among the Fourth International leaders is driven is the theory of the "bureaucratic socialist revolution."

In the last ten years we have written often enough about the official Trotskyists' theory of Russia as a degenerated workers' state. We showed, above all, that this theory amounts to automatically equating "workers' state" with complete statification of the means of production; that this crude formula (statification, of nationalization, equals workers' state), with all of its sterility and theoretical emptiness, is the actual content of their position.

Our discreet opponents never actually embraced this formula in so many words. Pushed into a corner, they sometimes even denied it, while still repeating its essence. The rise of the East Europe satellites of Russia made this equivocation impossible. Hence the present division in their ranks.

What distinguishes the position of the Pablo group is, first, its unreserved adoption of this blown-in-the-bottle formula. Its declaration on the subject is stark, crude, mechanical, unsuitable and four-square.

Here is Pablo's. His theme is "the assimilation of the buffer zone [East Europe] to the USSR"—i.e., its social identity with Russia—i.e., why these countries are, or are becoming, workers' states also. He vigorously asserts that—

"for those who agree that the assimilation of the buffer zone to the USSR is possible BY MEANS OF 'STALINIST ACTION' (THAT IS, MILITARY-BUREAUCRATIC ACTION)...the fundamental criterion which will express this assimilation must be the thoroughgoing transformation of the property relations in the buffer zone, the effective statification of all the means of production, transport and exchange."

"Property relations definitively characterize every SOCIAL REVOLUTION...and it is possible, necessary AND SUFFICIENT, in taking this criterion as a point of departure, to define the class nature of a given society." [My emphasis in capitals, Pablo's in italics. SWP Bulletin, May 1950, page 11. Lots more of same in following pages.]

No one could possibly write a clearer statement of the theory of a military-bureaucratic road to social revolution—to workers' states, specifically, in this case.

How to Spot a "Workers' State"

It follows that this is indeed the road to workers' states traveled by the Russian satellites. Pablo is nowise reluctant to say so. If there is still a question mark, we will see where it lies:

"This criterion, and this criterion ALONE, can guide us in resolving the question of the class nature of the buffer zone. For, in these countries, where the regime is NOT THE PRODUCT OF A GENUINE REVOLUTION and whose state apparatus is dominated by the Stalinist bureaucracy, thoroughgoing social transformations will only become definitively clear on the plane of property relations."

"Has this stage been reached already by all the buffer countries? I repeat that a study of the buffer zone, undertaken from this point of view, must be concrete for each country, since considerable differences still exist among them and since, on the other hand, STATISTICAL DATA are lacking for a categorical assertion on each case."

Hence follows the need of "our research on the class nature of the buffer countries."

It is related that in 1852 a clerk in the office of the India Trigonometrical Survey looked up excitedly from a page of figures and cried to his superior, "Sir, I have discovered the highest mountain in the world!" A check of the surveyors' observations proved that the summit listed as Peak XV was indeed the highest, and it was baptized Mt. Everest.

Any day now a clerk in the office of the Fourth International will look up from the latest tables of statistical data and cry, "Comrade Pablo, the social revolution has just taken place in Czechoslovakia!" It will be the first revolution in the history of the world to be discerned through a slide rule.

Rationale for Stalinist Expansion

Thus Czechoslovakia (and so on) will be baptized "workers' states." Thus the Pablo group discovers the military-bureaucratic road to socialism.

To socialism? So far Pablo has only raised the satellites to the status of workers' states (deformed). But this bureaucratic social revolution of his also opens a road to socialism for him:

"Experience has shown in the case of Yugoslavia that, first of all, certain Communist Parties, in a favorable conjuncture, when they are linked with a real revolutionary movement of the masses, can detach themselves from the yoke of the Kremlin and begin to act on their own. Consequently, to regard every victory achieved by a Communist Party as synonymous with a victory of Stalinism, that is, a victory of the Soviet bureaucracy, is an absurd generalization, a mistake."

"The case of Yugoslavia is of enormous theoretical importance, as it relates, moreover, to an understanding of Stalinism, to the meaning of its expansion, as well as to the revolutionary perspectives that flow from this expansion."

What is the meaning of this? In one sense, it is certainly true that the expansion of Stalinism raises new revolutionary potentialities. The more any imperialist oppressor extends itself over the world, the more it sharpens its own contradictions, evokes resistance, and thus out the power it has available for repression. So it was for the Caesars, for Hitler, for the British Empire, and this is now being learned by the U. S.

But this is not what Pablo has in mind. "The case of Yugoslavia" shows that (for him) the revolutionary meaning of Stalinist expansion lies in the revolutionization of the Stalinist parties themselves. To underline this, Pablo immediately refers to China.

The "expansion of Stalinism" is a world (bureaucratic) revolution, and this opens a road to socialism—"a transformation which is being realized in a fashion far more complex, more tortuous and richer in historical combinations than our teachers thought it would be."

Tortuous is an understatement. But we must not leave a false impression of Pablo's new line. Stalinist expansion opens a road to socialism for him, truly, but—perhaps you have forgotten—he is a "Trotskyist." It is not the road, not the one he prefers. He guards against slanderous misinterpretation by making clear that "Stalinism, judged by its over-all action, remains a definitively counter-revolutionary force." For three reasons (our emphasis):

- (1) "Because in the capitalist countries it does not fight consciously for the proletarian revolution" but uses labor to pressure the bourgeoisie for the Kremlin.
- (2) Because "in the USSR the bureaucracy is obstacle No. 1" to free socialist development of the country.
- (3) "Because in all the buffer countries the destruction of capitalism is achieved under conditions which impose upon the masses historically unnecessary suffering and useless burdens," alienating the masses and obstructing free socialist development.

Were They Right?

His reason (2) applies only to Russia. We are concerned with a worker in a capitalist country—say, France or Spain—who, like Pablo, sees the Stalinists making "revolutions" and "workers' states" by the dozen.

(1) The Stalinists do not fight consciously for the proletarian revolution? Leave aside for the moment the natural response "So what?" Personally I would be willing to join a party which is fighting for the revolution unconsciously or implicitly in fact, especially when I learn that in a whole series of countries they have in fact established workers' states.

But whether the Stalinist leaders are consciously fighting for proletarian revolution or consciously fighting only for the Kremlin, they have always claimed that the two come to the same thing in the long run, that the latter leads to the former. More important, their militants did not need Pablo to confirm their belief in this claim. For CP militants really and consciously believe that they are fighting for the revolution in their own way.

Vivid to mind are my many discussions with Stalinist rank-and-filers in which I have criticized this or that counter-revolutionary policy of the CP, only to be told, with utmost sincerity, in effect: "Don't worry, these are only temporary tactics; we've still got the revolution up our sleeve all the time; comes the right moment [a favorable conjuncture, in Pablo's language] we will haul it out. This is just a more indirect [tortuous] road we are following, but all the more effective."

It turns out, according to Pablo, that they were right all along.

(3) But their road means "historically unnecessary suffering"?—Who is to say what is historically necessary, if not History? And what has History said on the subject? It has said that their "Stalinist road has led to workers' states, while Pablo's has as yet led nowhere.

What a Stalinist Militant Could Say

"In which party do you belong: in the party which didn't even know a social revolution was going on, till now, or in the party which was making that revolution?"

"What good did the Yugoslav Trotskyites do, for example, with their 'dogmatism' and 'sectarianism' and 'pure revolutionary principles'? They managed only to get themselves machine-gunned, and how can you make a revolution in that condition?"

"And who put them out of the way, lest they misguidedly interfere with the REAL business of making a revolution? The man who you Trotskyites yourselves say is the hope of the world today, Tito. Perhaps Tito was over-hasty and harsh in his zeal, but you can't make an omelette without breaking eggs."

"If those Yugoslav Trotskyists had been good Stalinists instead, they would now be in the great Communist Party of Yugoslavia, instead of elsewhere, with something to say about things. And suppose your hope of the world had not been so harsh and had charitably let them live to mouth their revolutionary phrases on the outside, they would still be on the outside today while the CP runs things."

"Wouldn't it have been better to get in on the ground floor?"

And so this Stalinist militant stays in the CP, in spite of Titoism or through hope of Titoism or any combination thereof. And perhaps we are close to one of the reasons why Titoism has made no appreciable inroad on the worker-militants of the Communist Party even in France.

The theory of the "bureaucratic road to socialism," explicit in Pablo and implicit in any pro-Titoist position, reaches into the innermost vitals of every Marxist idea. If they are right, throw the books out! To be sure, this is no argument against pro-Titoism: maybe Marxism is all wrong... we must be free of all preconceived notions... etc. But we do not believe they are right. And before any Marxist takes steps on the Pablo road, as so many European independent Marxists are doing, they should at least cast a look ahead into the dark.

(Next week: the other swamp in the Fourth International)

The FIGHT for SOCIALISM

by Max Shachtman

A basic primer in the principles and program of Independent Socialism

\$1.00 Cloth-bound \$2.00 INDEPENDENT SOCIALIST PRESS 4 Court Square Long Island City 1, N. Y.

East German Stalinism: The Ruling State Party of the Russian Zone

By EUGENE KELLER

As indicated in my article on Eastern Germany in last week's LABOR ACTION, the Socialist Unity Party (SED) in the Russian Zone has been, over the past year or so, transformed into what its Stalinist leaders call a "party of the new type." This has meant the elimination, physically or ideologically or both, of the Social-Democrats with whom the Communist Party had merged in 1946 to form the SED; the strict enforcement of party discipline by means of control commissions whose chief task is to stamp out "Titoism"; and the encouragement of "new cadres" which have had no previous affiliations with either the Social-Democrats or the CP.

Hence not only the party's organizational structure but the character of its membership has been and is changing.

These new cadres must not be regarded as merely pliable to the wishes of the party leadership. The youth of the Russian Zone, having grown to consciousness during the depth of the depression, the years of fascism and war or the chaotic post-war period, is little encumbered by traditions, these having been indiscriminately destroyed. It has, furthermore, been impressed by the relative social mobility in the Russian sector, by possibilities of advancement in the statistified economy, the new army, trade unions and party hierarchies, etc., as well as those opened up by collaborating with a vast, powerful and apparently growing country.

To such youth (and we mean persons up to 35 years old) political problems mean little, if anything; and they must regard the SED as an indispensable means to, as well as safeguard of, their collective advancement. The term "collective" is used advisedly; for the coming to the fore of "new cadres" in the SED must certainly not be dissociated from a certain idealism.

The youth of the Eastern zone are organized (officially up to the age of 25, but its leaders are probably older) in the "Free German Youth" (Freie Deutsche Jugend—FDJ). We need not dwell on its totalitarian character and its close association with the SED—they are well known. It "collaborates" with the educational system, sport clubs, trade unions, etc., and extends all the advantages to its membership which a state-sponsored organization usually finds no difficulty in doing.

The Stalinist Youth

We need only recall similar organizations of the past, such as the Italian Balilla or the German Hitler Jugend, to see that there is not only no opposition to or skeptical discussion of the professed aims of the "movement"; but that there is little general resistance to joining it on the part of young people, that the latter are easily taken in by the spirit of comradeship and high collective morality which are fostered in it. This is so especially since these values cannot often be experienced at home or in the shop or office.

It can be assumed that for similar reasons the FDJ has little difficulty in recruiting members. It claims 1.9 million. The Office of Political Affairs of the U. S. high commissioner believes that no more than 5 per cent of these are convinced and ambitious Stalinists. Even if this figure were correct (there is no way of telling, of course) it would merely mean that the secondary and tertiary leadership, in addition to the top, rests with fairly reliable elements.

The power which the FDJ exercises over youth was evidenced most unmistakably at the much-vaunted Whitenside parades and rallies last May. The very effect of efficiently organized affairs of this type, combined with political slogans ("Unity" and "Peace") which are not deprived of their effectiveness because they are propagated by Stalinists, serves to enhance the cohesiveness of the participants, makes them more ready to accept the cause, rather than awakening any spirit of opposition or revolt against regimentation.

While the American press stressed the compulsory aspects of the rallies, etc., and alleged that Eastern zone youths were favorably impressed with the display of consumers' goods in West Berlin (goods which no West Berlin worker could afford, however), the German press was not quite so sanguine. The Muenchner Sueddeutsche Zeitung wrote: "Even Western observers admit that the parade was a memorable experience... and disturbing because the youthful marchers had a strong sense of fulfillment."

And the Muenchner Kurier: "The Allied commanders who cruised above the Friedrichstrasse in a helicopter could see with their own eyes... that a very large proportion of the marchers were clearly under no compulsion and were fanatically convinced of the truth of their slogans. The free world should reflect that it must give youth new ideals if it wants to lead them along the right path." Carolus, a liberal German correspondent, who quotes these excerpts among others in his article in The Nation. (June 24), confirms these views by his own observations; he is assuredly not a Stalinist.

Can They Be Tied to Moscow?

The eventual success of the FDJ, however, is far more limited than was that of the Hitler Youth. The analogy between the two must not be overdrawn. German fascism, after all, was able to identify itself with Germany as a nation because it was a product of native social forces which gained the upper hand. Not so with German Stalinism. It is bound ever more tightly to Russian policy; and the dangers of German "Titoism," which already is disintegrating the West German CP, are too potent for the Russians to allow the East Germans anything more than an appointed regime of lackeys.

What hold the Stalinists have upon the East German youth cannot be but partial and temporary; the prospect

of a Russian master race holds as little appeal to a German as that of a German master race held for a Russian. Meanwhile, however, we must not lose sight of the formation of "new cadres," based largely on the youth as well as on sectors of the workers, peasants, etc. (see below) which are crystallizing into a new social class.

The SED today claims a membership of 1.8 million among a population of about 17 million and an electorate of approximately 10 million. Its composition is as follows (from Neuer Weg, No. 8, 1950, published by the executive committee of the SED):

Industrial and agricultural workers...	46.0%
Employees (office, civil service, etc.) ..	21.4
Peasants	6.0
Artisans	6.7
Intelligentsia	4.3
Housewives and others	15.6

In 1928, a year of peak strength of the German CP among the industrial workers (but not of total membership), the CP's composition was as follows (nationally):

Skilled workers	39.9%
Unskilled workers	28.1
Agricultural workers	2.2
Artisans and office employees	11.3

Sixty-three and a third per cent of its members were employed in industry. Its total membership in 1928 was 130,000, nationally. It never exceeded 380,000 members, this figure having been reached in 1922.

"Party of a New Type"

Due to the large agricultural sector in the East German economy, no close correlation between the composition of the old CP and the present SED can be established. The thoroughgoing agricultural reforms of 1945-46 have created a certain base for the SED among the peasants and land laborers; the party claims that a total average of 31 per cent of its membership is organized in rural units. Not all of these are agricultural laborers; the figure probably includes peasants, housewives, etc. However, it seems safe to assume that the industrial workers do not constitute more than 25 per cent of the party's membership. This would give the SED 400,000 worker-members, a figure probably too high rather than too low.

What percentage these 400,000 constitute of the total industrial working class, we do not know. However, the above figures clearly show that the SED bears no resemblance to the old German CP. It does not "base" itself on any particular class; rather it is the Stalinist state's organizational means to consolidate its rule (that is, chiefly its ideological rule) over all elements of society. Like the Nazi party or the Russian CP, the SED cannot be thought of as existing apart from the state apparatus.

Naturally, the party leadership is concerned always to "improve" what it calls the party's "social composition." But the meaning of this term does not refer to working class elements which the party should strive to attract; rather, according to Walter Ulbricht, the secretary-general of the SED, it means that "activists" should be brought into the party's ranks.

The "activists" are the pace setters of production in the factories, the offices, on the farms, etc. As in Russia and other satellite countries, they enjoy various privileges, tending to form a privileged social element, apart from the mass of producers. Their accession to the SED helps to make it the "party of a new type," contributing to the stability of its cadres.

The managerial personnel of the Russian Zone has been reported to consist to the extent of 47.6 per cent of former workers; and the proportion of former workers

in the industrial administration is 27.3 per cent. (The remainder is composed of engineers, former businessmen and directors, etc.) This may have given the illusion of social mobility; and it is true that the abolition of class restrictions in the secondary school and university system has allowed talented workers, who were formerly barred from it, to improve their status. But in an exploitive economy, social mobility can be maintained only if the economy itself is "mobile," i.e., expanding.

Now there have been improvements in the East German economy over the past years but its basic character has remained that of a rump economy—deprived of its customary markets, dependent on the East for the importation of expensive raw materials, heir to backward and depressed regions in a largely agricultural setting; its growth has been stunted. In addition, it has been led by Russian dismantlings as well as the dealings of the Russian-run corporations which are said to dominate 20 per cent of the economy.

Two Channels of Resistance

Under these conditions a heavy burden rests upon the workers, made heavier by the deprivation of their rights. They cannot move freely to other jobs nor bargain collectively, their wages being set by the "plan"; they are subject to being drafted to areas of labor scarcity (such as the notorious uranium mines in the ore mountains), and have lost their voice in the setting of production quotas, which are arrived at by Stakhanovite methods.

Their work councils, once genuinely democratic institutions by which their rights to codetermining conditions of work and speed of production had been assured, have been abolished, and their functions taken over by the staffed trade unions. "Interference" with plant management, which at first they mistakenly believed to be subject to their control, has been energetically stopped by the occupation authorities. Need we mention that strikes are outlawed? The workers can struggle for the correction of grievances only indirectly; they are surrounded by insurable "control committees" and police spies; and while concentration camps are the most dreaded consequences of opposition, withdrawal of food cards or of pay but (under the circumstances) important privileges are also potent threats.

Resistance to the Stalinist regime so far has apparently found two channels, both of which Wilhelm Pieck, one of the SED's chairmen, found necessary to mention in his keynote address to the recent third congress of his party:

(1) The "Eastern bureau" of the Social-Democratic Party, which is a system of contact men and women organized in the Eastern zone, whose work seems to consist mainly of propaganda.

(2) The existence of "Titoist" organizations which range from actual close affiliates of the Yugoslav CP to the Trotskyists and so-called "Communist opposition" groups. Their programs are, by and large, hopelessly sectarian and evidence little understanding of the nature of Stalinism. However, this, under the given circumstances, does not deprive the groups themselves of importance; the impossibility of closing Eastern Germany tightly off against its Western counterpart, and the existence of a relatively free political labor movement in Berlin, gives these groups the chance to become rallying centers of opposition. The Stalinists understand this quite well and do their best to stamp them out.

However, effective resistance to a totalitarian regime must have outside aid and an international perspective. In the absence of dynamic democratic movements and policies in the West, resistance in the East cannot but confine itself to the most immediate and localized objectives. The continued political apathy of the masses of Western Europe, even of America, necessarily has a depressing effect upon the peoples suffering under the Stalinist heel.

MURDER IN MEXICO

The Assassination of Leon Trotsky

by GENERAL SANCHEZ SALAZAR in collaboration with JULIAN GORKIN

The story of the assassination of Trotsky written by the ex-chief of the secret service of the Mexican police, who was in charge of the investigation which led to the conviction of the murderer

235 pages \$2.50

Order from: LABOR ACTION BOOK SERVICE 4 Court Square Long Island City 1, N. Y. (Orders must be accompanied by payment)

Court Okays Smith Gag Act--

(Continued from page 1)

In the case was written by Judge Learned Hand makes the decision doubly significant. Not only does it uphold the constitutionality of the insidious and repressive Smith Act, but the agent of the decision is none other than the judge who, for decades, has expressed what is genuinely liberal and democratic in American law.

During World War I, Judge Hand wrote a classic decision in the case of Masses Publishing Company v. Patton in which he enjoined the postmaster general from prohibiting the Masses from the mails. The wording of that decision, written in 1917, in the midst of an openly repressive hysteria that has yet to be attained today, is still cited as one of the noblest expressions of the meaning of free speech and free press under American law.

It is interesting to cite a passage from that opinion in light of the decision of last week:

"Political agitation, by the passions it arouses or the convictions it engenders, may in fact stimulate men to the violation of law. Detestation of existing policies is easily transformed into forcible resistance of authority which puts them in execution, and it would be folly to disregard the causal relation between the two. Yet to assimilate agitation, legitimate as such, with direct incitement to violent resistance, is to disregard the tolerance of all methods of political agitation which in normal times is a safeguard of free government. The distinction is not a scholastic subtlety, but a hard-fought acquisition in the fight for freedom."

"Clear and Present" Equals "Probable"

In those days, Hand was almost alone in his struggle. The above decision was overruled by the higher court, which stated that "if the natural and reasonable effect of what is said is to encourage resistance to law, and the words aroused in an endeavor to persuade to resistance" then the speech is punishable by law. The Hand of today has joined his over-rulers of yesterday. As Learned Hand was a noble expression of liberalism in American thought, so does his present decision signify the utter impotence of liberalism to combat Stalinism with other than totalitarian methods. What is to be expected from a Tom Clark as the normal expression of police-state mentality comes from Learned Hand as a measure of decline of the American tradition.

The decision itself rejects, in effect, the Holmes "clear and present danger" doctrine. Like other decisions of the past year in other courts, respect is paid to the liberal doctrine before proceeding to emasculate it by redefinition, a small tribute the liberal conscience pays to its past.

Thus Judge Hand states that "clear and present danger depends upon whether the mischief of the repression is greater than the gravity of the evil, discounted by its improbability." The notion of "immediacy" is rejected for the criterion of "probability," and "clear and present" has come to mean present repression of possible future dangers.

This is the old conservative doctrine of "remote bad tendency" which Hand opposed so vigorously in 1917; but at that time liberalism had a confidence in its own society and its own beliefs which has been destroyed by the bewildering onslaughts of Stalinism.

What is most striking about the decision is the manner in which the cold war is brought to bear on the judicial finding. Other judges have placed their decisions on the altar of the cold war but usually in the most general terms. The Hand decision goes into the details of the world conflict, citing such items as the Berlin airlift, and arrives at his conclusions by what appears to be a purely political analysis.

Law as Servant of State

The decision makes clear that as a result of the present relationship of forces where "any border fray, any diplomatic incident... might prove a spark in the tinder-box and lead to war," the danger of the CP "conspiracy" to overthrow the government becomes a "clear and present" one.

It should be clear that the rule of law follows the stages of the war. Had the international situation been less tense, the danger of the conspiratorial revolution (a naive notion in itself) would presumably not have been so great and hence not legally suppressible.

There is an illuminating lesson here for those who like to think that the difference between a democracy and a totalitarianism is the absolute "rule of law" which prevails in the former, a law which is sacrosanct and above "men and politics," a law that is the unassailable refuge of the persecuted. The Hand decision clearly shows that in both democracy and dictatorship, law is subordinate to the needs of the society's survival and the amount of liberty any government can afford is in direct relation to its self-confidence and stability.

It is a mistake to think that the Hand decision is any less "law" for being so politically motivated; rather does it expose again the essence of the law as the servant of the masters of society. It may be a comfort to some that a Smith Act is validated by a court of justice, but this makes it no

less repressive than a totalitarian edict.

At the moment, the victim of the Smith Act and the Hand decision is the Communist Party. But neither the act nor the decision limits itself to the Stalinists.

Judge Hand writes that "literally they [the words of the act] make criminal the fulminations of a half-crazy zealot on a soap box, calling for an immediate march on Washington." Though Hand seems to indicate that such a person would not be criminally liable, the limitation of the law in this case does not limit it necessarily in others. The act itself reads that if "the application thereof to any person or circumstances is held invalid... the application... to other persons or circumstances" should not be effected.

In many ways this is a more repressive interpretation than if the act were taken literally. For now it is impossible for a person to know whether the act applies to him or not. It may be ruled invalid in one case, but that is no guarantee that it will be ruled that way in any other case.

Inscription on a Sword

In 1919 Ernest Freund, an authority on law, wrote an article on the case of Eugene Debs which seems to have been written in reply to Hand's interpretation: "So long as we apply the notoriously loose common-law doctrines of conspiracy and incitement to offenses of a political character, we are adrift on a sea of doubt and conjecture. To know what you may do and what you may not do and how far you may go in criticism is the first condition of political liberty, to be permitted to agitate at your own peril, subject to a jury's guessing at motive, tendency and possible effect, makes the right of free speech a precarious gift."

The decision opens the door wide to wholesale and indiscriminate repressions. In relying on the precise wording of the act to justify his interpretation, Judge Hand refused to recognize the social reality behind the phrase. In his classic work on "Freedom of Speech in the U. S.," Zechariah Chafee wrote, "the truth is that the precise language of a sedition law is like the inscription on a sword. What matters is the existence of the weapon. Once the sword is placed in the hands of people in power, then whatever it says, they will be able to reach and slash at almost any unpopular person who is speaking or writing anything that they consider objectionable criticism of their policies." That a Judge Hand helps forge this sword is a measure of the decay of liberalism and a tribute to the universally insidious power of Stalinism, a power which corrupts and debases not only its supporters but its opponents as well.

Readers Take the Floor... From Belgium: The Anti-Leopold Strike Movement

The following letter from a friend in Belgium is dated August 1 and was mailed at the time when the anti-Leopold strikers were at their highest point, before the settlement.—Ed.]

To the Editor:

When I arrived in Belgium on the Monday after the king's return everything was quiet. Business as usual and carnivals going full blast in every village and in Brussels too. I had the impression that the king and his reactionary advisers of the Christian Social Party had calculated very well, that all of the big revolutionary talk of the anti-Leopold Socialists was just so much bluff.

This impression was further confirmed as I examined the remaining evidence of months of political fanfare still posted and painted all over those brick walls (which surround everything in Europe). The anti-Leopold (Socialist and Liberal) slogans were in no case anti-monarchist. The huge demonstration of July 8, when tens of thousands of workers converged on Brussels, was, officially at least, a day of "Homage to the prince regent!" The banners and speeches were all in this vein. I am told, but the workers' chants were more radical: "Abdication sans condition" and "Leopold au poteau!" But the "social-democratic leaders are just too "clever" for such slogans—unless, of course, their political bread and butter is really threatened, and then they will try anything, it seems.

All day Monday and Tuesday, no strike call—let alone revolution. Was the whole affair a bluff?

No, not for the workers in the South. Without any call, they started to come out on a general strike. In scores of mining towns they vowed never to work again until the collaborator-king was gone. No one was surprised at the almost complete shutdown in the Borinage; but big surprise—in the industrial regions around Liège the strike was still more complete. Never had such a strike been seen in this part of the country. It was here that the three killings by the police brought the movement to a climax.

But where was ex-Minister Spaak? Where were the big-time parliamentarians? What strange silence, after all their revolutionary boasts of the week before! Finally, by Wednesday or Thursday they came to life again. And how! They now were more radical than anybody.

No limited protest strike for these gentlemen. Now that the workers have spontaneously shown the way, these revolutionary orators suddenly proclaim the unlimited general strike, not forgetting to sprinkle the word "insurrection" freely about. They vow that they will never again serve in a government under this king, nor be summoned to any consultation by him. They solemnly return all of their medals and decorations, demanding that this be printed in the official journal in print just as big as when the medals were bestowed!

They throw a revolutionary pose—an artist's conception of the great leaders of the great revolutions of the past. So persuasive is their oratory that they convince—not the king—but their waver-

Back in the Jungle

TAMPA, Fla., Aug. 4 (UP)—The president of the University of Tampa, a former army chaplain, said today that ministers should tell their congregations that it was "better to be a live sinner than a dead saint" and should "invite them to the rifle range" to learn how to make war.

Dr. Elwood C. Nance said he had decided that nothing "except armed force can stop the Communists from their present attempt to dominate the world."

"I believe that we should have total preparedness based on the laws of the jungle, that everyone should learn every art and science of killing," he said.

"I personally do not think that war should be restricted to armies, navies and air forces or that there should be any restrictions as to methods or weapons of destruction. I would approve bacteriological warfare, gas, atom and/or hydrogen bombs, inter-continental rockets, and so forth.

"I would not ask for mercy hospitals, churches, educational institutions or any special groups. War is contrary to everything for which religion and civilization stand and it would be sheer hypocrisy to offer mercy to any particular group."

Truth

Dean of Canterbury Hewlett Johnson is the notorious front for the Stalinists who has been lately jogging around Europe putting his stamp of approval on the Russian satellite regimes.

At a conference which he attended at Kromeriz, Czechoslovakia, he finally let the truth slip out.

"When I am back in England to tell the people about Czechoslovakia," he said, "everything I have seen and experienced here will appear to me as a beautiful dream."

R. G.

You're Invited

to speak your mind in the letter column of L.A. Our policy is to publish letter of general political interest, regardless of views. Keep them to 500 words.

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.

14-33

If this number appears at the bottom of your address, your subscription expires with this issue.

RENEW NOW!

Who Won the Propaganda War? —

(Continued from page 1)

over the "discomiture" which they attributed to the Russians. They had said they would boycott the UN till Mao's China was recognized, and now they are back . . . it proves how powerful the UN is . . . they lose face . . . etc. When the votes were taken, the headlines exulted: "We Win—8-3!" What happened?

Purely formally speaking, all that happened at the council sessions was a parliamentary battle. The U. S. put forward a one-point agenda: "Complaint of aggression upon the republic of Korea." Malik presented two points: recognition of Stalinist China, and "peaceful settlement of the Korean question." The council decided on the agenda to be followed. The U. S. "victory" consisted in getting its agenda adopted.

In the course of this "victory," Washington's support IN THE COUNCIL ITSELF was cut down, at one point, to five in a 5-5 vote. That U. S. delegate Austen could muster a majority against Russia would have been considered, before the meeting, self-evident. What stands out, even as far as the vote was concerned, was Russia's success in splitting the anti-Russian lineup.

NEHRU'S DILEMMA

India, the key to stopping Stalinism in Asia, headed by a man whom not even McCarthy has called Stalinist, Nehru, voted with Malik on every question but one—on which it abstained.

This in itself was a victory for the Kremlin, regardless of who came out with the majority.

The first vote took place on a ruling by Malik to put the U. S. resolution on Korea last on the agenda. India voted with Russia.

The second vote put the U. S. resolution on top of the agenda. India abstained.

The third vote was on whether to remove from the agenda Russia's proposal on China. Voting with Russia, besides India, were also Britain, Norway and Yugoslavia, countries which have recognized the Mao regime.

India's role had been foreshadowed by Nehru in speeches earlier in the week, in which he had attacked both U. S. and Russian policy, while supporting U. S. intervention in the Korean war. It was clear that the Indian prime minister wishes vigorously to fight Stalinist expansion in Asia. (If nothing else, it is a threat to him no less than to the U. S.) He took his position on Korea in the face of strong opposition at home (the Indian CP is weak). Yet U. S. policy has put him in the position of having to vote alongside Malik, however reluctantly.

It is this which, perhaps most clearly, shows the superficiality of the variety of post-mortem comment in this country which revolved largely around the technique of propaganda. There is discussion of how to expand "The Voice of America." There is a proposal to put high-power radio transmitters on warships and station them near the Stalinist outposts to propagandize them, etc. A correspondent plaintively wrote that "the Soviet propaganda trumpet was outblaring the United States' tin whistle all over Asia, as usual. . ."

AD MAN'S MIND

All this may be true, but certainly any existing weakness of U. S. propaganda does not account for Nehru's predicament. The government head of India does not need an American cruiser stationed outside Bombay to unmask Malik's lies.

The inability of the U. S. capitalist mind to understand what is happening is illustrated by the way in which Washington columnist Arthur Krock put the question of countering Russia's effectiveness:

"In a country bursting with the skills required for this particular performance [Voice of America], with the technique of

the advertising man modified by those of the diplomat and the proficient news editor . . . it is contended that a more effective propaganda than that of the world Communists should be a certainty, once there is agreement on two things. . ."

And what are these secondary "two things" which come trailing after advertising skills and news editing? "The source of the impact of Soviet propaganda; and what is best salable in our bill of goods." In other words: this second-rate point is: What shall U. S. propaganda say?

The big thing which such advertising hucksters' minds seem to be blind to is the fact that U. S. policy speaks louder to the world than the Voice of America's generalities about the democratic way of life.

(1) ON CHINA: While countries like Britain and India have already recognized Stalinist China, on the easy-to-argue ground that it IS the government of China, the U. S. had done a flip-flop of its own, far more damaging and meaningful than Malik's procedural reversal on boycotting the UN. After all the scathing denunciations of the Chiang Kai-shek regime by the State Department (its famous White Paper, for example), Washington is openly back in Chiang's kitchen again. Truman has promised to defend Chiang's last stronghold, Formosa, with American lives. More spectacularly, General MacArthur himself visited Chiang to discuss with him ways and means of doing that which Washington not long ago abjured—giving him military aid.

How effective is the Voice of America going to be on that, as-

suming that warships with radio transmitters ring Asia with a solid wall of airwaves?

HOW PROVE IT?

(2) While the entire world cries for peace, while the UN itself followed Truman into Korean intervention under the cry of peace, it is Malik who demagogically put Korean peace on the agenda and it was the U. S. which forced it off the agenda by whipping up its votes.

(3) While the refurbished Voice of America is presumably to beat the air-with denunciations of totalitarianism, the U. S. Congress votes a \$100 million loan to the most brutal totalitarianism OUTSIDE the Stalinist world, Spain's Franco.

(4) While the U. S. speeches denounce "imperialism" (Russia's only), it is the U. S. that has pledged itself to put the French puppet Bao Dai solidly in power in Indo-China.

In one of the most thoughtful articles which appeared in the daily press on the debacle, James Reston of the N. Y. Times (close to the State Department pipeline) summed it up:

"They [the Russians] were for peace, the United States was for war. They were allied with the new, the coming forces of Asia; the United States was allied with the past, with the has-beens, the Chiang-Kai-sheks, the Bao Dais, the imperialists. They were for unity and self-determination, the United States was for disunity and colonialism."

That's the way the Russian propaganda presented it, he says. Now Moscow is not for peace and not for self-determination; it is seeking to impose its own domination upon Asia. But it is impossible for

the U. S. to PROVE that to the Asian people as long as its own policy remains imperialist aid to every reactionary point of support in that part of the world.

As our front-page editorial points out (it needs re-reading in its entirety at this point), this is so NOT because of mere stupidity or ignorance on the part of Washington. Its policy could be more cleverly veiled than it is, its nature could be masked with more competent demagoguery or even more concessions to Asian nationalism, but essentially it boils down to the fact that the U. S. is trying to defend the old system in Asia, which is also its own system—capitalist imperialism.

WAR OF SYSTEMS

In their own way, the observers we have quoted recognize that this is not a radical cliché. Writes Reston:

"The United States, in spite of its anti-colonial tradition [in Asia, for example? The Asian people know better!] is still a symbol of the rich well-fed world of the West to Asia. . ."

It is not the wealth or good feeding of Western capitalism that Asia hates. It is the fact that so much of this wealth and good food has come from their labor and from their exploitation. This they know.

Reston proposed a bigger and better propaganda-broadcast campaign under UN auspices:

"The British cannot do this job, nor the French, nor the Dutch, for all their experience in Asia. [Note how to write a tactful article: These countries, the very symbols of imperialist exploitation to the Asians, would not be listened to BECAUSE of their experience in Asia!]

"And Washington cannot do it, for the history and suspicions of the capitalist world in Asia are against us."

So Reston proposes that U. S. propaganda go exclusively under the alias of the United Nations. What a comedown! What has happened to the idea about selling the American Way of Life to the backward natives? The UN as "a symbol of the independent equal future" is still pie-in-the-sky.

Reston's sober solution of the political problem — de-emphasize the U. S. and put forward UNism—demonstrates better than we could the inability precisely of the United States to match its ideology of capitalism against the Russian ideological offensive.

Or, as Arthur Krock asks—without answer: ". . . how can we persuade them [the North Koreans] and the civilians in Korea and other parts of the world that the system we offer is worth the show of devotion they display for the Communist system. . .?"

It is two social systems which are in combat over Asia. The one is old, and on the way out, and hated. Anyone who lines up under its banner cannot win the people. The other is the Russian despotism, new, unfamiliar, untried by the people, still in its honeymoon days of promises and sweet words. It has rushed in to fill the vacuum created by the disintegration of its predecessor. The Asian people will rue the day it conquers them. But they cannot be saved from its deadly embrace by pointing back to the past.

That is why Independent Socialism points the way out in the struggle against both forms of exploitation and for a socialist democracy.

U. S. to Finance Franco --

(Continued from page 1)

workers in violent, armed struggle? Was he not the archetype of the anti-democratic, anti-Semitic, anti-working-class and anti-socialist totalitarian rulers?

Two totalitarian rulers were aided at one swoop: Franco and Stalin.

France anticipates a loan, refused last year by the Export-Import Bank, although the political-moral gains of the U. S. gesture were perhaps of greater importance to him. Stalin has received a much more significant victory in the current propaganda battle between the United States and Russia. And he knows how to exploit it. The Stalinists know how deep and how widespread is the hatred for the Spanish butcher who inflicted one of the bloodiest defeats in modern history on the workers, peasants and republican armies.

The Stalinists, because of their different feel for propaganda, because of their anti-capitalist nature, because of their collectivist society (reactionary and bureaucratic though it is), know well how to utilize the dissatisfaction that exists with the old, decaying society. And they know especially well, since they went through a temporary period of "anti-fascism," how to utilize the popular hatreds generated by the decadent forms of capitalism, the fascist, totalitarian varieties, for their own interests.

BUSINESS POLICY

Thus the United States is faced with the contradiction that in order to fight a totalitarian order, it extends a helping hand to another totalitarian power, and plays into the hands of the former. The ground is cut from under its contention that it is fighting to uphold the forces of democracy against the totalitarian assault.

There is a certain consistency, whatever the squabbles among the American statesmen, in

United States policy in regard to Spain. Earlier, it was characterized by an arms embargo against the legally constituted Loyalist government when the latter was being fought by Franco with the aid of Nazi and fascist military supplies. Mild attempts at ostracizing Franco were made after the proclamation of victory over fascism in World War II and the formation of the United Nations.

This offer of support by the United States Senate, over the objections of Truman and Acheson, is part and parcel of United States strategy in World War III. The Senate action is "sound business policy" when it is borne in mind that American economic interests are closely identified with the Franco regime. The preponderance of foreign capital invested in Spain has shifted from complete German control at the end of 1939 to American domination today, a change which began in 1943. Today the power of American finance extends to all sectors of Spanish economic life: petroleum, metallurgy, mining, communications, hydraulic power, electrical materials, etc. The airport of Barajas, on the outskirts of Madrid, is labeled "the American Gibraltar" by the Spaniards.

TRUMAN'S OBJECTION

While the action of the Senate appears to be motivated by an attempt to embarrass Truman-Acheson on the part of anti-administration, bi-partisan mavericks, there is agreement, even among those statesmen who disagree, on fundamentals. There was objection mainly to the crudity of the action, the timing, etc. But the way has slowly been paved over the past year for a softening of public opinion, and of government policy toward Spain. Congressional and private industrial-ist visitors to Spain, official and unofficial, come back praising Franco and demanding governmental assistance for that anti-labor and robber regime.

Interestingly enough, Truman

and Acheson now object only to putting the official seal of government on a Spanish loan. They wish the loan to be handled directly through the Export-Import Bank as was Franco's request of last year. Actually, they do not object to economic assistance to the beleaguered dictator.

Last January Acheson wrote to Senator Tom Connally approvingly on the matter of rendering economic assistance to the Spanish totalitarianism and integrating it into the "concert of democratic nations." He said then in justification: "The internal position of the present regime is strong and it enjoys the support of numerous persons who, although they might prefer another form of government or another chief of state, fear that chaos and civil war would be the consequences of measures adopted to overthrow the existing regime."

BLOW TO SPANISH PEOPLE

Acheson, spokesman of the administration, has already ruled out any democratic alternative to Spanish fascism. However, the weaker Franco becomes, the greater the opportunities for a

democratic opposition. United States aid—or even the gesture, if it does not materialize—has dealt a blow to this democratic, liberal and socialist opposition to Franco, inside and outside Spain.

It has helped Stalin immeasurably. It has given the discredited and disintegrating Spanish Stalinist movement a rallying cry and a hope of resurgence.

Franco gives his proper thanks to the United States. The New York Times quotes a typical comment from a Spanish Roman Catholic paper:

"... while the GIs are dying for the highest reasons of civilization in Korea, France is juggling cabinets, Belgium is fighting over keeping or expelling the king, England is preoccupied with her policy of socialization and the talk everywhere is of elections, internal struggles and domestic disturbances."

There it is, replete with sneers at democracy, parliaments, socialization, getting rid of the Nazi-collaborator Leopold, etc.

No wonder Franco is so jubilant that American youth are dying in Korea!

THE NEW COURSE

by LEON TROTSKY

The Struggle for the New Course

by MAX SHACHTMAN

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

\$1.50

INDEPENDENT SOCIALIST PRESS

4 Court Square

Long Island City 1, N. Y.