

LABOR ACTION

Independent Socialist Weekly

NOVEMBER 20, 1950

FIVE CENTS

LABOR AND THE NATIONAL ELECTION

Reports from California, Ohio, Chicago, N. Y.

The Foreign Policy Issue in the Election

... pages 1, 2, 3, 8

Dynamite in Brazil

... page 6

What Happened to Labor in the Elections? Why Did It Have No Program of Its Own?

Franco Chortles: UN-U. S. Vote Props His Regime

The most disillusioning gesture thus far made by the United Nations—the withdrawal by the General Assembly of the portions of the 1946 resolution banning ambassadors to Spain and its membership in the specialized committees of the UN—has had the effect predicted in these pages in previous articles. Within Spain, the Franco regime has been strengthened by the UN olive branch. The Falangist extremists will have louder voices, the moderate elements will become warmer and the skeptics will be stilled.

The New York Times' Madrid correspondent reports the exultation of the Spanish press on the victory of Generalissimo Franco in the United Nations. It is utilizing the UN vote in the special fashion of fascist demagoguery as signaling a defeat of the "Communists" by Spain. Like Hitler and Mussolini, Franco poses as the arch-enemy of Stalinism. The United States, prime mover of UN policy in Spain, follows the course of making overtures to the enemies of its enemy—even though it means befriending a dictator here and there, and in the case of Spain the only living Axis leader.

The Spanish press is naturally a rubber stamp for the Franco regime and the people do not know that some criticisms leveled against Spain in the 1946 resolution still stand. But the government draws great and positive comfort from the very real softening of the UN stand. Chiseling steadily away at the antipathies of the UN countries stemming from the late alliance with fascism, the Falangist press maintains an uncompromising stand for the revocation of all restrictions on Spain in the UN. More important than the return of the ambassadors, according to Foreign Minister Albert Martin Artajo is "that they be consistent in their treatment of our country."

BUCKING UP THE CAUDILLO
According to the Times' Sam Pope Brewer, among the tiny minority who know the totality of the UN position, including the higher civil servants who are not Falangists, many are concerned about the long-range effect of the UN reversal. They reason that this overture to Franco can only confirm the Caudillo in his uncom-

promising policy toward the Western powers.

Brewer laments that "Spain's rundown railroads and limited highways, struggling industry and declining agricultural economy are not enough, even with her fine geographic situation, to make her such a valuable ally that the rest of the Western countries must come to her on bended knee." Franco, it seems, has made only the rivers run, on time.

The Times and similar critics treat the original UN resolution, passed in a moment of anti-fascism, as a "mistake," and the current reversal of position on the ambassadors and UN committees as a rectification of that mistake. Their regrets are confined only to the fact that Franco's controlled press is able to "distort" the meaning of the UN action and to utilize it to strengthen his hold in Spain. They have failed to view the issue in the still larger repercussions it will have in the Stalinist press and among its readership. After the late "war against fascism" and in the midst of preparations for the "war against totalitarianism" the circle of fashionable thinking on Spanish fascism is a little hard to square.

By ALBERT GATES

These are the days of the post-election reckoning. Is there any doubt about what happened in the campaign? For the politicians of the two big parties, their representatives and spokesmen, the results were clear enough. The Republicans outfought and outran the Democrats for the most part. We have already cited the manner in which this was accomplished.

The cross-ballot voting, selective and bullet choices have been stressed heavily in the press. This was an off-year election, many commentators have been forced to remark in their limited conceptions of what constitutes politics, and therefore, the "ins" were replaced by the "outs." Others ascribe the defeat of the administration to the vindication of Senator McCarthy and the rejection of Acheson's foreign policy; the heavy costs of war preparations, disgust with the corrupt municipal regimes of the Democrats, and so on.

These reasons are all true to one degree or another but they do not tell the whole story or its most important part.

The more acute analysts of the election, however, have recognized that the most significant aspect of the campaign was the organized participation of the labor movement on the most unified basis since the formation of the CIO, its main support to the Democratic Party and its disastrous defeat. If labor does not recognize that it suffered a defeat in the elections, it will never begin to learn anything politically, least of all, how to repair its mistakes.

"NEGATIVE VICTORY"?

It will not do to think that labor won a "negative victory," as one unnamed union leader asserted, because labor prevented the Republicans from winning a majority of Senate and House.

For, in that comment, is contained the essential blindness of

"Mr. Democrat"
No Saviour for Labor



the whole labor movement: the labor officialdom continues to think politically in the terms of the two capitalist political parties.

Yet they are not applauded by the reactionary capitalist press for this shortsightedness. No, they are viciously denounced for trying to "dominate" the elections through the domination of one of the main political parties. They are denounced for their "partisan" participation in the elections by the most rabid representatives of the "vested interests." And the truth is that the union leaders have dirtied their hands in the mire of filthy capitalist politics.

No wonder the New York World-Telegram of the Scripps-Howard chain called in the ghost of Sam Gompers to tell the labor movement to keep its hands off politics. The Telegram spoke of the "resurgence of independence" among the workers who refused to follow their union leadership in supporting candidates "selected" by them. Says the Telegram:

"American workers decided to
(Turn to last page)

Britain Gives Stalinist 'Peace' Fake a Lift

Labor Government Bans Visas to Delegates in Anti-Democratic Policy Imitating Truman

The British Labor government struck a blow against its own much-vaunted democracy last week when it forced abandonment of the Stalinist second "World Peace Congress" by arbitrarily denying visas to a large number of the delegates who had been scheduled to attend it. In this action the government has shown itself willing to ape one of the most reactionary practices which have been adopted by the government of the United States.

Among the prominent Stalinists denied entry visas were atomic scientist Joliot-Curie of France; Louis Saillant, general secretary of the Stalinist-dominated World Federation of Trade Unions; Pietro Nenni, secretary of the pro-Stalinist wing of the Socialist movement in Italy; Pierre Cot, former French

air minister; and Louis Aragon, French poet.

According to Home Secretary J. Chuter Ede 300 visas had been granted out of 561 requests, and in the case of nationals of countries who do not require visas 131 were permitted to land and sixty-five were kept out.

EVEN CHURCHILL

The lame explanation of the basis on which persons were excluded was that "those were excluded who appeared likely to engage in action detrimental to the determination of the democracies to meet and resist aggression."

Of course, the Stalinists all over the world will make propaganda capital out of this action. Even Churchill availed himself of the chance to take a fall out of the

government by denouncing the stupidity and crassness of its act.

It is encouraging that rank and file Labor members of parliament also attacked the government in what the papers describe as "a spirited debate." They stated that the action was a denial of free speech and assembly, and one of them stated that "on the grounds of constitutional principle, of expediency, of the needs involved in the defense of democracy in these difficult years the action was wrong."

The delegates will now meet in Warsaw. Due to the Labor government's measure to catch up with its United States partner when it comes to curtailing civil liberties, this conference will have twice the propaganda value it would have had otherwise.

The Stalinist attack in Korea had done much to make the "peace congress" appear as hypocritical as it is. The British Labor government has now contributed its bit to reviving and rehabilitating the movement.

NEXT WEEK

Crowded out of this issue:
NEW ELEMENTS IN STALINIST IDEOLOGY, by Vs. Felix.

TITOISM IN THE HUKBALAHAP MOVEMENT? by Richard Burgess.

A UAW LOCAL DISCUSSES THE ELECTION — a dispatch from Detroit.

CALIFORNIA The Douglas-Roosevelt Rout — Fair Dealers' "Me-Tooism" Flopped

By S. BEILAS
BERKELEY, Calif., Nov. 11—Just as the surge of the California Republican thrust on November 7 drove a splintered Democratic Party into crisis, so did it shatter labor's dream of political victory through the Fair Deal. Helen Gahagan Douglas, 48-year-old darling of American liberals, unanimously endorsed on both cheeks by the AFL and CIO, was crushed under a two-thirds of a million majority.

The debris of California's senatorial race reveals a scant two major counties, Contra Costa and Solano, supporting Douglas over her reactionary opponent, Richard Nixon. And Contra Costa, the smallest of the state's five metropolitan counties, gave her a bare majority of only 500 votes.

Elsewhere, with the exception of three Sierra counties numbering less than 150 precincts, neither the unanimity of the labor press nor the enmity of the ADA and other liberals could deliver the votes. In her own home county of Los Angeles Douglas lost by over 300,000. San Francisco County, the stronghold of the CIO, voted her down by 40,000 votes, and Alameda County by 20,000.

The mounting Douglas defeat becomes further magnified by the fact that the California electorate turned out in almost equal number to the high mark of 3,800,000 in the 1948 elections. Despite the lack of campaign funds until the last week of October, Douglas successfully stumped the state and drew large middle-class, Negro and liberal audiences wherever she spoke. A battery of national Democratic guns, from Vice President Barkley down, came to her aid with numerous speeches and endorsements.

Yet this liberal-labor-Democratic coalition collapsed under the onslaught of a two-pronged Republican campaign: McCarthyism in domestic politics and MacArthurism in foreign affairs.

ROOSEVELT DEBACLE

Douglas' campaign strategy impelled her into embracing more ardently the administration's policy, identifying herself whenever possible with President Truman. She stressed her Congressional pro-Korean war record. She failed to attack the trend toward a garrison state, although she reiterated all the 20-year-old bromides on the Common Man.

In this way she hoped to answer Nixon's smear of Communism, and in turn she associated the record of Nixon with that of Marston. So leery were her liberal supporters of any radical taint that Professor Odgaard at her Berkeley campus meeting publicly dissociated Douglas from the Socialist Youth League literature being passed out.

But the more Douglas shied away from the radical elements in her record, the more her labor support grew cool and the more the middle class and farm vote flocked to Nixon.

If the defeat of Douglas was a rout, then James Roosevelt's showing for governor was no less than a debacle. Warren, with a mealy-mouthed stand-pat program for a third term, won out by a 1,100,000 vote! Roosevelt failed to capture a single county in the state—with Los Angeles county casting a 425,000 majority for Warren. This in a state whose voting population registered 3 to 2 for the Democratic Party.

president of Local 10 of the Longshoremen's Union. The CIO Longshoremen's Union impartially displayed both Democratic and Republican gubernatorial banners from its headquarters.

The tepid support the rest of the trade unions gave Roosevelt is easily understandable. After all, the eldest son of FDR was untried in politics; his official actions in support of labor amounted to exactly nothing. Although his program included highly acceptable points for an adequate civilian defense, more schools and federal ownership of tidelands oil, his other planks carried the undertone of an out-politician's demagoguery.

DEMOCRATS ROUTED
His own party spelt out Roosevelt's defeat even prior to November 7. The forces of Buddy-Luckey-Pauley-Malonee coalesced to strangle Roosevelt's campaign by refusing it finances. They obviously preferred defeat, precipitating a leadership crisis, as the precondition to their Democratic control.

Few of the Democratic national spokesmen who toured the state for Douglas gave Roosevelt a warm greeting; let alone an endorsement. Truman's elephantine memory on Roosevelt's support of Eisenhower in June 1948 prevailed. Thus labor unwillingly and unwittingly was left holding the bag with a moribund candidate.

That the reactionary Republican sweep to increased power in California equaled and even exceeded the rest of the country can be seen by closer analysis of the election results. No major state-wide can-

didate supported by labor and the Democratic Party won out over the Republican machine, except Edmund Brown who ran for attorney general. But Brown's 250,000 majority, in view of his favoring state ownership of the tidelands, might be interpreted as a personal victory for Pauley.

John J. Allen, whose role in Congress parallels Nixon's, retained his seat over Lyle Cook. Of the 23 representatives to the 82nd Congress 12 will be Republicans. Representatives Shelley and Havener from San Francisco were retained, the latter by an overwhelming vote, but the Democratic hope of gaining one additional seat and overturning the present majority went down the drain. In the state legislature where the Republicans have held forth for fifty years, their majority was increased by two votes each in both the Senate and Assembly.

Probably the most jolting blow to the labor movement and the working class came from the real-estate boards whose Proposition 10 slipped through with a 50,000 majority. This proposition, a state constitutional amendment, stipulated that no public housing could be undertaken without the majority vote of the local registered electors. Because local by-elections of this nature seldom pull out a total vote equal to the majority of registered voters, public housing would thus be automatically defeated.

Throughout the state every trade union, LLPE, PAC, ADA, SDA, veterans' organizations, Women's Voters' League, liberal groups, etc.,

violently opposed this proposition; yet in the avalanche of reaction the imperious real-estate interests, who just received state-wide rental increases up to 25 per cent, again triumphed.

LIBERALS BACKTRACKED
Complete election returns as of this date are not available, but the Stalinist-run Independent Progressive Party apparently dwindled in stature to something smaller than the Prohibition Party. Fauntleroy, the Alameda County IPP candidate for state senator, gleaned a mere 41,000 votes to 200,000 for his opponent. The chance of any IPPer receiving the required 140,000 votes for that party to remain on the ballot appears extremely unlikely. Stalinism in California has turned a mass party into nothing more nor less than another front group.

What accounts for the disastrous turn of events in the California elections, particularly when the labor movement into meekly following the Democratic Party as it twisted and turned under the reactionary attack. But the workers and the middle class felt the impact of war upon their living standards. Their apathy over the war stuck out all over. Offered no solution to the growing crisis, they slowly moved away from that party which spoke in their name. Finally the reversal in Korea brought the decisive break.

Once again the powerful trade unions, particularly the AFL, were placed in a timid and subordinate position while they waited for the liberals within a capitalist party to lead them out of the wilderness.

Between June and November a war intervened with resultant inflation and lowering of living standards and a manufactured hysteria over internal security. Liberal Democrats hastily backtracked and capitulated on civil liberties in the name of "the clear and present danger." Douglas herself grew alarmed over the "world-wide conspiracy" of the CP. On

Great Train Robbery

Standard & Poor, the leading business reporting corporation, reports on railroad profits: It predicts that net earnings of Class I railroads for 1950 will hit \$725 million. That's an increase of 67 per cent over 1949.

September 22 she introduced her own version of the Kilgore bill. Her bill, HR 9737, called for "the retaining of Communists in time of emergency," as she said. She, like other liberals, responded as a victim to the hysteria and not as an opponent.

With the almost universal stress upon "the clear and present danger" enhancing the frenzy, all other issues were eclipsed. No one in California, not even the labor movement, spoke out sharply against inflation, and rising living costs. No one proposed an adequate program of price controls. And not one word was uttered against the war, except by the IPP which patently supported the Kremlin.

The California coalition between the Democrats and labor forced the labor movement into meekly following the Democratic Party as it twisted and turned under the reactionary attack. But the workers and the middle class felt the impact of war upon their living standards. Their apathy over the war stuck out all over. Offered no solution to the growing crisis, they slowly moved away from that party which spoke in their name. Finally the reversal in Korea brought the decisive break.

Once again the powerful trade unions, particularly the AFL, were placed in a timid and subordinate position while they waited for the liberals within a capitalist party to lead them out of the wilderness.

NEW YORK After That "Smart" Liberal-Tammany Deal — No Mess of Pottage for the Liberal Party

By PETER WHITNEY

NEW YORK, Nov. 13 — New York State voters thumbed their noses at straight party tickets on election day. They jumped from line to line on the voting machines in an amazing display of selectivity, and produced the weird winning combination of Republican Thomas E. Dewey, re-elected for governor; Democrat Herbert H. Lehman, re-elected for the Senate; and in New York City, "independent" Vincent R. Impellitteri, victor over the regular Democratic-Liberal candidate, Ferdinand R. Pecora.

It was the New York City situation and Impellitteri's sensational victory which left the city's political leaders holding their heads. Impellitteri sailed into City Hall without the backing of any major party except a disgruntled faction of Tammany Hall, and left his chief opponent over 200,000 votes behind him. Undoubtedly, many Republicans dumped their own candidate to vote for him, but substantial numbers of Democrats and Liberals deserted to his line also. And it is this phenomenon which has led to some deep soul-searching, particularly among the Liberal Party supporters.

The Liberal Party strategy of supporting the Democratic ticket for the three top offices boomeranged heavily against them. During the campaign, the mutterings among the rank and file, particularly against having to swallow Lynch and the Tammany deal involving Pecora, were silenced by the leadership with promises of how much their influence and power would be increased by this "smart" deal with the Democratic Party. The rank and file was exhorted that this was a winning combination, and the Liberal leaders even rashly predicted a vote of a million on the Liberal line. The party faithfuls were promised that they could then write their own ticket and wouldn't have to bow down to anyone.

ASK THEM!
But now it is the morning after, and the sad fact facing the Liberal Party leadership is that their vote this year is smaller than it was in 1949, when the registration was smaller and when they were calling upon their supporters to vote for Democrat Lehman for senator and Republican Newbold Morris for mayor. This year, without such "confusion" in the voting, the Liberals gave Lehman 305,325 votes as against 426,675 in 1949.

The membership has the right to ask David Dubinsky, Alex Rose, and Adolf Berle: What happened to over 100,000 votes on the Liberal line? How did we lose them? Could it be that these voters looked at the Democratic line and then at the Liberal line and seeing no difference for the major state-wide offices, decided to vote for the party that was, after all, the legitimate party of those candidates?

The Liberal leaders stated, after the elections, that it was Lehman who had really forced this policy on them. He refused to run as their candidate unless they came to an agreement with the Democrats on the gubernatorial and mayoralty candidates. And since their prime objective in the campaign was to re-elect Lehman, they had to accept the Democratic candidates. Incidentally, this should dispose once and for all their contradictory claim that they "forced" Tammany to accept Pecora.

Dubinsky and Rose are, they insist, practical politicians and they justify their policies by the votes that they get. How will the practical politicians explain a policy, adopted to strengthen Lehman's position, which results in the exact opposite: a decrease in Lehman's vote? This decrease must also be accounted for in the light of the weak candidacy of

Hanley whose scandalous letter of political bribery lost him votes within his own party, and whose age and ill health sent him to the hospital before the campaign was over.

RODE IN ON "BOSSISM"

Nor can a "reactionary trend" be given as the reason, not at least in this case in New York State, because an analysis of the reasons for Impellitteri's victory reveals that healthy and progressive sentiments were exploited to attain that victory. He won because the voters were convinced that he was not a "bosses' man" and that he would clean up the mess in City Hall. This candidate, whose vocabulary up until the election was restricted to the word "yes" to any Tammany Hall demand, ironically enough became the symbol of the fight against municipal scandal and corruption.

He exploited the tremendous hatred of New Yorkers for political bossism and gangster rule. He promised to smash racketeer Frank Costello's influence and end patronage in government. Every revelation of graft in the Police Department, every scandal in the educational system, he utilized to further his own candidacy. Thus we had the spectacle of O'Dwyer's

right-hand man capitalizing on all the unsavory scandals coming to light during the election campaign.

How could the Democratic-Liberal candidate Pecora tap this huge reservoir of progressive sentiment against bossism and Tammany Hallism in New York City? Pecora proclaimed that he was independent of any bosses, but the simple fact remained that he was the candidate of the Tammany machine. He was silent as O'Dwyer himself on all the corruption of Tammany's regime. What were his protestations of independence worth when never once did he attack O'Dwyer's record, nor did he say what he would do about all of Tammany's patronage in City Hall?

Here we have another example of practical politics at work. In 1949 the Liberal Party had thundered away at Tammany Hall and its leader, O'Dwyer. They endorsed Newbold Morris of the Republican Party (after they had "forced" him on the party, à la Pecora) and they waged a thumping campaign for cleaning out City Hall and getting good clean government. Even with a sizable section of the Liberal Party supporting O'Dwyer in 1949, the Liberal Party rolled up some 372,000 votes for Morris.

Given such unprincipled combination, is it any wonder that the Liberal Party voters register their disgust by giving Pecora a vote of 225,000, as against 372,000 for Newbold Morris in 1949? Most of the difference probably went to Impellitteri and helped to elect him.

Perhaps the Liberal supporters were recalling the Adolf Berle of 1949: "Tammany Hall is not merely a Manhattan organization. It is a state of mind and a method of government — a bad

one and we are against it. . . . You cannot build a liberal program on a district leader system or on a basis of crass and sordid political deals." Those words were more prophetic than Berle suspected and they have come home to roost in 1950.

The cast of Walter Lynch is still another example of the curious method of practical politicians to attain their ends. They say that they want to have liberal-minded legislators, but it would be difficult to stretch Lynch into this pattern. Lynch, regarded as the spokesman for the Bronx in the House of Representatives, voted for the loan to Franco and for the McCarran Bill, both measures heartily attacked by liberals. These inconvenient facts, of course, were never revealed to the Liberal Party ranks in all the long descriptions of Lynch's "perfect" voting record in Congress. Lynch was part of the package deal which the Liberal leaders had made and they swallowed him.

What did the Liberals hope to get in return? As one commentator in the New Republic put it: "A Supreme Court designation (Continued on page 7)

Perhaps the Liberal supporters were recalling the Adolf Berle of 1949: "Tammany Hall is not merely a Manhattan organization. It is a state of mind and a method of government — a bad

one and we are against it. . . . You cannot build a liberal program on a district leader system or on a basis of crass and sordid political deals." Those words were more prophetic than Berle suspected and they have come home to roost in 1950.

The cast of Walter Lynch is still another example of the curious method of practical politicians to attain their ends. They say that they want to have liberal-minded legislators, but it would be difficult to stretch Lynch into this pattern. Lynch, regarded as the spokesman for the Bronx in the House of Representatives, voted for the loan to Franco and for the McCarran Bill, both measures heartily attacked by liberals. These inconvenient facts, of course, were never revealed to the Liberal Party ranks in all the long descriptions of Lynch's "perfect" voting record in Congress. Lynch was part of the package deal which the Liberal leaders had made and they swallowed him.

What did the Liberals hope to get in return? As one commentator in the New Republic put it: "A Supreme Court designation (Continued on page 7)

ILLINOIS What Chicago Workers Had to Vote for —

Case in Point: a Lucas and a Cop

By R. F. SARGENT

CHICAGO, Nov. 12—Overwhelming defeat of most labor-backed Fair Deal Democratic machine candidates on election day here has delivered a stunning blow to the prestige and authority of the AFL and CIO leaderships, whose political blindness has been exceeded until now only by their own smug cocksureness and bureaucratic arrogance.

The Illinois CIO-PAC announced its "wholehearted" support for the re-election of Scott Lucas as U. S. senator, in which capacity he has been steering the Truman legislative program as majority leader. During this period Lucas had been FOR the Taft-Hartley Law on the original vote, only later voting to support the unsuccessful Truman veto. He repudiated Truman's veto of the McCarran "anti-subversive" bill. He indicated clearly enough that he was opposed to health legislation. This is the man who led, the ticket in Illinois that labor was supposed to work for and see that everyone registered to support.

Lucas was defeated by ex-Congressman Everett Dirksen by a 287,000 majority. Backed by the Republican Chicago Tribune which campaigned demagogically against the Democrats' "Endless Wars, Endless Inflation," Dirksen, an even cleverer scoundrel than Lucas, has a notoriously long anti-labor record in his 16 years of previous service as a congressman.

He found it possible in his campaign to insinuate notes which could play upon the genuine fears of the people, fears which could not be answered by the Democrats' blarney and the laborites' blarney. In one speech he managed to remind his listeners of "another bite out of your pay checks on October 1. . . . heavier war casualties last week than we have been allowed to know. . . . secret foreign policy from Yalta to Korea," etc.

Jake Arvey, head of the local Democratic machine and the only politician to comment publicly on its devastation at the polls, insisted that defeat was due to "Korean developments in the last 3 or 4 days," with the possibility of war with Stalinist China looming.

BLAMES KOREAN WAR
Although this certainly was a factor, other very important causes, produced by the machine itself, had a most direct bearing. The election occurred after the Kefauver crime investigation committee had been devoting considerable attention to the traditional alliance between Chicago capitalism and gangsterism. The Democratic candidate for sheriff became the natural center of discussion in terms of local issues, therefore, especially since during the immediate preceding period two unsolved murders had occurred, the victims of which had been known to be working with the Kefauver committee and the Republican candidate for sheriff.

So unfolded the fantastic story of Captain Daniel Gilbert, popularly known as the "richest cop in the world."

For 18 years as chief investigator for the state attorney's office, charged with producing evidence against gangsters, Gilbert had never been able to produce anything to salt away any of the more notorious criminal characters of Chicago. Instead, although drawing a pay of \$5200 annually in his post, he filed a \$45,000 income tax in 1949 and is reputed to have amassed a bankroll of \$300,000. In addition, old timers in the labor movement remember him for his outstanding anti-labor proclivities in the early formative years of the CIO in this area.

PAC BACKS COP

To make a long story short, the press had a field day against Gilbert as one of the standard bearers of the corrupt Democratic ma-

chine. While they supported Babb, an almost unknown Republican glamor man and former OSS officer, the local Americans for Democratic Action and the CIO-PAC refused to support any candidate for sheriff—up until a few days before the election.

Then the top state CIO-PAC officialdom overrode their own previous abstention and came out for Gilbert over heavy protest from their rank and file. This so-called move did not save Gilbert from being snowed under by a 377,000 majority!

It would be almost needless to say that CIO-PAC in this election was not able to rally active unionists in any significant numbers to work for the candidates it supported, who possessed absolutely no labor appeal whatever. If only the microscope, painstakingly applied, could discover wherein the leading candidate Lucas was a "lesser evil" than his opponent, then surely unionists could not be expected to take seriously their leadership's call to do battle for lesser lights with enthusiasm.

In the state legislature the Republicans now control both House and Senate and the labor-liberal Democratic machine Governor Stevenson is a captive. With passage at this election of the much-needed but entirely inadequate "gateway" amendments for possible constitutional revision, it now appears that a real danger confronting Illinois labor is that new state sales taxes will be imposed to finance increased highway and school expenditures at the expense of the people generally. Stevenson has long been a sponsor of such a state "Fair Deal!"

KORSHAK REJECTED

As a way of showing its "independence" from the Democratic machine the state CIO-PAC had refused to endorse numerous candidates for minor offices that clutter the ballot. This holdout did not

apply to any of the major contests, except one.

As readers of LABOR ACTION will recall, in the past spring the CIO-PAC ran Willoughby Abner, UAW official, unsuccessfully for state senator against Democratic hack Marshall Korshak in the Democratic primary in the 5th District. Abner's PAC organization, which is the only one of its kind known to operate on a year-around basis and composed of rank-and-file militants in the Negro wards, was confronted by a demand from state PAC big shots to endorse Korshak for the fall elections, since Korshak claimed to be a full-fledged Fair Dealer and had now obtained ADA support.

The Abner group steadfastly refused to grant its endorsement to Korshak, taking the position that neither he nor the Republican candidate was worthy of the office. Abner carried this fight into the state CIO-PAC, where he obtained a majority for this stand and for the right of his group to determine what candidates from his bailiwick would be endorsed.

To the extent that in this very limited area an actual fight was put up to consciously refuse endorsement to a "Fair Dealer," the local labor movement salvaged its only remnant of honor and showed the kind of political judgment that, when vastly expanded and put into positive terms, can lead to a new departure for labor's politics and to a way out of the terrible swamp it now is in.

With the Democratic machine's prestige now at the lowest ebb in recent years at the big question remains: Will labor now take steps to tear its blind leadership from the fatal embrace of the Democratic machine and make a start toward the creation of an independent party of labor? Only such a party could speak for labor and win the respect of labor and the small people amid the rising clamor of reaction today.

OHIO Labor United Its Forces — for What?

Taft Beat Nobody, Named Ferguson

By JOE HAUSER

CLEVELAND, Nov. 13 — The smashing election victory of Ohio's Senator Robert A. Taft has rocked the organized and politically united labor movement in this state. All other candidates and issues had been subordinated to the one task of unseating "Mr. Republican," the recognized Congressional arch-foe of the unions, and the election in his stead of Joe Ferguson, Democratic state auditor.

The big question seems to be: "What happened on election day?" The United Labor League of Ohio had accomplished an important step in successfully merging the political forces of the CIO, AFL, United Mine Workers, and the Independent International Association of Machinists. In every community in the state this new political alliance made its presence felt.

The unionists hammered away at meetings, in the union newspapers, in radio programs, at neighborhood rallies: "Beat Taft!" A persistent campaign to register voters was carried on, resulting in registration figures far above normal for an off-year election. With a large vote due, the union forces were confident of victory.

Election day found the United Labor League forces, at least in the big cities, more in evidence than the usual Democratic and Republican political workers. Cleveland alone had over 2000 ULL workers getting out the vote, plus many others sponsored by individual unions. In addition, about 30,000 building construction workers took a holiday to swell labor's political forces.

It was generally conceded that the senatorial race would be close, although Taft claimed victory by 100,000 votes and Ferguson stated he would win by 250,000. The next day the story. Taft won by 400,000 votes, rolling up 1,642,537 to his opponent's 1,211,658, giving him the biggest majority for any Ohio candidate in many years. That is why the question uppermost in the minds of working people was: what happened?

The first and most evident rea-

son would appear to be that this was strictly a negative campaign on labor's part. The ULL was against Taft—period! They simply could not say very much for their own candidate or what he stood for in a positive way. Before this year Ferguson was unheard of in labor, or even liberal, circles. He was merely an ordinary politician, an ordinary state office holder, an ordinary figure in the usually corrupt big-city Democratic Party machine.

OVERNIGHT EMBRACE

In a wide-open Democratic primary election to determine the senatorial candidate, Ferguson won by virtue of his support by the official state Democratic apparatus. The union forces, unwilling to put up their own candidate or even to come out in favor of any one primary contender, were forced to clasp this nonentity to their bosom, and declare him to be "The Workers' Friend!" Overnight he was pointed as the staunch fighter for the underprivileged and oppressed.

It does appear that the Democrats, having presented this candidate, allowed the United Labor League to carry the burden of the campaign. Ferguson's speeches were prepared for him, and he read them, monotonously and dutifully, whenever necessary. The ULL even had to hire a speech professor to guide their man in this simple task. On rare occasion Ferguson spoke informally, and then he usually got in trouble.

Two stories illustrate this point. Once, speaking impromptu, he repeatedly assured his audience auditor: ". . . as if the poor fellow couldn't get out of the safe rut he had occupied for so many years. On another occasion when his guard was down, Ferguson was asked by a farm audience for his views on the Brannan plan. His answer was: he didn't know what the plan was about, but if elected he would then study it, and if it was in the farmers' interests he would support it, and if not he would oppose it. No wonder his backers avoided any debate between the candidates!

Lacking a past record to dis-

to, Ferguson had to make the best of the fact that he came from a poor family, worked his way through school, and raised a large number of children. There just was nothing more to say for the man. As a result it was a common thing to hear at union meetings, "Let's not even think about Ferguson, our job is to defeat Taft." And this was precisely the weakest part of the campaign.

GOP RODE THE TIDE

What little was mentioned about the program was simply in support of the Truman administration. Nothing more, nothing worthy of a "labor candidate." This tie-up with Truman brings up what may have been the second factor in Taft's favor. There seems to have been a definite Republican trend in Ohio as apparently throughout the country, probably reflecting dissatisfaction with both the foreign and domestic policies of the national administration. The swing in Ohio was definitely Republican.

Lausche, a Democrat, won the governorship, but he was known for his admiration for Taft and his coolness to the unions and Fair Dealers. Half the state officers elected were Republicans, and this party won overwhelming majorities in both houses of the Ohio legislature, taking at least 27 seats out of 33 in the Senate and at least 96 out of 135 in the Assembly.

Another factor was the press. Virtually every daily paper in the state was for Taft, and they poured on the propaganda for their man. They boosted Taft as a real leader, a man of integrity, a great thinker and planner, vitally needed in this hour of national crisis. And of course they had no trouble depicting Ferguson as the little man he was. These papers made a big issue about the labor forces taking over Ferguson's campaign, and claiming that the union "dictators" were trying to force their members to vote against Taft against their will.

This scare campaign against "union boss" domination served to bring out a very high vote in the middle- and upper-class dis-

tricts. There is no doubt either that Ohio's large farm population, normally Republican, really turned out in volume to help Taft.

WHAT NEXT?

An added factor which might have had some effect was the introduction of the office-type ballot for the first time in Ohio. This ballot lists candidates by office, in irregular party order, and thus prevents easy straight-slate voting. This encouragement to vote split tickets might have strengthened Taft's chances among many who would otherwise have voted straight Democratic.

For whatever reason, it is apparent that all working people did not vote against Taft. Cuyahoga County, containing Cleveland and its suburbs, certainly a heavily industrialized and unionized area, gave Taft 20,000 votes over his rival. Practically all other counties in the state favored Taft, with the exception of the coal-mining areas. The Taft-Hartley Law was probably responsible for this.

Now that the election is over, what next? The top officials of the United Labor League have no explanation, other than that they were out-voted. They say, now at least, that they do not intend to break up their political merger, and as a matter of fact, have already declared their goal for 1952 as the defeat of Ohio's second reactionary senator, John W. Bricker. Up to the present they have the same negative approach on how to do this.

The failure to lick Taft is bound to have some reaction. To some it will indicate the error of labor's entry into the political field. Others, we hope, will see instead that the error was not in going into politics but in servile support to old parties and old-party politicians. Now is the time to start talking of the need for an independent labor candidate against Bricker in '52, to give the workers a candidate of their own, a program of their own, and to turn the United Labor League into an independent Labor Party.

The ISL Program in Brief

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

INTERESTED?

Get acquainted with the Independent Socialist League—

4 Court Square Long Island City 1 New York

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

I want to join the ISL.

Name _____ Address _____ City _____ Zone _____ State _____ Tel. _____

YOU and SCIENCE

Senator McCarthy Moves into the Labs

By CARL DARTON

The McCarran Act of 1950 is now law, the Subversive Activities Control Board has been named, and the last day for "Communist" and "Communist Front" organizations to register voluntarily has passed. Since no organization has stepped forward to put its head on the block, the next step is up to the Justice Department which is to cite certain groups to the board.

It is unlikely that any scientific organization will be placed in the dock but scientists should bear in mind that Republican Senator Joseph McCarthy recently branded the Inland Association for the Advancement of Science as an "unorganized, apathetic, and indifferent" group dominated by "a small clique" of Communist fellow travelers, and also characterized the Federation of American Scientists as an "organization heavily infiltrated with Communist fellow travelers."

The act provides that hearings will be held to permit the accused organizations the right of trial before they are reported subversive. Whether such proceedings will include a fair hearing or be a witch-hunt and a farce remains to be seen. Certainly the government's record in administering security clearances and loyalty hearings, particularly in connection with the attorney general's notorious blacklist, gives little hope for fair treatment.

The importance of fair legal procedures in such loyalty and subversive investigations is stressed in Walter Gellhorn's *Security, Loyalty, and Science*, reviewed in this column on October 23. He warns that a mockery can be made of democracy. Indeed, the type of justice which can be expected in Washington today is indicated in the "off the record" comment of one official who is quoted by Gellhorn as saying: "It is far better that nine innocent men should suffer than one guilty man remain unconvicted."

A review of the government's past doubtful legal procedures, as outlined by such a legal authority as Gellhorn, is of interest. Where hearings have been permitted on "loyalty" cases in the past the defendant has been put to every disadvantage, often not even being given advance notice of the exact charges. As Gellhorn says: "It is vain to give a man his day in court if he has no opportunity to prepare for it. To commence a trial without first giving reasonably precise information concerning the matter that is to be heard is to mock the 'due process of law' which tradition and constitution alike demand in this country."

Furthermore, charges are often so vague and broad as to be meaningless. Many times no evidence is produced and in fact the charges often are the only "evidence."

"Fact-Finding" on a Scientist

Trial by hearsay and gossip has again been introduced in American justice. One of the most effective instruments in ensuring justice is the procedure of confrontation, cross-examination and rebuttal. This is impossible when charges rest upon the unrevealed testimony of undisclosed informants. Another traditional guarantee of justice is that not only the findings and decisions but also the reasons for the conclusions be written. But the "fact finders" in loyalty and personnel security proceedings have failed, almost uniformly, to make their findings known and have failed to prepare opinions which illuminate the decision. Actually the Loyalty Review Board has forbidden the preparation of findings and explanations.

The case of one nuclear scientist before the Security Review Board of the Atomic Energy Commission is of extreme interest. As reviewed by Gellhorn, the original charges were that the scientist had read left-wing publications and that certain of his relatives by marriage had been reported to be Communist sympathizers. During the hearing the defendant's opinions on the following matters were investigated:

- (1) The cooperative movement and state ownership of property. (2) The capitalistic form of enterprise in the United States. (3) The efficiency of the Truman administration. (4) Racial injustice. (5) His father's participation in labor-union affairs.

The formal charges against the scientist were almost neglected. The Gellhorn book has bred new evidence to support its own thesis. Editorial comment on *Security, Loyalty, and Science* in the October 24 issue of the F. A. S. Newsletter refers again to the infamous Senator Joe: "McCarthy regards the book as confirming all his previous fears about Communist infiltration of the scientific fraternity in the face of incredible naïveté on the part of leaders of American science. He dismisses Prof. Gellhorn as a 'well-known enemy of the House Committee on Un-American Activities.'"

In the atmosphere of Washington today, where the talk of fighting totalitarianism abroad leads to its increase at home, the workers need to be wary and on guard against curtailment of their democratic rights. Above all they should realize that for their own interests they cannot be aloof to the apparent academic problems of the scientists, not even to the question of the legal rights of the Stalinists.



LABOR ACTION

Independent Socialist Weekly

Vol. 14, No. 47 November 20, 1950

Published weekly by the Labor Action Publishing Company, 114 West 14 Street, New York City 11, N. Y. GENERAL EDITORIAL AND BUSINESS OFFICES: 4 Court Square, Long Island City 1, N. Y. Telephone: IRonsides 6-5117. Subscription rate: \$2.00 a year; \$1.00 for six months. (\$2.25 and \$1.15 for Canada and Foreign). Re-entered as second-class matter May 24, 1940, at the Post Office at New York, N. Y., under the act of March 3, 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

"WHY I WON"—"WHY I LOST": Interviews with candidates. (U. S. News and World Report, Nov. 17.)

By telephone and telegraph, the editors of U. S. News asked 200 prominent candidates what factors determined the outcome of their contests. They conclude from the replies that the issues stacked up as follows in importance, as seen through the eyes of the candidates themselves:

- (1) "Coddling of Communists" by the administration. (2) Administration foreign policy. (3) The "war and its irritations." (4) Spending and taxes. "Labor-leader interference" and "socialism" got many mentions from the Republicans and figured next.

Taft's reply to the quiz concluded that "I would say that it's a vote of lack of confidence in the administration's foreign policy primarily." Sen-

ator-elect Duff (Rep., Pa.) said: "It was the Korean situation," and put the people's desire for peace in first place. Nixon, who beat Helen Gahagan Douglas in California for the senatorial seat, answered: "I think the major issue in my race was the issue of the administration's foreign policy in the Far East."

One of the Democrats interviewed, Elbert Thomas, who failed of re-election to the Senate in Utah, replied to the question "Was the Korean war an issue?" with: "Only to the extent that the administration had failed completely in a foreign policy and that our boys are fighting in Korea because of the bungling that Truman and the rest had done." Which would seem to be quite an extent.

Dewey pointed to the fact that the AFL and CIO had endorsed his opponent but chortled that "labor was split up all over the lot." See articles in this issue for comment.

WORLD POLITICS

INDIA TODAY UNDER NEHRU'S NATIVE CAPITALISM IN POWER

By JAMES M. FENWICK

Since the end of World War II India has barely met the minimal qualifications of newsworthiness as established by the big press of the United States. That is to say, India has not yet demonstratively become a country in contest between the United States and Russia, as have China, Korea, and Indo-China. Very little news concerning the Indian scene has therefore appeared in the press. Consequently, even the most informed section of the general public is only very vaguely aware of what is occurring there.

The socialist movement also suffers from this ignorance. Fortunately, however, the means are at hand for the overcoming of this disability. We refer to *Janata*, a 16-page weekly tabloid in English put out by the Socialist Party of India. It is certainly the most interesting socialist paper we have seen come out of the colonial world in recent years and, along with the Spanish bi-weekly *La Batalla* [Struggle], organ of the POUUM, and *Vpered* [Forward] the review of the Ukrainian socialist resistance movement, is one of the very few outstanding working-class papers being published anywhere in the world today.

Broadly speaking, the Indian Socialist Party adheres to a Third Camp position and is well to the left of any other socialist party we are acquainted with. Prior to discussing the Indian Socialist Party, however, it seems useful to outline the post-war development of India and the current status of that country, against the background of which the policy of the party can be seen more sharply. Our source, again, is the plentiful and concrete data contained in recent issues of *Janata*.

CONGRESS RENEGED ON PROGRAM

With the liberation of India from England in 1947 the representatives of the native bourgeoisie equipped within the Indian Congress Party took over power.

In order to hold its mass base the Congress had, during the 30's developed a radical program. "It's dominant tone," states a Foreign Policy Report reprinted in *Janata*, "was radical, egalitarian and socialistic. For the peasantry, the Congress demanded sweeping changes in the land system, alleviation of rural unemployment, and rising standards of living.

"In the cities, it called for rapid, broad development of diversified industries. To prevent the emergence of an oligarchy of great wealth it called for public ownership of key industries and services. And to carry through its whole program properly, the Congress advocated comprehensive governmental planning of economic life so as to assure the best allocation of resources for a richer and fuller life for the masses in the New India."

Once in power it did not take long for the Congress Party to reveal its essential character. It is true that, among many other things, it promulgated a relatively democratic constitution, but the aspects of its program which could be designated as socialist, not to speak of many which were simply progressive, were never implemented.

The nationalization program was shelved in April 1948 "by the declaration of the government's new policy which laid down its intention to have a controlled economy or mixed economy, 'in which private enterprise was never to be nationalized for the sake of nationalization.'"

"The peasants," says Indra Sen in a neat summary of the Congress record, "also have a similar tale to tell. No past pledge in regard to them has been kept by the Congress-in-power. The zamindari [landlord system] is not abolished; uneconomic holdings are not exempted from rent or land tax; forced labor still continues; feudal dues and levies have not been stopped; tenures have not been fixed; rural debt has not been liquidated; ejection has not stopped; living wages and suitable working conditions for agricultural workers have not been provided for."

The partition of the country which, in creating Pakistan, it was hoped would dampen communal (religious) strife, has accentuated it. Millions of refugees fan the flames of hatred between Pakistan and India. Trade between the two states has virtually ceased as a consequence of the partition and of the failure of Pakistan to devalue the rupee after India had done so. To the economic stresses thus induced has been added the burden of the war machine established as a result of the Kashmir controversy, which has cost \$500 million up to 1950. The weight of all this falls upon the poor, for the government tax program not unnaturally favors the fabulously rich native capitalist class.

The current statistics speak for themselves: "The cost of living is spiraling up every month. In Bombay, for instance, the working-class cost-of-living index has jumped up from 265 in 1947 to nearly 300 in August 1950." See notes: "The real income of the average peasant has fallen as can be gauged from the results of the enquiry instituted by the U. P. [United Provinces] government. The enquiry revealed that 60 per cent of the village population go with one meal a day for six months in the year." There is starvation in Bihar province and elsewhere in the country. A report by Jayaprakash Narayan, a prominent leader of the Socialist Party, made on the basis of a trip to afflicted areas in Bihar concludes: "Finally, it is a matter of great pity that ministerial pronouncements have so far been extremely light-hearted and complacent."

"Last year industrial production was short by 6 points as compared with the previous year. The production of almost all the consumer goods in the first five months of the year is even lower than in the corresponding period last year." Profits, however, have increased. "Last year, the net profit of 478 concerns, representing coal, cotton textile, engineering, jute textile, sugar, tea and miscellaneous industries showed an increase of 22 per cent over the net profits of 1948." Capital formation, decisive for the development of a country like India, is dragging miserably.

In regard to labor: "A minimum wage has not been fixed. The hours and conditions of work remain what they were before the war. There is no provision for old-age pension or unemployment insurance. The right to strike has been virtually eliminated. The right to unionize is heavily circumscribed by the open and brazen support of the government lent to the INTUC [Indian National Trade Union Congress]."

As a result of the enumerated conditions it is hardly surprising that in spite of all obstacles there have been extensive strikes, student actions, hunger marches, and variously motivated protest demonstrations throughout India, all of which has received the most biggared notice in the metropolitan press of this country.

The boldest of these was an SP-led strike of 225,000 textile workers in Bombay which began in mid-August and was starved out two months later after a magnificent display of solidarity in the face of extreme government brutality. By the end of August over a thousand SP members were in jail throughout India for their activities in the mass movements.

It is the politics of these militants which we shall examine next week.

THE PRO-TITOISM OF THE SOCIALIST LEFT—17

The Drives Behind Tito's 'Decentralization'

By HAL DRAPER

On the relations between the Stalinist state and its own bureaucracy, which has been the subject of the last two articles, one last and very important point remains. This point is also closely bound up with the Titoists' boasts about democratization of the regime via decentralization and workers' councils.

Economically, Titoist "decentralization" has taken the form of decrees putting the industrial complexes under the control of the several governments of the constituent republics rather than under the administration of the central national (federal) apparatus. We discussed this in the February 20 issue of LABOR ACTION and find nothing to add or subtract here.

Politically, the Titoists represent as "decentralization" the assignment of wider powers to the organs of government below the federal level—the governments of the republics (Serbia, Croatia, etc.) and the local People's Committees.

As we shall see, there is a definite and real purpose behind such steps. What is demagogic and phony about them is only this: the accompanying propaganda claim that they have anything to do with democratization.

As a matter of fact, the propaganda claims go further than that. Tito, in one of his most highly publicized speeches of the year, presented his decentralization as heralding the withering away of the Yugoslav state "as an instrument of coercion"! This nonsense is not worth discussing. Neither are the Yugoslav dithyrambs about how the new measures mean the elimination of all "remote control" from the factories. If this means anything at all—and it doesn't—it would mean the end of economic planning.

With regard to both economic and political decentralization, there is only one consideration necessary to puncture the balloon: As long as the political authority—the monolithic-totalitarian control through the Communist Party and the secret police—remains what it is, any technical measures assigning subordinate spheres of authority can only be administrative devices and nothing else. And of such, all the Stalinist states have a plentiful number, all directed at achieving the greatest efficiency within the bureaucratic framework, all designed to exorcize the bureaucratic devil, all inviting greater "initiative" from the masses.

The Fiction of Local Autonomy

The Yugoslav leaders took pains to point out this elementary fact themselves at the very moment of announcing the latest stride toward "democracy" through political decentralization—the law of 1949 assigning wider powers to the Peoples Committees (local governments). This is in the "great document" of Kardelj's entitled *On People's Democracy in Yugoslavia*, dealing with that law.

After all the necessary hosannas to new-type democracy, etc., he stressed:

"In this sense [the principle of unity-of-authority], in our country there is no difference in principle between the central and local political organs. Both are organs of the same authority. . . . Both carry out their tasks on the basis of the same principles within the framework of their competence. . . ." [Page 53.]

And again:

"Since, in our country, all authority, on the central and local levels, is in the hands of the working people, since, therefore, the entire state system is a reflection of people's self-government, no difference in principle can exist between the central and local organs of government. Each organ carries out its respective tasks in the name of the same unified people's authority, and the law fixes their respective power on the basis of democratic centralism. Under our system it is erroneous to make a distinction between the local and central organs of government. . . ." [Page 62.]

No doubt! But if, under the Tito-Stalinist system, "it is erroneous to make a distinction between the local and central organs of government," since both and all organs of this totalitarian government are arms of "the same unified people's authority," how does the transfer of this-or-that jurisdictional competence add or subtract one whit of democracy? Yet somehow the pro-Titoists swallow each and every absurdity handed out via the Tanjug Agency.

The showpiece of Yugoslav "decentralization," in addition to the People's Committee, is the so-called autonomy of the constituent national republics: Serbia, Croatia, Montenegro, Macedonia, Bosnia-Herzegovina and Slovenia. These, to be sure, have their own governmental apparatuses, just as the states of the U. S. have their separate state governments. Compared with a Yugoslav republic, however, an American state is a free-wheeling sovereign body.

The federal constitution leaves few shreds of republican autonomy after Articles 131, 132 and 133 are read:

"In matters within federal competence [which means: everything] the federal government has the right to suspend the acts of the government of a republic and abolish the acts of the ministers of a republic if they are not in conformity with the federal Constitution, the Constitution of the republic, the federal laws, the laws of the republic, the regulations, instructions and orders of the federal government, or the rules, orders and instructions of a member of the federal government. Under the same conditions the members of the federal government have the right to suspend the acts of the ministers of the republic."

One would think that after that, only a paid employee of the Yugoslav press bureau could manage to write about "republican autonomy." But it is not all:

The Socialist Youth League of BERKELEY

AUTUMN CLASS in MARXIST SOCIALISM

Thursday evenings at 8 p.m. 466 Tenth Street, Room 218 (Half block west of Broadway), OAKLAND

Session 6 . . . Nov. 30: Religion and Capitalism Session 7 . . . Dec. 7: The Evolution of Stalinism

"Illegal and irregular acts of People's Committees of lower rank" can be annulled or abolished by any of the higher bodies up to the republic's presidium. Similar acts of the Executive Committees of People's Committees can be annulled by the higher bodies, including any individual minister in the government of a republic. "The Executive Committees of People's Committees of higher rank have the same rights toward Executive Committees of lower rank." Any People's Committee of lower rank or its Executive Committee can be dissolved by a higher-rank People's Committee or by higher bodies up to a republic's presidium, which then can order new elections.

But these constitutional precautions against mavericks—while making perfectly transparent the farce of republican "autonomy"—are, after all, only emergency reserves. The first line of defense in the monolithic state is the all-pervading straitjacket of the ruling party and the all-powerful secret police. The Tito regime could abolish every one of the above constitutional jokers without impairing by one whit the monolithic structure—which does not depend upon any constitutional provision, any more than it does in Russia.

A one-sentence press report over the Belgrade radio speaks louder about the Yugoslav governmental setup than all the provisions of the constitutions plus all the Tanjug handouts:

"SARAJEVO—A four-year administrative secondary school for future members of the People's Committees has been opened by the legislative committee of the Presidium of the Government of the People's Republic of Bosnia-Herzegovina." [February 5.]

The advantages of the Stalinist system are obvious: you can efficiently train a "people's representative" for his duties before he is elected—or even nominated.

"Workers' Control" under Stalinism

What then is the real role—within the framework of Tito-Stalinism—of "decentralization" and similar measures? Administrative efficiency, we said in general. This much is true not only for Yugoslavia but also for the more firmly and longer established Stalinism of Russia. The particular form of the Yugoslav measures is, however, decisively conditioned by a consideration which no longer applies to Russia.

As in the case of so much else, it was pointed out by Trotsky's insight into the workings of Stalinism, in spite of his false "workers' state" theory. Trotsky is writing after Russia's overrunning of Finland at the beginning of the Second World War:

"In the USSR workers' control is a stage long ago completed. From control over the bourgeoisie there they passed to management of nationalized production. From the management of workers—to the command of the bureaucracy. NEW WORKERS' CONTROL WOULD NOT SIGNIFY CONTROL OVER THE BUREAUCRACY. This cannot be established except as the result of a successful uprising against the bureaucracy. In Finland, workers' control still signifies nothing more than crowding out the native bourgeoisie, whose place the bureaucracy proposes to take. Furthermore, one should not think that the Kremlin is so stupid as to attempt ruling eastern Poland or Finland by means of imported commissars. OF GREATEST URGENCY TO THE KREMLIN IS THE EXTRACTION OF A NEW ADMINISTRATIVE APPARATUS FROM AMONG THE TOILING POPULATION OF THE OCCUPIED AREAS. This task can be solved only in several stages. THE FIRST STAGE IS THE PEASANT COMMITTEES OF WORKERS' CONTROL." [In Defense of Marxism, page 136. My emphasis.]

"The extraction of a new administrative apparatus from among the toiling population"—this is an urgent problem of the Tito regime, a hundred times more urgent than it was for the Kremlin in the case Trotsky is discussing above. All the differences between the two cases merely underline this.

Tito's Desperate Urgency

For Stalin to attempt to rule one of his satrapies "by means of imported commissars" would be, in Trotsky's opinion, "stupid." He is perfectly right, of course—provided Stalin has an alternative to doing so at any given time and place. The fact is, however, that the satellite states are crawling with imported commissars today—Marshal Rokossovsky, the Kremlin's gift to Poland, at their head. It is not Stalin's stupidity which has made this necessary. But Trotsky is still essentially correct on the point even today: one of the important tasks of the imported commissars is precisely to "extract a new administrative apparatus from among the toiling population."

A hundred times more so for Tito—who cannot even temporarily fill in with "imported commissars" as a stand-by for a native bureaucracy.

To see how Stalinism today bends its efforts to extract its new bureaucracy from among workers' elements, we recommend to our readers the illuminating articles by Benno Sarel on Eastern Germany today, in recent issues of LABOR ACTION. All of the new Stalinist states face the problem, but in none of them does the problem have the desperate urgency that it has in the Stalinist state which has broken with Moscow domination, Yugoslavia.

We cannot therefore simply EQUATE the present-day developments in Yugoslavia with developments in the Moscow-Stalinist world, as we have pointed out before: this would in fact miss the whole point of the specific drives of NATIONAL-Stalinism. It would, indeed, be the simple opposite of pro-Titoism, which converts these specific features into a "break with Stalinism."

To drive behind the Yugoslav regime's need to extract a new bureaucratic apparatus out of the toiling population exists simply because the regime is new, in the first place, and in the second place because the regime has broken with Moscow. (This second consideration subdivides, in turn, into two parts: it means that Belgrade cannot use imported commissars as pinch-hitters, and it means that it needs an especially reliable cadre of bureaucrats who will be unsusceptible to Cominform pressure.)

In addition, the need is exacerbated by two other factors: (3) The backwardness and low cultural level of the country as a whole, which means that potential administrators have a much greater distance through which they have to be "extracted"; and (4) the fact that Tito's present cadre is loaded with unsavory, corrupt, opportunist (even from Tito's view), careerist and generally suspect elements of every description—the best proof of this being Tito's speech to the Third Congress of the People's Front on April 9, 1949.

All that we have been discussing in this and the last two articles is what lies behind the creation of the "workers' councils" in Titoland.

(Next week: Tito's Workers' Councils.)

LATIN AMERICA

Brazil's Ex-Dictator Comes Back to Power —

Vargas' Victory Is Loaded with Dynamite!

By V. F. MADEIRA

RIO DE JANEIRO, October—The Brazilian general election, held on October 3, brought overwhelming victory to the movement led by ex-dictator Getulio Vargas, who won the presidency of the republic.

Vargas' party, demagogically called the "Labor Party," will also have a large majority in the federal Congress as well as in the state and city legislatures of the big cities. The state governors were, most of them, elected with Vargas' support and those who were not backed by him belong to the same government party—that is, they formed the right wing of the Vargas dictatorship (1937-1945) and will tend to unite with him.

In present-day Brazilian politics, it is important to understand that large sections of the masses, especially in the industrial areas, have passed beyond the traditional bourgeois political framework in their development; but their ideological development is very low and they are completely unorganized. They simply expect that a vote for Vargas, the "Father of the Poor," will give them higher wages and lower prices.

This is so because most of the industrial working class developed during the period of Vargas' dictatorship, with its socialist demagoguery. Although Vargas destroyed the independent political and trade-union organizations of the workers, his regime produced a series of "social laws." The sound parts of these laws were the achievement of the labor movement, which Vargas destroyed. The rest was a mere translation into Portuguese of Mussolini's "Charter of Labor."

BROKE PRECEDENT

Vargas' brand of "laborism" also won the support of some sectors of the industrial bourgeoisie, as well as of some plebeian elements who had participated in the state apparatus of his dictatorship, and all sorts of petty-

bourgeois adventures who wanted to win a seat in the Congress by attaching themselves to Vargas' bandwagon.

The conservative forces and Brazil's ruling classes failed to present a united front before the Vargas movement; it was split between Eduardo Gomes of the "Democratic Union" and Cristiano Machado, the official candidate put forward by the Dutra government.

Vargas' victory means that, for the first time in Brazil, an opposition candidate has defeated one sponsored by the government at the national level, even though it is a Brazilian proverb that "the government never loses an election." Although they did not understand that Vargas may be worse for them even than his rivals, the workers felt that they could not vote for openly conservative politicians or the impotent liberals.

They voted against the government, against most of the state camorillas, against low wages and high prices, against the generals who opposed Vargas' return to power, against the employers who spent millions on behalf of Macha-

do, against the church which had condemned Vargas' vice-presidential candidate.

Nevertheless, it is certain that Vargas will make his peace with the conservative forces and regroup them behind him, and that the people will break with Vargasism, moving to the left.

DISILLUSIONMENT AHEAD

Conditions do not give Vargas room for an industrialization drive, social-demagogical concessions or nationalist opposition to U. S. imperialism—the policies which could maintain his prestige with the masses, but which would raise a strong rightist opposition and lead Brazilian economy into a crisis.

There are increasing signs of Vargas' change of front. His supporting press already openly bore the burden of the high prices, the post-war crisis, inflation and the U. S. policy of exploitation. The wartime prosperity during his previous regime, industrialization, and his "social" program were all chalked up for Vargas.

The repercussions of Vargas' victory not only in Brazil but also in all of Latin America will perhaps be greater than Washington thinks. Vargas and Argentina's dictator Peron will form a solid bloc in South America which will be able to attract all the other countries and impose its line on all sections.

The second result will be the strengthening of the Peron regime in Argentina, which has been tottering and has been in hot water with growing opposition from both labor and the

Vargas-Peron Axis Looms in S. A. Profiting by 'Anti-Yankee' Feeling

By JUAN REY

SANTIAGO, October—With the election of Vargas to the presidency, the Brazilian masses openly repudiated not only the official candidate of the Dutra government, Cristiano Machado, but also the representative of the National Democratic Union, Gomes, who likes to call himself the "candidate of democracy." The reason is that the people considered both Machado and Gomes as in the same political camp. In reality, Dutra could not have governed without the political support of the NDU, of Gomes, who was in opposition only in words.

The whole weight of the Dutra government could not down Vargas, with his demagogic "labor" program, his slogan of industrialization, his "opposition" to imperialism. The industrial bourgeoisie, the large

bourgeoisie. Now Peron acquires a powerful friend and can hope for a bit more tranquility at home, while preparing for expansion into the neighboring countries, especially into Bolivia, Paraguay and Chile. The Argentine opposition has been set back more in Rio de Janeiro than in Buenos Aires.

VARGAS-PERON AXIS

Thus there has been established a rather strong center of political reaction in South America, based on the two most powerful countries. This concentration has no center of attraction such as Nazi Germany constituted—or such as Russia could constitute, since the dictators know very well how risky it would be to bet on Stalin's horse. But even so, with their own forces alone, they could give a lot of trouble to the State Department and the big

(Continued on next page)

Socialism and Stalinism in Brazil

By V. F. MADEIRA

RIO DE JANEIRO, October—In the recent election in Brazil, the left wing of the Brazilian Socialist Party was successful in forcing the party to put up a candidate of its own. The special convention of the party, held June 28-30, launched the candidacy of Joao Mangabeira, the party's president, as the standard bearer of socialist independence.

But the SP's leadership and right wing succeeded in hampering the socialist campaign. First, they did not follow the policy laid down by the convention, limiting the socialist presidential campaign to a platonic protest against the agreement between the "liberal" candidate Gomes and the Integralistas (Brazilian fascists).

The socialist candidate did not even make a political tour through the country and did not speak in a single public meeting. The right-wingers preferred political suicide for fear that the party might get out of its groove and give birth to a real mass movement. They did not even issue the central organ of the party, for fear that it might fall into the hands of "Trotskyists." [This refers to the former Vanguardia Socialista group, which has broken with the Fourth International Trotskyists—Ed.] They said not a single word about the Stalinists' trend toward insurrection, because many a "socialist" expected that the outlawed Stalinists would vote SP.

All the socialist publications issued during the campaign were put out by sections of groups of the party, like the newspaper Folha Socialista. As a result, the SP was unable to elect a single representative to Congress.

CP MOVES TO PUTSCH
Given inevitable disillusionment with Vargas among the masses, and in view of the manifold weaknesses of the Socialist Party, it is unfortunately true that the Stalinists are likely to be the heirs. Luis Carlos Prestes, the Stalinist leader, is nearly as popular as Vargas himself.

The Brazilian CP used to be the strongest CP in South America. Although its membership has greatly declined, it is still very active; and the slime of Brazilian politics provide good opportunities for the Stalinists. Besides, although the CP is outlawed, it

like very much to make a dent on U. S. interests in that era. The semi-colonial conditions which prevail there give them excellent opportunities.

In 1935 the Stalinist uprising which set the stage for the Vargas dictatorship dominated the town of Natal for a few days; quite near to Natal is the big Parnamirim airport which the U. S. built in the last war. Three months ago, a member of the CP central committee was arrested at Recife (the main city in the area) where he was organizing Stalinist work among the troops stationed there.

The CP denounced the October 3 election as "a farce to legalize fascism" and ordered its followers not to vote for any candidate for president. But, with the exception of the party members, its followers voted almost en bloc for Vargas. In the eyes of the Stalinist leadership, Vargas' victory plays right into their hands.

But the votes pulled by the Stalinists show that their influence has greatly declined. They expect to profit by the workers' coming disgust with Vargas; but if they try to pull off an uprising as they did in 1935, its consequence would only be to install

the fiercest reaction.

The situation in Brazil should be of the greatest interest to international observers. The Brazilian masses are living through a great experience, having broken with the old controls. In this country which is the key to America's rear, the outlook is for greater and greater ferment. Many dangers threaten the future of the Brazilian working class and its civil liberties. But if it breaks with Vargasism and avoids capture by the Stalinists, a great perspective opens up before the socialist working-class movement of South America.

Left Socialism in the Brazilian SP

By JUAN REY

SANTIAGO, October—There are two forces in the working class of Brazil: Stalinism and socialism.

Brazilian Stalinism is the strongest in all South America. Its leader, Prestes, is swimming in clouds of glory and legend created by the propaganda of the Comintern. He has considerable popular support, is audacious and daring, and capable of any adventure which Moscow might order.

The Kremlin looks on Brazil as the China of South America, and if it had an opportunity to create a diversion in the rear of the U. S. it would undoubtedly launch it in Brazil. The Brazilian Stalinists are capable of any coup if ordered to make one, being much stronger and bolder than their Chilean, Argentine or Bolivian counterparts.

In the recent election Prestes broke his alliance with Vargas and ordered his followers to vote blank. It seems that Vargas does not want to come before the bourgeoisie with Stalinist support; and, for his part, Prestes has gotten orders from Moscow for "a large-scale left offensive" and has agreed to prepare for it.

LEFT WING WON

Outside the Stalinists, there has been a real flowering of the independent left and the Brazilian Socialist Party, whose main center is in San Paulo, the main industrial city. It is made up of

reactionary position of Gomes and his alliance with the Integralista fascists.

This decision by the SP was important because it made possible an independent working-class political campaign in opposition to the whole bourgeoisie. Inside the SP two tendencies are in conflict: the petty-bourgeois reformists and the revolutionary-socialist left. The decision for the independent candidacy represented the victory of the left, mainly represented by the ex-Vanguardia Socialista group.

Certainly this group is right now the most noteworthy in the Brazilian working-class movement. It left the Fourth International in disagreement with the latter's outworn theory and politics, and for some years maintained its own weekly organ Vanguardia Socialista, under the editorship of Comrade Pedrosa, its political leader.

The SP surprised the country by running its own candidate in the election, Joao Mangabeira, thereby showing the workers that it is as necessary to break with the "democratic" bourgeoisie as with Stalinism, and to carry on an independent working-class policy. The democratic-left group supported Gomes as against Vargas but then decided for an independent policy in view of the

(Continued on next page)

Wallace: New Role as Judas Goat

By L. G. SMITH

Henry Wallace has hit the headlines once more. But this time he does not appear as an apostle of "peace," or to describe his former role more accurately, of appeasement. Now Wallace is demanding that the United States rearm quickly, in fact "as fast as possible," and that the militarization of the country proceed until such time as the Stalinist governments of Russia and China give "concrete evidence" that they are interested in a specific program for peace.

Today Wallace heads no political movement. He has no organized following. Yet the daily press gives his statement front-page coverage for a reason which should be pretty obvious. At one time he was the Judas goat who led a considerable group of liberals and progressives into the political embrace of the Stalinists. Today the pro-war newspapers play up his statements because they hope that he will be equally successful in influencing the same type of people in favor of the armament race and the war which it is designed to prepare.

Wallace's views have importance only because at every stage of his hectic political acrobatics he has, in fact, expressed the sentiments of a more or less broad group of American liberals. When he was the symbol of the Progressive Party his ideas were vague and muddled. Today they are vague and muddled today. But so are the ideas of this whole stratum of liberal and progressive people from all walks of life who feel trapped in the remorseless development of the cold war, who seek a way out of it, but who are unwilling to break from the fatal idea that a road out can be found through support for one of the two tremendously powerful political-military blocs dominated by the United States and Russia.

Any appeal to the sentiments of the liberals, whether they be of the pro-Stalinist or pro-State Department variety, must, to be successful, contain a grain of social truth in it. When Wallace was playing the Stalinists' game, the grain of truth lay in his denunciations of the direction, motives and consequences of United States policy. The distortion lay in whitewashing Russian policy, and in a complete failure to analyze the social roots of the policies of the ruling classes of both blocs.

GRAINS OF TRUTH
Today the grain of truth lies in his denunciation of the imperialist policies of the masters of the Kremlin. It lies, further, in his insistence on an "economic, psychological and political" policy by the United States which can win the peoples of Asia and Europe to its side and thus make a "war with guns and bombs . . . eventually pass."

In the meantime, said Wallace in his recent statement, the United States will have to arm to "protect ourselves and our allies. But in so doing we must pursue a rounded program and be sure that emphasis on military strength does not mean defeat in the field of economics and ideas."

Such a program would involve "a real job of rehabilitating Korea, not for an outmoded regime but for the people of Korea, North and South. . . . Unless we spend as many billions for helping the people of Indo-China as we do on arms to blow up the towns of Indo-China, we shall certainly lose in the long run. The fatal flaw in the Truman Doctrine is that the USSR can usually maneuver to make it appear that we are using our arms on behalf of colonial powers, kings, landlords or money lords to oppress the people and stop the inevitable course of progress."

Here, in Wallace's typical "liberal" doubletalk is given the program—or more accurately, the line of wishful thinking—which has attractive power for the liberals. It is, essentially, a program of having your cake and eating it too. It ignores the hard reality that a vast military program is incompatible with an equally vast social program, and that the first inevitably takes priority over the second.

RUIN, THEN RULE
It ignores the fact, further, that people whose homes and loved ones have been destroyed by American arms, whether they be held by Americans or by the French Foreign Legion or by the soldiers of a Rhee or a Bao Dai, are not likely to become fervent supporters of their destroyers even if these promise to spend an "equal amount of money" to bring things back to where they were before the destruction.

But the false idea which is the center of all these illusions does not lie primarily in a misunderstanding of the social forces and thoughts which move the peoples of Asia. It lies in the complete failure to understand the dominating political and social realities in America itself.

When Wallace was a Stalinoid he blamed the catastrophic road of American foreign policy on certain vicious people in the State Department, and the "reactionaries" in general. Both he and the liberals of Stalinist and anti-Stalinist leanings fail to understand that no American government which bases itself on the capitalist system at home, and therefore sees as its mission the preservation of the capitalist system throughout the world, can have a foreign policy which is essentially different from the present one.

All the liberals wish that the State Department would stop supporting the reactionary Rhee and

and more strength every day. From this point of view, the Brazilian election undoubtedly constitutes an "anti-Yankee" anti-imperialist gesture which should not in any way be underestimated.

DISTORTED BLOW
The Vargas-Peron axis will not be able to do away with, or mitigate very much, the economic exploitation of South America, for this cannot be done under the regime of monopoly capitalism. But it can impose its conditions, it can ask a higher price for its service, it can demand loans on more convenient terms — in a word, it can do something to "organize" the exploitation of the South American peoples and insist on certain conditions. The international situation, centering around the U. S.-Russian cold war, favors it. The U. S. bourgeoisie, rich and powerful though it is, will have to loosen up a bit.

While, economically, the South American axis will possibly mean an advance for these countries from the point of view of a limited industrialization based on U. S. loans and the conjuncture of the third world war, politically the Bonapartist regimes have to restrain political and social development, straitjacketing it with its paternal police-tutelage and holding back its socialist awakening.

For this reason and the others we have given, revolutionary socialists have no reason to rejoice over Vargas' victory, even though to a certain degree it will interfere with imperialist activities in South America.

But it is still true that the Brazilian election represented a strong blow against Yankee imperialism on this continent, albeit in distorted form, proof that the Latin American people are on the march toward their emancipation, which can be really attained only in a world socialist society.

Independent socialists all over the world should applaud them for this and give all moral support to this most advanced section of the Brazilian working class and intelligentists.

Vargas-Peron Axis Looms in S. A. — Liberal Party —

(Continued from page 6)

run their own candidate on a forthright program, they would have taken a mighty step forward in building their own party and in organizing labor's independent political strength. A continuation of their present policy, a string to the Democratic kite, can only succeed in unraveling their forces still further and leading to further demoralization. If nothing more, this miserable showing of the Liberals will raise serious doubts about the party policy and lead to healthy questioning. Such practical politics can be the death of the Liberal Party—even as a bargaining agency.

Dr. NESSON, Dentist has moved to 95 Lexington Avenue (betw. 26th and 27th Sts.) Phone: MUrrayhill 5-3350

Left Socialism in SP —

(Continued from page 6)

constant discussion in its pages assured it a lively ideological life and awakened the interest of its readers.

Vanguardia published the important theoretical documents of Marxism, perhaps for the first time in Portuguese; translated the most important articles from the working-class press and of the Marxist publications of the U. S., England, France and Spain. It published many articles from the Independent Socialist League.

AGAINST THE CURRENT

The consistent work of Vanguardia over many years was not in vain nor was it merely "plowing the sea." It is an important earnest of a solid ideological foundation for Brazilian labor on the march. It sowed fertile and virgin ground which will produce a rich harvest some day — not a very distant one. The Vanguardia group dissolved their own organization and periodical,

(Continued on next page)

Symbol

In May 1949 Secretary of State Acheson explained in a press conference why the U. S. would insist on retaining the anti-Franco stand by the UN. He argued then that the UN resolution was important not for what it accomplished but for what it symbolized—condemnation of the fascists' destruction of human rights. A vote to rescind the resolution, he said, would also be a symbol—a symbol of the fact that after all we don't care much about these rights."

Now the ban on Franco Spain in the UN has been rescinded. It is still a symbol.

mount as part of the psychological preparation for the war, the more timid the liberals become in voicing their criticisms of the trend of government policy.

The fact that Wallace has now just about completely reversed his field is not very important. Like the host of liberals who think like him, he is doomed to run back and forth within an ever-narrowing field of social illusions, which can end only in unconditional support of one side in World War III.

The way out of this political trap lies in a fairly simple idea. Before the United States can support socially progressive classes in other countries, a socially progressive class must have control of the government here.

It is to this end that independent socialists urge the formation of a labor party in the United States: to organize the working people for the purpose of winning political power. Once the American government represents the working people of this country, it will be able to support the working people of other countries in their struggle both against their present reactionary ruling classes and against the Stalinists who seek to rule over them.

REVERSING THE FIELD
As long as they do this, the government and the daily press and the "money lords" have little to complain of. The support of the war is the main thing; the plea for a humanitarian or "progressive" foreign policy can easily be drowned in waves of anti-red hysteria. The higher these waves

(Continued from page 3)

Liberal Party —

(Continued from page 3)

run their own candidate on a forthright program, they would have taken a mighty step forward in building their own party and in organizing labor's independent political strength. A continuation of their present policy, a string to the Democratic kite, can only succeed in unraveling their forces still further and leading to further demoralization. If nothing more, this miserable showing of the Liberals will raise serious doubts about the party policy and lead to healthy questioning. Such practical politics can be the death of the Liberal Party—even as a bargaining agency.

Dr. NESSON, Dentist has moved to 95 Lexington Avenue (betw. 26th and 27th Sts.) Phone: MUrrayhill 5-3350

HANDY WAY TO SUBSCRIBE



LABOR ACTION

The Independent Socialist Weekly

4 Court Square, Long Island City 1, N. Y.

Please enter my subscription: NEW RENEWAL
 Six months (26 issues) at \$1.00
 One year (52 issues) at \$2.00

NAME (PLEASE PRINT)

ADDRESS APT.....

CITY ZONE STATE

Bill me Payment encl. (stamps, currency or postal note)

Foreign Policy and the Elections: GOP May Nail U. S. Coffin in Orient

By ABEL BAKER

Never before has Asia played so large a role in a national U. S. election. There can be no doubt that the consistent disasters suffered by Washington's policy in Asia were of major importance to the outcome on November 7.

The Republicans made Far Eastern policy their major difference on foreign policy with the administration. They bothered with Europe only on the side, if at all. How is it that the Republicans succeeded with this issue?

Never has an American foreign policy suffered such blows. Since the last national election in 1948 the U. S. has been virtually routed from the Asiatic continent. In place of U. S. financed Chiang Kai-shek, power in China is in the hands of Mao Tse-tung and through him in the hands of the Kremlin. China, the heart of the continent, has gone over to the camp of America's enemy.

Attempting to salvage what little he could, Acheson adopted the policy of "waiting till the dust settles" and meanwhile "hands off." Acheson and Truman announced they had no interest in Korea or Formosa from the standpoint of U. S. strategic needs. When Stalinism ruthlessly invaded South Korea, in a matter of hours this carefully elaborated policy was thrown out of the window. Korea became a decisive test for the U. S. in Asia.

The 7th Fleet took up the defense of Formosa against Stalinist China. But the U. S. had not prepared for a Korean war. Its puppet was defeated ignominiously. American soldiers were thrown into death traps to save time for the new policy, in which Korea — yesterday strategically useless and militarily indefensible — became the very keystone to U. S. power.

NO BRIGHTER IN SOUTHEAST
Since the previous "watchful waiting" approach had been intended to mollify Peiping, the new aggressive military interventionist policy which the Korean war inaugurated outraged Peiping and pushed it decisively into the Russian camp. And on the very eve of the election, the U. S. was confronted with the possibility of war with Stalinist China. Truman and Acheson had thus led the U. S. from political defeat to military adventure to the brink of world war.

Having rescued its military fortunes in Korea it is face to face with these disastrous dilemmas: (1) Fight Mao or make a deal with Mao? (2) On the political front, maintain a military government in Korea indefinitely or hand the power back to Rhee, who is in large measure responsible for the present chaos? The UN is not a third alternative but simply the means through which these possibilities can be effected.

If we turn to Southeast Asia the picture is not any prettier.

During the last two years the U. S. supported French imperialism in Viet-Nam, but it did so with reluctance, constantly pressuring Paris to yield some of its colonial powers to Bao Dai so that the puppet could look more substantial. In April 1950 this policy was thrown overboard. Acheson announced from Paris that the U. S. would send direct and large-scale military aid to the French to prosecute "the dirty war."

Shortly thereafter a general strike in Saigon announced that the Viet-Namese people now recognized the U. S. as their enemy equally with France. In recent months, with U. S. material pouring into the country, the French have been driven out of most of the Chinese border region and are now threatened in all of Tonkin. What Washington did accomplish in Viet-Nam is very clear: it forced Ho Chi Minh further into the Stalinist camp so

he formed an alliance with Mao.

In the Philippines, the display-window of U. S. policy toward backward areas, the Bell report, issued a week before election day, announced that the U. S.-supported Quirino regime was fatally corrupt, heading for financial bankruptcy and needed American receivership to be rescued.

The key to Southeast Asia, India, remains decisively uncommitted. On the Korean question, Nehru distinguished himself: India may be oriented toward the U. S.-British bloc but it remains an uncertain and neutral factor. Washington cannot count on Nehru. On the contrary, the latter has on several occasions administered some sharp rebukes to the West.

Only in Japan has the U. S. established a base of power. But this did not help Truman since General MacArthur is the "shogun" there. Japan under the occupation does not pull its weight in Asia, politically speaking. To the Asiatics it remains suspect — for its past imperialism and for its present subservience to MacArthur. Politically Japan is a liability in Asia.

Few democratic governments could retain power after such a rollcall of defeats. Yet it is not the defeats alone which are responsible for the repudiation of Washington's Far Eastern policy in

the elections. It runs much deeper.

Washington has tried many different policies there. In China it supported Chiang but urged reform. In Korea it supported Rhee but actually tried to take steps to institute land reform, giving land to the peasants. In the Philippines it laid out detailed technical aid program for urban industrial reconstruction, irrigation and reclamation works, and granted formal independence. In India U. S. engineers are constructing a huge hydroelectric and irrigation system in one area. In Viet-Nam, for years, U. S. pressed for greater independence. In Indonesia, after much procrastination the U. S. forced the Dutch to come to terms with the republic and grant political independence. In China General Marshall tried to build up a third liberal group against Chiang.

AND THE GOP?

In other words, Washington has not SIMPLY supported reaction everywhere. It has tried many things, including pouring in large sums of money (three and a half billion in China, two billion into the Philippines, a half billion into Korea), technical aid, land reform, political reform, direct and indirect intervention and non-intervention.

All ended the same way: all

Labor in the Election --

(Continued from page 1)

vote according to their own convictions and ignore the demands of the labor hierarchy. That decision may have marked the end of a political epoch. The result was not a victory for partisan politics. It was a defeat for labor politicians. It was a devastating defeat for creeping socialism. . . . The main interests of union members are better wages, better working conditions and maximum practical job security."

"END OF AN EPOCH"

There is no doubt whatever that the workers are interested in the latter, but they are beginning to understand that these things are completely related to politics, for they have learned to their bitter sorrow that whatever gains they may work in that direction can be easily nullified politically by the actions of Congress.

Participation in politics is a necessity for the labor movement. The question is, in what way and for what objectives? We hope, too, that this campaign marks "the end of an epoch," but not the kind envisaged by the Scripps-Howard Press, which advocates the retreat of labor from politics. We want to see labor participate in politics independently and through its own party and program, in order to avoid dirtying its hands as it did in this campaign.

What did labor do in this election campaign? Why didn't the organized workers follow the lead of the leadership? Because it participated, for the most part, in Democratic Party politics, supporting the program and candidates selected by the administration and the party machines. As a result it offered no alternative to millions of dissatisfied voters who cast their votes in all directions to express their discontent with things as they are. Let us look at the record.

The AFL and CIO were determined to defeat Taft in Ohio. From the very beginning they ran into collision with the Democratic bosses in Washington and Ohio. The big Democratic bosses wanted Taft elected on the pre-

mise that he would then become the GOP presidential candidate in 1952 and would make a more beatable opponent than any other GOP aspirant. Within the state, no leading democrat would run against Taft.

After months of bickering, a political zero, State Auditor Joe Ferguson, was selected. The man could hardly make a speech. He had no program; he promised everything to everybody, and he impressed thousands of voters, workers included, that he was a simple windbag. Moreover, the leading Ohio Democrat, Governor Lausche, would not campaign for Ferguson. As a result the campaign had to be carried on and financed in large part by the AFL and CIO.

With a wonderful opportunity to defeat the conservative spokesman of big business and the co-author of the Taft-Hartley Act, the labor leadership engaged in a miserable, filthy campaign at the low level of capitalist politics. Any wonder then, that Taft swept the election with the greatest plurality he had ever had?

GOMPERS' POINT

And was that all? In Maryland, where Senator Tydings was defeated by the unknown Butler, who ran in his first political campaign, the labor movement supported Butler, who was also the candidate of big business, Senator McCarthy and Fulton Lewis, the bumbling radio mouthpiece for the NAM.

In Nevada, labor supported, of all people, Senator Pat McCarran, author of the vicious McCarran Law. It campaigned for such "labor stalwarts" as Russell Long in Louisiana, Scott Lucas in Illinois, and Olin Johnston in South Carolina.

The height of something or other, or the depth if you will, was the meeting called in Chicago by the AFL's Labor League for Political Education in support of the notorious "richest cop in the world," Captain Dan Gilbert. He whom everyone but the Cook County Democratic machine scorned was embraced by AFL leaders!

It should be more than abun-

dered while supporting reactionary regimes.

The American people may not be aware of these details but they do sense the frustration and helplessness in Washington with regard to Asia. It was this mood which the Republicans were able to exploit—the sense that the administration had tried everything and that everything had failed. Asia was lost because somehow, no matter what American capitalism did in Asia, it seemed to have little relevance to the problems facing the Asiatics. All the varied efforts struck no responsive chord anywhere. This blind alley is palpably real.

The Republican answer to these problems is that all these different efforts were really "coddling communism." The Republican alternative is a simple military approach, a policy which is focused singlemindedly on dragging any unpopular reactionary into the American camp—the MacArthur mentality. Taking advantage of the anxious fears of a people newly launched on the world stage, the Republicans won with their simplistic, nationalistic and military MacArthur approach.

If this is what Asia is to get now in place of the Acheson mixed brew, the outcome is only too certain. America's alienation from Asia will become final.

Stakhanovism

The weekly East Europe (October 19) reports:

"In Poland, with the upward revision of the Six Year Plan targets, all norms (quotas for production per worker) are to be increased for the second time this year. In Czechoslovakia, it has been announced that the impending increase of the norms would not signify lower wages; the workers who will work more will earn more. In Hungary, 'the readjustment of the norms' has resulted in a 15-20 per cent decrease of wages. The Hungarian press is complaining that the workers refuse to overfulfill the norm because they fear that it will be raised again. . . . In Rumania, a nasty trick has been applied—basic wages are paid for the norm plus 10 per cent, bonuses beginning only at 111 per cent."

Business at Work

Behind the full-page newspaper ads for the new "miracle drug" named "Imdrin," advertised to knock out arthritis:

The Federal Trade Commission has charged that the claims for Imdrin are false, because it is only an expensive form of such common pain-killers as aspirin.

In its answer to the FTC, the manufacturer denied that the company had made any claim that the product "is an amazing, sensational new discovery of scientific research," or that it would treat, cure or give immediate relief from arthritis.

At the same time its ads were still appearing: "Sensational new research discovery." "At last the story can be told." Etc.

ter Reuther, president of the UAW, say to fill this void when he journeyed to New York to speak in behalf of the Tammany-Liberal Party candidate for Mayor, Ferdinand Pecora? Nothing!

A real independent political party of labor, with its own program and candidates, would not be a narrow, isolated movement. By its very nature and purpose it would represent the total social interests of the overwhelming majority of the people.

That is the justification for an independent labor party. But it was precisely because the labor movement allied itself with the Democratic Party that it did not have any program that it could call its own, any more than it could call the candidates selected by the party bosses its own, no matter how much they tried to do that.

Without such a participation in politics, the labor officialdom is compelled to participate in a lot of political skulduggery, to become involved in the machine squabbles of the party leaders on state, county and local levels, to be caught up in these aimless and (from the point of view of the mass of people, especially the working class) useless forays.

Thus, the time, energy and finances of the labor movement are wasted in a hopeless participation in capitalist politics. The way out is not Sam Gompers' way of choosing "labor's friends," not by abstention from politics, not by avoiding the great political issues of our times.

No, the way out is by a greater labor participation in politics, but through the road of independent organization, independent candidates and an independent program based upon the needs of the working class, the middle class and all the social groupings who are at the mercy of monopoly capitalism. In that way, labor, truly the most progressive force in society, could properly assume its leadership of the nation. The first step in that direction is to break with capitalist politics and take the road of independence. This is the lesson of the election campaign.

LABOR HAD NO PROGRAM

There is truth in this. But it is not because labor ran on a narrow program. What the labor movement ran on this year could hardly be called a program. It participated in the campaign on the program of the Democratic Party, adding to it only such things as "defeat Taft."

What alternatives did it offer to the Democratic platform? None! What did it offer in the way of positive additions to that program, or independent of that program? None! What, for example, did Wal-