

# LABOR ACTION

Independent Socialist Weekly

FEBRUARY 5, 1951

FIVE CENTS

**U. S. CRACKS THE WHIP:  
UN JUMPS THROUGH THE HOOP**

... page 3

**A Lesson from Russia's Underground**

... page 6

**Neutralism Spreads in Europe**

... page 3

**W. German Labor Wins a Victory**

... page 7

## Wage Freeze, plus Price Freeze at Highest Level in History, Soaks Labor Both Ways

By BEN HALL

Wall Street reacted promptly to the government freeze of prices and wages this week. Stocks are devoid of all sentimentality and hypocrisy; they remain deaf to appeals of fake liberalism and to every hint of "equality of sacrifice"; they respond only to the hard-boiled economic realities of profitability and to the actual relations between the workers and capitalists.

"Answer to Freeze: Stocks Climb High," reports the New York Times. On Friday, controls were announced. By

late Saturday, stock quotations spurted sharply upward, gaining two to four points and adding over a billion dollars to the value of holdings. On Monday, new rises.

And no wonder! All experience with simultaneous wage and price controls justifies the obvious optimism of the profit-anxious owners.

Government price controls, as during the last war, succeed only in slowing down but not eliminating open and hidden price rises. But wage increases are quickly and easily put under rigid clamps which are eased only slowly and only partially.

It means flexible, easy-going controls over prices. It means harsh controls over wages. It means the disappearance of relatively low-priced "economy" types of goods and their replacement by higher priced semi-"luxury" substitutes. It means a decline in quality, in wearability, a concealed adulteration of commodi-

ties which appear to stay in the same price brackets while their real cost goes sky-high. It means that real prices, in terms of what the buyer gets for a dollar, race upward while wages limp behind.

It means, therefore, a steady and continuous decline in real wages, a decrease in the actual buying power of an hour's labor, of a week's pay. It means, therefore, that the employers as a class squeeze greater and greater profits out of their workers, who labor harder and faster for less and less.

### THE INEVITABLE FORMULA

In hundreds of cases, unions bargaining for increased wages have come to an immediate dead stop. The miners' \$1.60 a day increase is frozen. In all likelihood, it will soon be thawed out, but later.

Meanwhile, prices are still rising while government agencies figure out how to enforce the price controls. But the wage controls are already enforced. Employers cooperate quickly by holding off wage increases.

Such is the inevitable formula. From June 1950 to January 1951 prices rose 12.1 per cent. A wage freeze now will stop millions of workers from making up for this increase. Food prices are not yet under any sort of controls.

Unionists, even those with only a short memory, know what happened during the last war, only a few years ago. They must recall how profits mounted to staggering heights, how prices continued their upward sweep and how wages were held down under the wage-freezing "Little Steel formula." Between 1941 and 1945, the real buying power of auto workers' straight-time hourly earnings dropped more than 6 per cent.

The reply of the labor movement, based upon bitter experience, should unhesitatingly be: Price freeze? Yes! Wage freeze? Absolutely no! But the actions of most of the labor leaders are characterized by cowardice multiplied by duplicity.

The labor representatives on the Wage Stabilization Board had the power to begin the fight (Turn to last page)

### ROLL BACK PRICES TO JUNE!

The new wage-price freeze order is a double blow at the worker-consumer. A wage freeze is bad enough, as our lead article demonstrates. In addition, the price freeze to go along with it is announced in haste with no machinery to enforce it AND WITH NO ROLLBACK OF PRICES.

The freezers are talking vaguely about a rollback to come. Maybe. There may be tokens and sops—maybe. And at that, after business has had plenty of time to work out its dodges and prepare for half-hearted government pressure. Maybe it's too early to say—

"But it is not too early to ask why prices, instead of being rolled back, were frozen at their highest point. Price Stabilizer DiSalle in a statement explaining the freeze edict said this point was chosen because corporate profits before taxes were at an all-time high. And when the Stock Exchange heard the nature of the wage-price order, prices again bounded upwards.

"But in a democratic society the purpose of a wage-price freeze should be to stabilize the wage-price-profit relationship at the level where the burdens of the defense effort would be borne equitably by all. There is nothing in Director DiSalle's statement to indicate that in the base period chosen in the edict—Dec. 19 to Jan. 25—wages, prices and profits were in better balance than in the period just before or after the outbreak of the Korean war.

"Quite to the contrary: in the period chosen, just because business men were expecting the freeze, there were abnormally violent movements of prices upwards, as every housewife can testify. It is no wonder that business has taken the hold-the-line order calmly because, as the New York Times reported, business had anticipated the order for some time and 'steps had been taken in terms of pricing to guard against the adverse effects.'"

(N. Y. Post, Jan. 29)

So business took its "steps" and the government obligingly waited to freeze prices until the steps had been taken.

Everybody knows what has to be done. Roll back prices to the level of last June, before the outbreak of the Korean war!

## U. S. to India: Vote Our Way — or Starve!

*Near a hundred million people are in danger of starving to death in one of the modern world's greatest famines ever to strike a nation.*

In India, especially the North and East, drought, locust plagues and other natural calamities have brought sweeping starvation. The Indian government's handout to the stricken people has had to be reduced to nine ounces of rice a day. The country is short two million tons of wheat.

The Indian government appealed to the U. S. for aid. The government of this country has replied in effect: *Get out of our way in the United Nations, if you want us to save the lives of your people; cease opposing our policy or—starve!*

That is not the voice of the American people. You can stop it.

It is not the American people who want to blackmail their way to world domination over a holocaust of famine-stricken bodies. The American people do not want to hold a pistol to the greatest nation of Asia with a gangster's hoarsely whispered "Your UN vote or your life!"

Last year, when the Indian famine was beginning, one of the motives for Prime Minister Nehru's visit to the

U. S. is now understood, was an attempt to negotiate famine relief from the richest country in the world, which continually tells the less fortunate peoples of the world that it is interested only in raising their standard of living, not in dominating them.

About a month ago, Mme. Pandit, India's ambassador to the U. S., published a statement calling on the government to assist her starving millions.

The response of the administration and its State Department was to refer the appeal of the Indian people to . . . the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. There was quicker help forthcoming from neighboring humanitarians when a city zoo once announced that its giant panda needed a special diet.

It is millions of human beings that are starving!

### The Government's Dodge

The referral to the Senate committee was a shyster trick in the first place. The granaries of the U. S. are overflowing with wheat. We, the comparatively well-fed people of the United States, would not have to be deprived of more than a couple of kernels. . . . We mention that in case the recent calls by government leaders for "austerity" and a "Spartan way of life" extend only to sacrifices for slaughter and war and not to humanitarian and brotherly aid to other peoples. . . .

It is not only the granaries of the grain-growers that are full. The U. S. government itself has huge stocks of surplus grain stored away.

The Indian government is willing to pay, in various forms. That is, it is willing to pay money. The U. S. government is demanding a different coin.

There is absolutely nothing else that stood in the way, or that stands in the way, of the U. S.'s ability to help feed the Indian people—and be paid for it to boot. There was no other reason for the government to refer the matter to the Senate committee as if it were a question of haggling over trade goods, instead of lives.

The government did so only in order to stall. With macabre hypocrisy it did so in the guise of . . . humanitarianism. It announced that it did not want to give India a loan to buy the needed stuff of life, as India proposed; it would consider making an outright grant.

The trick was: the latter course required referral to the Senate committee; the course that India proposed, a loan, could have been taken care of by the administration through existing international financial institutions, with dispatch, in time to save men and women and babies. The problem was deliberately thrown into the Senate committee in the midst of the congressional atmosphere of "He who is not with us is against us," passed on to two-penny politicians who ignorantly curse anyone

(Continued on page 8)

# Will Nimitz Commission Whitewash Witchhunt?

By MARY BELL

The creation by President Truman of the Commission on Internal Security and Individual Rights, charged with investigating the maze of laws, statutes, committees, organizations and government bodies dealing with "loyalty" and "subversion" is eloquent testimony to the mass hysteria which exists in this area of our national life.

A non-partisan committee headed by Admiral Chester W. Nimitz, its personnel is such that Senator Joe McCarthy and his fellow-Neanderthals will have to go far to find it in league with Moscow. It is hoped by some of the administration supporters that the commission's study and report will cut some of the ground from under McCarthy.

But it was the president himself who played the role of sorcerer's apprentice by instituting the loyalty program in 1947, whereby every federal employee or applicant for a government job is required to take an oath that he is not a member of any organization advocating the forcible overthrow of the government.

## The Case of the Paperless Sailor

Alfred Kleebe, a sailor, has been given a bird's-eye view of a West European continent fragmented by national state boundaries and saddled with a system in which a man lives not by bread alone but by . . . paper.

The following item appeared on January 20 in the Paris *Le Monde*:

"On his way to Genoa in November 1940, Alfred Kleebe, a Swiss sailor who had become a naturalized Argentine citizen, at one and the same time lost his sailor's book, his naturalization papers and his passport. He had to get these old scraps of paper replaced. While he was waiting, the unfortunate man became *heimatlos* (stateless), was arrested, freed, again arrested, and finally expelled by Italy to Switzerland. From Switzerland he was immediately expelled to France. From France to Germany. There, last March, the Allied travelers' aid of the high commissioner's office gave him an exit visa to Belgium. He was to sail from there to Buenos Aires. Piling misfortune on misfortune, Kleebe missed his boat, was arrested by the Belgian police and expelled to France. This time the French sent him back to Luxembourg. The Red Cross of that grand duchy gave him a railroad ticket for Trèves, from whence he got to Bremen and finally wound up in the Sailor's Home of that city. The Argentine consulate at Frankfurt was contacted by the high commissioner's office but replied that Kleebe's nationality was 'doubtful.' At last account, a copy of his birth certificate has been gotten for Kleebe at Berne (Switzerland), and Kleebe will be able to get back to Argentina."

## Self-Defense

The *Challenge*, Bulletin of the Association of Former Political Prisoners of Soviet Labor Camps, January 1951, carries an article with excerpts from a secret NKVD (GPU) training manual on such cultural subjects as how to strangle a man, how to knife him, how to tie him up, etc., with illustrations.

One passage describes how to pin down a man who is lying on the ground, presumably as the result of the other instructions. The prostrate one is referred to as the "assailant."

## NOT IN THE HEADLINES . . .

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

# LABOR SCOPE

## 3-WAY UNION BATTLE ON WEST COAST

By BOB OROZCO

SAN FRANCISCO, Jan. 23—A three-way battle is raging on the coast for control of the 7,000 members of the Marine Cooks and Stewards Union. The lineup is the present Stalinist leadership of the union versus Joseph Curran of the National Maritime Union versus Harry Lundeberg of the Sailors Union of the Pacific (AFL).

The battle was touched off by the arrival here of Curran and two vice-presidents of the NMU, John McDougall and Herbert Warner. Curran lost no time in making clear that his intention was to take over the MC&S. He was reported as saying that he didn't want to start an "inter-union war" but that he was here to stay "until the job was finished."

Curran, and the CIO which is supporting his drive, evidently considered the MC&S a ripe plum ready to be picked. The MC&S, one of the few remaining strongholds of the Stalinists in the labor movement, had been expelled from the CIO. Within the union an opposition to the Stalinist leadership developed which looked to Curran for support. Curran's line has been to blast the undemocratic regime of the Stalinists while, of course, keeping quiet about his own undemocratic and terrorist regime in the NMU.

### NONE OF THE THREE

But several days after Curran's arrival, the SUP declared itself a contender for the MC&S. The NMU had discounted significant opposition from the SUP because the latter is well-known to be a Jim Crow Union, while the MC&S has a large number of Negroes and other minorities in

its ranks. But the SUP could not afford to stand idly by while its rival, the NMU, extended its power on the Pacific coast, and accordingly entered the fray. Its main talking point was: We don't need any Easterners telling us what to do.

To get around the Jim Crow issue, the SUP offered the MC&S a separate charter under the SUP, with full autonomy to elect its own officers.

The character of both the NMU and the SUP leaderships makes it much easier for the Stalinists to fight to maintain control. It will be remembered that Curran came to power in the NMU as a stooge of the Stalinists; after the war and with the intensification of the cold war, when the heat was put on the Stalinists in the labor movement, Curran was quick to realize that he was riding the wrong horse. He then became the leader of the anti-Stalinist forces, using typically Stalinist methods to cut down his former buddies. After his victory he proceeded to purge the union of all opposition in a completely ruthless bureaucratic manner. The SUP leadership is no less active than the NMU's in suppressing opposition and discussion, and on top of this has its thoroughly Jim Crow policy.

Thus the victory of any one of these three power cliques is not calculated to reverse the present trend on the waterfront away from its traditional militancy and democracy. If, on the other hand, the rank and file used their own strength and relied upon themselves to throw out the Stalinists, their union could become a rallying point for the labor movement on the waterfront.

# There's One Liberal Left Anyway: Meiklejohn Scores Purge Trend

By J. WALKER

BERKELEY, Jan. 27 — "The American tradition of freedom" has now been altered to mean the freedom to "protect the government" already established, rather than to keep democratic processes at work, said Alexander Meiklejohn last night to some 300 University of California students and Berkeley residents in the campus Unitarian church. "We who proclaim the doctrine [of freedom] no longer believe it to be true," he added.

In analyzing this "tradition of freedom" from Roger Williams' day 320 years ago down to today's circumstances, Meiklejohn mentioned two tasks which the early colonists had to face in order to achieve a democratic government: "First they had to plan a revolution . . . by force and violence" against English rule — in violation of the British equivalent of today's Smith Act, let it be noted, we may add; and then they had to construct a democratic government which would unite the colonies.

Under the Constitution which they established the First Amendment gave the people certain reserved rights. These rights were necessary for the maintenance of the political sovereignty of the people, having a direct relation to the means by which the people selected their government.

### 4 BLOWS AT FREEDOM

"How is our political thinking done?" Meiklejohn asked. He answered by listing three main avenues: printed materials, public discussion and political parties, and voting. In order to use these agencies the First Amendment "gives the people the reserved power to choose for themselves what to read." It recog-

nizes the "authority of the elector to listen in peaceable assembly," and it forbids "the questioning, under duress" of one's political views with compulsion to answer" and threats against "wrong beliefs."

Today, however, there are at least four practices which are used to hinder our freedom:

(1) The "immigration department now . . . protects us from dangerous ideas." Aliens are not allowed to enter the country if they believe that another economic or political system might be better than our present arrangements. They are not allowed to "engage in discussion without permission," i.e., become interested in radical politics. In criticizing this policy Meiklejohn said that "any government which is afraid of ideas is unfit to govern."

(2) The FBI has built up a secret police and espionage system in the U. S. It lists public opinions held, for possible attacks in the future. It denies an individual the right to hold certain beliefs, free from the interference of the state.

(3) The attorney general has established a "subversive" list, which publicly condemns groups as "disloyal" without either a hearing or any evidence to substantiate the charge.

(4) The federal and state committees on Un-American Activities investigate "dangerous ideas." If individuals refuse to state their political beliefs through concern for freedom or through fear of "incriminating" themselves, they can be "punished" for contempt of their inquisitors."

Some of the liberals in the audience began to get a little uncomfortable in their seats as

Meiklejohn went on to the subject of academic freedom. He criticized those "administrators of democracy" who "talk freedom and practice repression," as they exist among our "educational masters." Stalinists should be allowed to teach, Meiklejohn believes, and not only technical subjects, but "Communism" as well, and why they believe in it. If students face the possibility of going to fight and die against a "Communist" government, then they have the right to know what this form of government is, and from the people who believe in it.

### A REAL LIBERAL

He attacked those people who agree with the purpose of "loyalty oaths" but disagree with the means employed. In a plea for real academic freedom Meiklejohn mentioned these important guides: "Students must be assured that their teacher is not compelled to believe this or that." Otherwise the teacher "becomes a hired man," thinking "what he is told to think," and saying "what he is paid to say."

Introduced as a liberal "of the old school," Meiklejohn believes that "freedom as a form of government is far more dependable in times of stress" than any other form of government.

There was no opportunity for a question period, but there seemed to be a general air of agreement with what Meiklejohn said. A socialist might not agree with his implicit faith in the Constitution, but certainly would agree with his stand on democratic rights in current issues. Copies of the Socialist Youth League pamphlet *Cold War on the Campus* were sold in front of the church in the fifteen minutes preceding the address.

# U. S. Cracks Whip: UN Jumps thru the Hoop

By L. G. SMITH

The United States government cracked down hard on its allies in the United Nations on the China question, and on January 30 drove through its resolution to brand Stalinist China an aggressor and to study methods of punishing its aggression.

This resolution does not reflect the judgment or desires of a large number of the governments involved. It shatters any illusion that may exist that the anti-Stalinist states are an alliance of equals. The boss cracked the whip, and all of them, from proud Britain to the once glorious France, jumped through the hoop. Only India and Burma (outside the Russian bloc) stood by their convictions to the extent of voting against the U. S. resolution, while a number of other states who have been in the forefront of the opposition either abstained or buckled completely and voted with the United States.

Even the most ardent supporters of U. S. policy do not attempt to conceal the real state of affairs with regard to this vote. The New York Times for January 31 states: "It was reported that the votes of several delegations on the Asian resolution was affected by conversations with United States representatives beforehand. The latter made it clear, it was said, that the United States could not accept the seven-power preliminary peace talks envisaged in the Asian plan. Thus, these delegations reasoned, it would be futile to adopt the proposal."

The Canadian delegation's turns on the question illustrate the point. Canada had started as one of the nations which supported the Indian position. Shortly before the vote Canada announced that it would abstain. At the last moment, however, it voted for the U. S. resolution. But—as reported by the Times: "Some delegates, such as Lester B. Pearson, Canadian Minister for External Affairs, made it plain that they were still unhappy that the United States proposal was being pressed at this time. It was evident that their votes were being cast for the sake of Western unity and in the belief that there was no other course."

### HOW THE WHIP WAS CRACKED

What other course was indeed open to them once the U. S. government had made it amply clear that "Western unity" could only be preserved on its own terms, as India had already learned?

Last week's headline in LABOR ACTION read: "U. S. to Blackjack Allies into War Moves on China." The ink was not yet dry on the paper when it was publicly announced that the Senate Foreign Relations Committee had decided to delay action indefinitely on India's urgent request for American wheat for her famine-stricken people. It is no coincidence that the Indian government is leading the opposition to the U. S. resolution to denounce China as an aggressor and to apply sanctions against her, and every government in the world knows it.

Why is the American government driving ahead so ruthlessly on this question? Is its policy determined by its appraisal of the world political situation or is it more a response to internal political pressures?

RESTON'S THEORY  
The United States delegation in the UN has been using some peculiar tactics. Ever since the Chinese Stalinist government rejected the UN cease-fire proposal, the United States has insisted that the UN vote both to condemn China as an aggressor and to apply sanctions against her. This despite the fact that no U. S. spokesman has come forth with a list of the sanctions which will be proposed.

It is rumored that the British and French delegations have been willing for some time to vote for the "aggressor" resolution, but that they insist that no practical and effective sanctions can be applied at the present time, or at least none which could be effective without leading directly to an extension of the war. The U. S. delegation, however, has strenuously objected to separating the resolution so that China could be branded an aggressor

without commitment as to what further would be done about the aggression.

One of the most intelligent press commentators, James Reston of the New York Times, states that the opinion is spreading among the European and Asiatic governments that the State Department wants to use the UN to draw off the lightning which is descending on it from Congress because of its vote for the cease-fire resolution.

They reason as follows: Acheson wants to appear to be advocating a very tough policy, while actually he is not too anxious for the American government to get involved right now in sanctions on China. Thus his delegation rejected all further talk about negotiations and adamantly demanded that its resolution be passed. But at the same time it knew that once this has been done, the question of actual sanctions could be kicked around in UN committees indefinitely. Then Congress could get mad at the UN without hurting the administration too much politically.

### AGAINST CONVICTIONS

What the immediate result of the diplomatic struggle will be cannot be foreseen. To all objections to the division in the ranks of capitalist nations brought about by U. S. government policy American officials replied, according to Reston: "Don't worry, when the vote comes our resolution will pass."

But then the correspondent adds: "This, however, is precisely the difficulty. They [the other governments] are with us on our objectives — no doubt about that. They are also with us on the ballot, but their votes do not necessarily register their convictions, and in the end, as we discovered in Korea, it is their convictions that count."

With only an eighth of the iceberg visible above the waters of diplomatic maneuvering, it is clear that they did not vote their convictions.

As this game with the lives of millions is played by the diplomats and their governments, the executive council of the American Federation of Labor, assembled at its usual winter watering place in Miami Beach, Florida, has come forth with a program for American foreign policy. If a paid representative of the "China lobby" did not write the section of this program which deals with China for the council, it is evident that such a representative has the right to demand stand-by pay on the ground that his jurisdiction has been invaded.

"The Communist dictatorship over China should be branded by the UN as an aggressor. Economic sanctions should be imposed. . . . It should be denied a seat in the UN. . . . Generous moral and material support should be given to the rising democratic resistance movement on the Chinese mainland and to the Chinese Nationalist government now in Formosa. An authoritative military mission should be dispatched to Formosa for surveying the Nationalist military forces and recommending steps for their retraining and adequate equipment."

So much for the reactionary, landlord-capitalist government of Chiang Kai-shek. But the fifteen old men of the council are also determined to help all resistance movements against Stalinism, or rather to urge the government to help them. Another section of the resolution reads: "Special efforts should be made to encourage and aid, in every way, the democratic forces behind the Iron Curtain in their resistance to despotism."

As the readers of LABOR ACTION know, it is our contention that the movement of resistance to-Stalinism behind the Iron Curtain can have positive political results if it is waged in the name of democracy and socialism, and not in the name of restoring capitalism. That is one of the reasons why we insist that the labor movement of this country must

itself take the lead in aiding and assisting the resistance movement, and must not rely on the American government to do it.

Of course, the AFL leadership approaches the problem from exactly the opposite point of view. The first part of their program states: "We urge all-out effort for complete mobilization. Defense production must have exclusive priority. The need of the hour is for unlimited effort to insure peace through overwhelming strength."

This is pretty strong language, much stronger than that used by the top leaders of the government themselves. In fact, we can confidently affirm that it goes far beyond anything which is wanted by the most rabidly pro-war members of AFL unions, and that the actions of the unions will demonstrate in due course that their old leaders are just making a lot of noise.

But this noise can do much damage. If the AFL's statement gets widely known among the workers of the rest of the world (and the Stalinists will no doubt give it plenty of play in Asia and Europe) it will do much to convince these workers that they can hope for nothing in the way of guidance or help from the American labor movement.

It would be foolish to contend that the American labor movement, with its present ideology, is actually able to make a positive contribution to American foreign policy, let alone to the struggle of the workers on both sides of the Iron Curtain against their ancient capitalist oppressors or against their new Stalinist ones.

But it would be equally foolish to close the books and give up the idea that the American workers can yet become a positive factor in world politics. The important thing is to do what is possible to hasten their political education. And that is the chief task of LABOR ACTION, of the Independent Socialist League, and of all independent socialists.

# Neutrality Spreads in Europe

By HENRY JUDD

PARIS, January—Is Stalin planning a major diplomatic coup, in the form of a magnanimous offer of "neutrality" in case of war to Italy, France and other Western European countries?

Certainly this is not in the realm of the impossible. The deliberately circulated Stalinist rumor recently, to the effect that Stalin was prepared to guarantee such "neutrality" to France and Italy in case no Four Power Conference is to be held or such a conference proves to be a failure, may well have been the opening feeler in a new diplomatic game being prepared.

In any event, the phenomenon of "neutrality" is now one which cannot be ignored and which is increasingly reported in the European press. We cannot analyze it, extensively in this brief report, but we shall indicate some of its many forms. It seems to be a tendency most likely to grow and flourish.

A sardonic leaflet is now plastered on the walls of Paris: "Libérez Thorez" (Free Thorez); another says "Down with 18 months military service; we want 3 years as in Russia." But these pointed and ironic digs at the Stalinists reflect a minority, rightist opinion rather than that of the apathetic mass which is wide open to defeatist, neutralist, capitulationist, appeasementist, etc., propaganda of all shades. We give some forms and examples of these takes.

Above all, it takes the form of hostility—unconcealed and vehement—to all that smacks of American policy. The rash, brusque and violent haste with which the

American government pursues its aims in the United Nations and throughout the world has certainly been the most effective means of creating the "neutralist" wave in Europe.

The enormous gap between American talk and American action—not to mention the reality of a defenseless Europe—has caused the greatest fright of all in those circles inclined to be most "pro-American." For example, to this day not a single American soldier has arrived in Western Europe to reinforce American policy of defending Europe (or so we are told), nor has the question of German rearmament advanced beyond the most elementary stage of preliminary discussions. Yet the Americans try to drag their ever more reluctant allies into impossible positions (such as the issue over declaring China an "aggressor"), and to commit them to tasks which everyone knows can never be fulfilled.

RECOIL FROM U. S.  
The effect of all this has been a distinct recoiling on the part of all Western European governments, headed by England and France, before what is considered blind American adventurism. Simultaneously, the halting and paralysis of discussions over the Schuman Plan for coal and steel unification (for separate reasons) has further deepened the defeatist moods of all governments. The climate is ripe, in our opinion, for some kind of Stalinist offer of "neutrality," although the actual moment has not yet arrived. Some speculate that it may come after the failure of a Four Power Conference.

Reflecting these conditions, the

tour of General Eisenhower has been singularly quiet and subdued. Like a much more intelligent and alert individual than his fellow general in the Pacific, he knows how to behave without antagonizing and worsening the situation. He has a definite populism in Western Europe, perhaps because of the pleasant contrast he makes with the notorious MacArthur.

The Stalinist efforts to arouse popular demonstrations against him have failed, particularly in Paris. But we should not be surprised by the feeble demonstrations organized here. The more important thing to note is the complete lack of enthusiasm, support, encouragement and popular sympathy he has received everywhere. If a climate of active preparation for defense against Russia existed, his reception in government circles and elsewhere would have been entirely different. Instead, his trip was like that of an American businessman inspecting his offices, factories, etc., abroad. He came and went amid the general indifference of all.

CP BENEFITS  
The terrain is thus ripe for a widespread "neutralist" campaign on all fronts, diplomatic and popular. The Stalinists have already indicated their position on popular "neutrality."

In an article published in a leading Stalinist theoretical publication, Jacques Ducloux—present head of the party—gave a formal position of hostility to "neutralist concepts." Neutrality between Russia and America? Neutrality toward the Soviet fatherland? Such a position is, of course, impossible. But this is only the for-

mal side of the matter. Ducloux then gives the real position: there is, it seems, a progressive form of neutralism, that of the masses who fear war most of all. This is directed only against America, the sole war provocator of the day. This form of neutralism must be supported by us Stalinists, etc., etc.

For Ducloux, this is a neutralism of paralysis, the kind which is most successfully employed in the various Stalinist front organizations which try to organize pacifist and neutralist people.

In fact, the Stalinists are now actively creating a whole new series of organizations to corral such movements — against German rearmament, for continuation of the Franco-Russian Pact, etc.

In the absence of any socialist movement it is only natural that they are the ones to benefit from the present wave of neutralism. The two-pronged Stalinist attack — invincible power backed by terror on the one hand, generous offers of an illusory neutrality on the other—continues to be highly successful. To the same extent and degree that American propaganda is unsuccessful.

Available: BOUND VOLUMES of Labor Action 1945 to 1949 \$3.00 a volume Order from: Labor Action Book Service 114 West 14 Street New York 11, N. Y.

# The ISL Program in Brief

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

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

Stalinism, in Russia and wherever it has 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—

114 W. 14th Street  
New York 11, N. Y.

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

## SCIENCE, CONSERVATION AND MVA

By CARL DARTON

The approaching war throws all the contradictions of our society into sharper relief. The nation is being forced into total mobilization for an all-out endeavor to blast a substantial portion of the fruits of man's painful labor into the rubble, dust and elements from which they were constructed. At the same time there is a noticeable increase in anxiety over the accelerated depletion of the natural resources with which the U. S. has been so bountifully endowed.

The war machine requires more coal, more power, more iron, more and more of a multitude of all raw materials. Thus there will be more streams polluted by industrial waste, a heavier pall of smoke over our cities, reckless cutting of our dwindling timber supply, the erection of dams for power without regard to recreational, irrigation, or flood-control needs, and more feverish churning of the soil in search of iron, coal, and uranium ores.

We have gone so far along the road of carelessness and waste of natural resources and show so few signs of turning back that, even if the enemy bombs never fall on American soil, we may within generations be living in an arid, treeless, and scarred wasteland.

Under the capitalist system there is always the exploitation of the natural resources as well as the exploitation of the working people. The state and federal governments have, by and large, never been conservation-minded compared to even the governments of Western Europe. Nevertheless they have had to take some limited conservation measures. No doubt the reader is well acquainted with the extent of the willful violations of these measures by the industrial interests.

Socialists are of course opposed to the exploitation of resources in the interest of the moneyed few. They are opposed to the reckless use of those materials in limited supply which are vital to the personal and economic needs of the people. Socialists are conservationists. They do not, however, belong to that school which would return lower Manhattan to the primeval forest paradise beloved by rod and reel. They are in favor of setting aside areas for the recreational need of the people and of providing adequate income and leisure time for use of these facilities. Of greater concern, however, is the planned use of scarce irreplaceable materials, the conscious discovery of new and substitute materials, and the replacement of forests and grasslands. In these undertakings scientists would be of great assist-

### The New Missouri Compromise

Science can aid conservationists in three ways: (1) The most efficient methods can be devised for the extraction of these natural resources such as coal, iron and oil which seem to be limited and essentially irreplaceable.

(2) Substitute materials can be found for many raw materials which are in short supply. The metal aluminum is an example of such an effort. Most of these substitutes will be from universal and plentiful sources such as earth or ocean.

(3) Many resources are replaceable. Grasslands, forests, water supply are notable examples. The efforts of science are clearly evidenced here. The technical aspects of avoidance and correction are known. Industrial smog need not blight our cities. Trees can be planted and to a great extent protected from fire, disease, and insects. Floods, droughts and falling ground—water levels are credited with the disappearance of forests and grasslands.

We know that the capitalists with their emphasis on wars and profits will do little conservation work. But we cannot be complacent about their failures. An outstanding fiasco has been the development of the Missouri River Valley. Here we meet a combination of failure to comprehend the problem, to consider an already indicated solution, and of rivalry between the bureaucracies of two federal agencies.

All evidence points to the need for a single integrated Missouri River Valley development program. Such a solution is prevented by the very active opposition of privately owned public utilities and rivalry between the U. S. army engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation. After years of dispute the army engineers now have control of the lower river where they have already spent over \$400 million of public funds in scouring the river bottom. The upper river is in the hands of the Bureau of Reclamation.

Under this new "Missouri Compromise" it is estimated that two thirds of the electric power potential is lost, forests are not protected, there is no alleviation of drought, and the huge storage reservoirs on the main river will do little but cover valuable bottom land.

The issue of conservation is a broad one for it is intimately tied in with all parts of the economy. A serious and comprehensive conservation program must enlist the help of a great number of scientists. Scientists will need to readjust their professional standards. The scientist who chooses to work in silviculture, plant breeding, stream purification, or mining methods should have equal status in the scientific community with the nuclear physicist.

Readers interested in the conservation issues now in the public eye are referred to two easily read and interesting books: *The Pursuit of Plenty*, by A. G. Mezerik, Harper and Brothers, 1950, and *Western Land and Water Use*, by Mont. H. Sanderson.

**LABOR ACTION**  
Independent Socialist Weekly  
Vol. 15, No. 6 February 5, 1951

Published weekly by the Labor Action Publishing Company, 114 West 14 Street, New York City 11, N. Y. Send all communications to general editorial and business offices of LABOR ACTION at that address. Telephone: WATKINS 4-2222.  
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

U. S. COMMUNISM: ITS SECRET BUSINESS EMPIRE, by Claire Neikind. (The Reporter, January 23.)

For all of the organizational blows which the American CP has suffered, "its financial empire is intact," writes Claire Neikind—whom we remember particularly as the author of the only article outside the radical press (also in the Reporter) which told the truth about Joe Curran's reign of terror in the National Maritime Union. Miss Neikind here turns her attention to the business tycoon of U. S. Stalinism, Robert William Weiner.

Weiner, who became financial secretary of the CP in 1938, "has set up a group of regular commercial enterprises, mostly in the North-eastern states. As far as is known, these have

included a doll factory, a sponge company, a shoulder-pad factory, a tool-and-die plant, a string of export-import houses dealing in such items as wrist watches and jewelry, real-estate agencies, stationery and supply stores (including a large one in New York), lithographers, a steel-processing plant, printers, a record company, a national string of bookshops, and night clubs. Many of them are small. . . . Often they stay in business briefly, and then reorganize under another name. In addition there is a string of summer camps. . . .

As for Weiner himself: "He lives well . . . he wears Brooks Brothers suits, smokes dollar cigars, takes frequent vacations in Florida, and dines at first-rate restaurants. His habits, like his talents, are those of a great financier."

### FILMS and Ideas

## "Destination Moon"—

# Half Science, Half Green Cheese

By PHILIP COBEN

Out of loose terminology, the film "Destination Moon"—which is about the first space flight to earth's satellite—has been discussed by reviewers as if it were science fiction. Properly speaking, there is little of science fiction about it at all, nor was there intended to be by the film's makers. That is what distinguishes the picture and makes it a must.

The sections dealing with the flight to the moon, the moon itself, and the technical preparations for the flight are as much straight science as many a book on those aspects of science which are still partly speculative. Speculative does not necessarily mean fictional, and there is less even of speculation in the film than most of its viewers are likely to think.

But if there is little science fiction in the film and much science, it is still painfully true that the film is half science and half fantasy.

The part which is fantasy, and of a somewhat less credible variety than *Weird Tales*, is the first section which tells how the space ship was financed and constructed by a cartel of public-spirited and far-sighted capitalists in spite of the obstructions placed in their path by that of 'debil the government.

The picture gets back to reality only when the good ship's rockets blast off. At this point it becomes a semi-documentary on an event which has not yet taken place. Up to that point it is not down-to-earth.

The silly stuff at the beginning, however, which takes place on our own planet and without space suits, makes a very interesting point—if we stand its plot on the head. That requires a slight summary of the business.

### FRANK MERRIWELL TO THE RESCUE

The main characters are the Scientist, the General and the Capitalist. (They have names, but we have to keep this simple in the spirit of the script writer.)

The Scientist, to begin with, is experimenting for the government with a rocket ship, which is complete and in working order but explodes on its first test because of mysterious sabotage by You-Know-Who. The project folds up as a result of the failure, even though the FBI has proved it was sabotage (which makes much less sense than Scully's little green men from Venus). However, the General, who has been working with the Scientist on the rocket, unable to get a spark of interest from the witless government bureaucrats, turns to his friend, the Capitalist.

The Capitalist is the head of an aircraft corporation and the spittin' image of Frank Merriwell, a young, handsome, grimly determined, clean-limbed American youth. Properly scornful of Buck Rogers notions at the beginning of the conversation, he is convinced in one minute 27 seconds flat.

The plan is concocted in the remaining three seconds: American Industry and Private Enterprise Will Do the Job, since the politicians are too dumb to see that the U. S. flag has to be planted on Tycho crater before the Other Fellow gets there first.

Next thing we know, all the leading capitalists of the country are gathered together in Frank Merriwell's board meeting room, headed by "Mr. Ford," whose first name is left unspoken to baffle the audience. After the General goes through his routine about the military necessity to Get There First, the assembled capitalists toss aside all vacillation and

### They Need Your Help!

Local New York of the ISL sends food and clothing packages to needy workers in Europe. You can help! Send your aid—especially clothing for school-age children—to the New York ISL, 114 West 14 Street, New York City 11.

### BOOKS and Ideas

## THE NEW BOOK ON THE FBI—7

# The Social Philosophy of J. Edgar Hoover

By SAM ADAMS

In reviewing Lowenthal's book, we have already cited some of the evidence of J. Edgar Hoover's special contributions to the activities of the bureau and the GID over the years and the particular pride that he had himself stated over the creation and development of the latter division. We shall cite several representative expressions of the man, for they will increase understanding of his "theoretical views," and of the "practical idealism" and "artistic temperament" which his apologist Holtzoff has claimed.

There was the investigation and persecution of the newly formed Communist Labor Party and Communist Party in 1919—parties which were certainly a far cry from the present degenerated Stalinist party which is primarily an agent of Stalin's Russia. We have written that Hoover likes to appear as a learned man, one who has a special knowledge of the social sciences, of Marxism and the theories of socialism. Thus in all his campaigns, he dressed his struggle against the radical movement in what he proudly believes to be "theoretical" understanding.

In dealing with the CLP he called attention to its opposition to the Versailles Treaty which he regarded as "particularly significant" for showing its attitude toward "world-wide peace." (If Hoover wished to jail those who opposed the Versailles Treaty, he would have had to imprison half of Europe and the U. S., including many government officials.)

But what he found particularly reprehensible about communism and its social theories was that it was "directly in violation of the principles upon which this government was founded—namely, that of nationalistic sectionalism." A new theory of American capitalism! Communist doctrine was "the very essence of immorality, of lawlessness, and of ruthless government, as has nowhere else been found at any time in the history of the world." Hoover is not talking about Stalinist totalitarianism, but of socialism, which he like all his ignorant contemporaries, the malicious and the innocent alike, equates with Stalinism.

### Policeman of Ideas

Is it any wonder that with this kind of social view he was and is able to act as the policeman of ideas and opinions?

If this is what communism is, why should those who embrace Marxist socialism have the democratic right of free speech, free press, and organizations? They shouldn't, of course, because "freedom of speech is always a liberty, but never a license." Who decides when it is a liberty and when a license? In the present case, Hoover, on the basis of his views and with the assistance of several anti-democratic measures passed by Congress. Like all oppressive bodies and laws, they are always accompanied by professions of democratic belief and the defense of democratic rights. Yet the history of the bureau is replete with violations of such rights.

In the Palmer raids, confessions were forced out of people arrested and their trials protracted endless evidence of the "Gestapo" methods of the bureau and its GID. To make the position of the prisoners even more difficult, no counsel was permitted them, nor were they advised of their legal rights. In addition, excessive bail was demanded so that prisoners could not be freed. There is no evidence that Hoover opposed excessive bail.

But there is evidence that he more than once asked for enormous amounts of bail. Ordinary bail of \$500 was raised to \$10,000 in more than one instance, and this was in keeping with all the other methods employed in the raids.

Let us take the matter of wiretapping conducted by the sensitive Mr. Hoover's department. Despite congressional objection, the FBI engaged in wiretapping for years and years. Admonition that it cease this practice was unavailing, for despite the attitude of Congress, and rulings by the Supreme Court the FBI continues its practice of wiretapping.

Attorney General Jackson warned that in one case FBI agents acted in a manner which might constitute a violation of the Constitution. A Senate committee under Senator Burton K. Wheeler which included Truman and Barkley, was really alarmed by the practices of the police (including the FBI), over "the recent resurgence of a spy system," upon "persons who have committed no crime, but whose economic and political views and activities may be obnoxious to the present incumbents of law-enforcement offices. . . ."

### 'Americanism' versus The 'Vipers'

Included in this were search of "private homes without warrants" and seizure of "private papers without warrants," holding "unconvicted persons incommunicado, refusing the request of an arrested person for permission to see a lawyer promptly, privately and before he is questioned by the authorities, refusing to tell him promptly of the nature of the charge on which he is being arrested and detained," using the "process of interrogation to entrap suspected persons," etc.

But this wasn't all done by the FBI? No, but much of it was. One thing, however, does stand out: the Department of Justice does not appear in any of these events as an overseer of justice and its protector and defender. It hardly could as long as one of its divisions commits identical violations.

In fighting back against his critics, our "practical idealist," the man with the "artistic temperament," uses the language of incitement which is "tempered" with a warning to caution. Observe: "Foreign 'isms' are seeking to engulf Americanism . . . underworld of filth . . . organizations of questionable background . . . an ink stream of vilification. . . . There is no place in America for such purveyors of

## Next—A Labor Party! by Jack Ranger

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

25 cents a copy Order from:  
Independent Socialist Press, 114 W. 14th St., New York 11, N. Y.

hate and horror. . . . However, what I have to say to you today should be construed as an appeal to common-sense and a desire for a calm, common-sense appraisal. . . .

Again: ". . . the vipers of alien 'isms' whose poisonous fangs are fatal . . . these scoundrels. . . . Agitators have worked among . . . sharecroppers [what a dirty thing to do, trying to improve the lot of one of the most exploited peoples in the country!] . . . These praters against the American way of life are in reality a gang of international confidence men, seeking to steal our wallets . . . vile and vicious forces . . . scandal sheets. . . ."

The language of the crime fighter in a political struggle! Why should anyone be calm when faced with vipers, scoundrels, confidence men, vile and vicious forces? Yet Hoover incites people at the same time that he admonishes them to be calm!

It is the same with the advice given the people at large to send in any and all information on their neighbors, friends, acquaintances, but to refrain from hysteria and irresponsibilities. The hysteria and irresponsibility as anyone can see stems from above.

### It Still Goes On

Outside of specialized studies made by public institutions and governmental bodies, no such history of the FBI as Lowenthal's has previously appeared. It is a vital and important work, having particular significance for the labor movement as a whole, even though the labor officialdom conducts itself with an obtuseness that at times beggars description. At least, it seems unbelievable that people engaged in the profession of unionism in behalf of the working masses should be so craven and blind as not to understand that the federal police agency is dangerous to the liberties and democratic rights of the people; and that in this particular instance, as experience has shown, the old chestnut about vigilance being the price of liberty is no idle phrase. For if at the present time the FBI touches primarily the small and unimportant political movements of the working class, lumping them all into the same pot with Stalinism and fascism, it is capable, as it has demonstrated more than once in its history, of serving the interests of big business against the labor movement as a whole.

One of the worst aspects of this situation is the present "list of subversive organizations" drawn up by the attorney general's office under a directive from the president and on the basis of the advice received from the FBI. There is no "legal" way to achieve redress from such a listing made without prior advice to the organizations listed, without informing them why they are on the list, and basis or source of the evidence adduced to warrant such placement. An organization that is listed is literally helpless in trying to find out why it is on the list, how it came to be there, or what the reasons are for it. Hoover will not divulge any evidence because that would mean disclosure of his spy system and informants. Congress endorses this procedure. And although the attorney general's list has no standing in court before any reasonable and conscientious judge, it has an unofficial standing that could not be greater if it were official.

The world situation and the threat of a new world war only promises to narrow the areas of democratic life and the democratic process. That is why it is so important to know everything important and significant about an organization like the FBI, to know its history and development, in order that the democratic rights of the people and the democratic processes may be defended with greater knowledge and consciousness. The word is one thing. The deed is another. Beware the deeds!

## MARCANTONIO SCRAPPING WITH CP FOR POWER OVER ALP, SAYS REPORT

By AL FINDLEY

NEW YORK, Jan. 29—It is an open secret that all is not well in the Stalinist-controlled American Labor Party of New York. Its vote and enrollment fell to an all-time low in the last city election. Many of its prominent leaders have deserted its ranks, the latest being ex-Congressman Leo Isaacson, Manhattan leader Connolly, and Tito's U. S. legal adviser O. John Rogge.

What is now reported is that a fierce factional struggle is raging between the Stalinists and their darling, Vito Marcantonio, titular leader of the ALP. Marcantonio, who fronted for the CP and received the adulation of the Stalinists, is now trying to take over control of the ALP and make it his personal machine, according to the account of well-informed labor reporter of the N. Y. Jewish Morning Journal, Y. Cohen, today.

According to Cohen, on December 9 Marcantonio called a meeting of the executive board of the ALP. At this meeting, after a lengthy report on his own accomplishments as the sole fighter against the reactionary forces in Congress, he proposed that the ALP be reorganized. In effect his plan would abolish the county committees and centralize all power in a small committee headed by himself. It is also reported that he plans to move the state office of the ALP into his own congressional district.

CP TACTICS vs. CP The Marcantonio plan was opposed by most of those present. He thereupon declared that a conspiracy against him existed and that he would not allow himself to become the "scapegoat" for the ALP. At a second meeting held on January 9, the account continues, Marcantonio, in true Stalinist fashion, allowed the opposition speakers one minute each. When Paul Ross objected, he extended the time for 10 seconds. After discussion was closed, Marcantonio rejected a rollcall and called for a standing vote. A majority stood up in opposition; nevertheless he declared his plan adopted. The meeting adjourned amid disorder and catcalls.

The newspaper correspondent adds that Marcantonio is still a defender of the Stalinist line but feels that, in view of its defeats, the ALP needs to free itself from the stigma of its obvious and virtually direct control by the CP. Despite his defeat in the race to retain his congressional seat, he has not given up his political ambitions. In the past he achieved his successes by maneuvers and deals with various Republican and Democratic wardheelers and politicians. Having lost all or most of his contacts in the major parties, he needs a reliable party machine of his own to foster his career.

# A LESSON FROM THE RUSSIAN UNDERGROUND

By HAL DRAPER

Last week on this page we published a page of material devoted to the struggle of the anti-Stalinist underground in the Russian Ukraine. The headline which we put over the main article featured the admission by the Kremlin's gaudier that "hundreds" of youth were fleeing into the underground—"a very rare and important event," as Comrade Vs. F. stressed.

Also appended, however, was a document from the theoretical discussion going on in the ranks of the Ukrainian People's Army, behind the Iron Curtain itself. We should like to point up and underline one passage which occurred in this article whose significance, in our opinion, is greater than may be realized.

The article was by P. Poltava, the leading theoretical writer of the *nationalist non-Marxist* wing of the underground. As has been explained in our press before, the Ukrainian revolutionary movement did not start as a socialist movement. When it was operating during the war against the Nazi occupation in the Polish Ukraine, simple nationalism was sufficient for its program. Nationalist tendencies have always been strong in the Ukraine, both Polish and Russian. Under the regime of Stalin, which has not "solved the national question" but which has embittered it, nationalism was still a revolutionary force.

Even before the Second World War, Leon Trotsky launched the slogan of "self-determination for the Ukraine" in order to prepare the movement for support of and aid to revolutionary-nationalist elements seeking to win the independence of the Ukrainian people from the Kremlin. Such a movement would be progressive, he said, even if not led by socialists, even if it remained programatically on the level of bourgeois democracy.

That was and is absolutely just, in our opinion. Such a movement did actually arise, though by that time the great revolutionist had already been murdered by Stalin's henchmen. As long as it was directed primarily against the Nazis, it based itself on a struggle for democratic rights, without a wider social program.

But when it came into contact with the masses who were oppressed not by the Nazi totalitarians but by the Stalinist bureaucratic-collectivist regime, it found that it could not make way simply on the basis of the program of nationalist democracy.

It was demonstrated in life that it was not a question of whether a nationalist-democratic movement against Stalin was PROGRESSIVE and worthy of support by socialists. What was demonstrated was that a nationalist-democratic movement was IMPOSSIBLE, ineffective.

This is what Poltava's article testified to.

## "It Is Dictated to Us . . ."

But the last paragraph of Poltava's article is even more interesting. He wrote:

"This is our road of struggle. It is not the fruit of any theoretical ideas. It is dictated to us by the every-day conditions under which we live and struggle."

And in his discussion with the writer of the Marxist wing of the movement, Babenko, we are informed by Comrade Vs. F.: "Poltava replies that his program came out of the practical reality of conditions in the USSR and not from any political theory or doctrine."

This statement deserves some thought. To be sure, it can be said—and probably with justice—that Poltava's (that is, the nationalists') program did come out of "political theory," if not his or their own, then under the influence of the Marxist elements in the movement. But this qualification, with whatever weight one wishes to give it, does not gainsay that Poltava's statement indicates an important fact about the socialist struggle under Stalinism.

For there were Marxist elements leavening the movement also when it was limited to the nationalist-democratic program against the Nazis. From both sides it is testified that the adoption of the socialist program was not simply a matter of the socialist elements winning out in the course of the development of the movement, as a result of victory in a political and theoretical

struggle, but that the socialist program was adopted under the impact of the "every-day conditions" which the movement ran up against as soon as it transferred its activities from people dominated by capitalist masters to people dominated by Stalinism.

Now the adoption of a revolutionary socialist program by a movement "not [as] the fruit of any theoretical ideas" but because it was "dictated to us by the every-day conditions" is, to say the least, unusual.

Oppression and exploitation by themselves have led workers to form trade-union associations for self-defense, and have led to trade-union consciousness. But of themselves the every-day conditions of capitalism did not lead the working-class to socialist ideas. These every-day conditions "merely" laid the basis whereby the ideas of the socialist vanguard could win out in the working-class movements of the world, since these ideas corresponded to the needs and interests of the class under capitalism.

That is under capitalism, where the visible exploiter is the private owner of the machine and factory. The rise of capitalism was also accompanied in an earlier day by the advance of democracy, which gave the mass of exploited workers the illusion that a continuing advance of democracy could give them power over these private exploiters. The ideas of socialism had (and in the U. S. at least, have) a big obstacle to overcome, a hard lesson to teach which was obscured by the very setup of capitalism itself. As a social system governed by the blind laws of the market, the economic masters and the political masters were not identical; the Marxist theory of the state taught the relationship that existed between them ("the state is the executive committee of the ruling class") but it is a relationship that is neither self-evident to the naked eye nor automatic and straight-lined in its operation. At some point in his development the rebellious worker, straining against the conditions of life imposed upon him by forces beyond his vision, had to make a leap in his ideas in order to become a socialist. Trade-union consciousness did not automatically turn into socialist consciousness, far from it.

## The Socialist Fight under Stalinism

All this is not so under Stalinism.

Under the Stalinist social system, the capitalist owners of production no longer exist. (This, indeed is the reason why Stalinism is still able to palm itself off falsely on workers in the capitalist countries as "socialism.") Under Stalinism, the means of production are owned and controlled not by private exploiters and regulated by the profit motive, but are owned and controlled by the totalitarian state—which is "owned" and controlled by an uncontrolled bureaucracy, politically organized, who form the new ruling and exploiting class.

Under Stalinism, in other words, the state bureaucracy is not "the executive committee" of the ruling class. It is the ruling class. The economic masters, the direct exploiters visible to the naked eye, are identical with the political masters.

Whereas under capitalism the workers could come spontaneously only to trade-union consciousness—that is, to struggle against the direct exploiters, under Stalinism a struggle against the direct exploiters automatically means a struggle against the state, for power in the state.

What for workers under capitalism requires an ideological leap of which only the vanguard of the class was capable to begin with, for workers under Stalinism is "not the fruit of any theoretical ideas" but is "dictated by the every-day conditions."

The socialist program tends to arise SPONTANEOUSLY, under Stalinism, as the only road of struggle for the ineradicable human aspiration toward freedom.

Stalinism is the first social system where this is true.

Under capitalism, the emphasis of the socialist movement, as it developed, necessarily came to be put on the need to nationalize the factories, mines and mills. This even came to be interpreted, unfortunately, as the sufficient content of so-

cialism. Under Stalinism this is an anachronism. The means of production are already nationalized. There are no private owners to be expropriated. The overthrow of the tyranny and its replacement by the democratic self-organization of the people will find the mines, mills and factories already in their hands.

Tyrannies have been overthrown before by revolts, but the overthrowers had to have "theoretical ideas" in order to know what to do with their victory. They had to have a social program, of greater or lesser complexity. The social program of the movement that will overthrow Stalinism is already, in distorted form, provided by Stalinism itself. The sufficient key to the anti-Stalinist revolution is democracy, which is not provided by the Stalinist regime but which does not have to be imported into the masses by theoreticians.

## When Democracy Equals Socialism

This does not mean that the anti-Stalinist revolution can limit its ideas to one word, nor gainsay the role of deep theoretical understanding in guiding, organizing and fruitifying the struggle. It merely emphasizes that the big jump in "theoretical ideas," ready to be further developed by the vanguard, is spontaneously generated by the "every-day conditions" themselves.

As we wrote in *The New Internationalist* three years ago on this point:

"From a struggle to take the factories out of the hands of the exploiters and therefore to take the state out of their hands, it [the fight for socialism] would become a struggle to take the state out of their hands and thereby the factories. Starkly—even more starkly than today—would the social task be presented to the masses: the state 'owns everything' but we do not own the state; the target is visible without camouflage."

"In present-day terms, the socialist struggle becomes a struggle for 'political democracy'; but this language would be as inadequate and obsolete to describe the social reality as when a savage describes a gun as 'the arrow that kills from afar.' For the content of 'political democracy' under such conditions becomes not a harking back to outlived bourgeois democracy but becomes synonymous with proletarian, socialist revolution and economic democracy. The seizure of the state power by the proletarian democracy already finds the means of production collectivized."

This stresses only one side of the question of the socialist struggle under Stalinism. It is a side that is not, I think, given weight by socialists in the United States and more generally by Western anti-Stalinists. A fair proportion of the ease with which some socialists have gone over to the proposition that Western capitalism must be supported in war against Russia is due to their belief, often explicitly put into words, that a victory of Stalinism in war means an end to the socialist perspective.

It is doubly unfortunate that, for quite different reasons, this same impermissibly and blindly pessimistic conclusion was also put forward by Leon Trotsky (in his argumentation against the theory of Russia as a new type of exploitive society).

The general objection of the West powers to the Far Eastern policy of the United States is that the ultimistic approach of the U. S. may lead to a large-scale war in the Orient which would divert manpower, material, and interest to the Far East—to the detriment of the key area, Europe. The U. S. policy is viewed with all the more misgiving in that, over and beyond this, it is at the moment incoherent, without a set perspective for the immediate and near future, and is the subject of party politics.

## The Other Side

But if socialists on this side of the Iron Curtain have been pushed toward social-patriotism by this view that the triumph of Stalinism would convert the socialist perspective into a Utopia, and that therefore all bets are off on Marxism, the opposite side of the coin is perhaps to be seen among some elements especially in Europe, (including elements in the Ukrainian underground, perhaps) who take an equally one-sided though opposite view of the socialist struggle under Stalinism. This is: that the triumph of Stalinism would, in some sense, make the socialist struggle "easier," or at least that it is necessary before the triumph of socialism can in turn be achieved. It is one of the bases for a kind of pro-Stalinism among some elements who have no other illusions about the nature of the Stalinist regime. It is a defeatist and crippling view, which seizes on only one side of the relationship between the socialist struggle and the Stalinist regime, and grafts onto this side a hopelessness and despair in the ability of the working class to struggle against both capitalism and Stalinism.

Neither capitalism nor Stalinism can kill the inevitable tendency of the people to fight for socialist freedom. The forms of that fight may change but "it is dictated to us by the every-day conditions under which we live and struggle."

# West German Labor Victorious On Issue of Co-Determination

By GORDON HASKELL

As we go to press it appears that the West German labor movement has won its fight for co-determination in the iron, steel and coal industries.

If the reports in the press on the meaning of "co-determination in industry" in Western Germany are accepted at face value, the German workers have won a victory of the greatest historic significance. They have taken an important step toward effective workers' control over the most important German industries from the plant level up to the highest policy-making bodies. They have done this, further, under a conservative coalition government, and without having to carry out their threat to strike the industries involved.

The very size of this victory, achieved with such apparent ease, dictates a degree of caution in the approach of socialists to it. Unfortunately, the only detailed information available at the moment comes to us exclusively from capitalist sources. Until the German labor and socialist press gives us the whole picture from labor's side, we will have to do the best we can with the materials at hand.

On the political side the agreement reached between the unions and the employers, under the mediating efforts of Chancellor Adenauer, is shaking the coalition government to its foundations. In a special cabinet meeting held on Friday, January 26, representatives of the three parties of the governing coalition appeared not as ministers of a united cabinet but as strict party representatives.

It is quite possible that before this issue of LABOR ACTION has reached our readers the West German parliament will have passed a co-determination law with the Christian Democrats and Social Democrats voting together against the other coalition parties. It is quite possible also that the Christian-Democratic Party itself will be split over the co-determination issue.

Exactly what the German labor organizations won? According to an editorial in the *New York Times* of January 27 the main features of the co-determination bill to be presented to the Bundestag will provide as follows: "Labor, as represented by the trade unions, shall have equal representation with the old management in both the board of directors and an executive committee managing each company, as well as in a top organization, called a 'senate,' representing each industry as a whole. As members of these bodies

the trade-union directors and senators will have an equal voice with the old management, not only in matters of wages, hours and working conditions but also in all day-to-day operations, including business policy, production quantity and methods, purchasing, selling, amount of employment, sale or shutdown of plants, and, most important of all, in appointments to all management positions.

"The owners and stockholders are relegated to back seats with little voice in their companies' affairs, and the only check on complete union domination is to be the presence in these bodies of either an 'independent,' a technical, or, in the case of the 'senate,' a government representative, holding the balance of power."

Another report in the *New York Times* for January 26 states that the councils at each plant and mine will be selected as follows: There will be five labor representatives. Two will be selected from among workers at the site, two will represent the trade unions without regard to employment status, and the fifth will be chosen by the workers from among prominent persons in public life. Four of the employer representatives will be selected from among the stockholders,

and the fifth from public life. These two groups will then select an eleventh member of the council.

As for the "senates," it is not as yet clear just how they will be selected, but one report has it that "they undoubtedly will be similar to the traditional German economic chambers representing industry and labor."

Trade-union leaders in Germany have been hailing this agreement and the legislation which will enact it into law as just a start. They have made it clear that they are determined to extend co-determination to all sectors of German economic life.

According to Jack Raymond of the *Times*, co-determination has already been in practice in about 80 per cent of the mines and steel plants which are in trusteeship under the Allied decartelization law. But the unions have been demanding that the federal government at Bonn recognize their permanent right to co-determination.

It is apparent that many aspects of co-determination are still unclear. Aside from the major question of just how extensive the powers of the "senates" will be, there is also the question of what the machinery will be through which the rank-and-file workers can determine their rep-

resentation in the "senates." Actually this is not even completely clear with regard to the plant and mine councils. Will the workers have the right to recall representatives who do not carry out their wishes, including those appointed by the unions and the "public figure" who is supposed to represent them?

One factor which looks good for the workers is the opposition to the whole scheme expressed by spokesmen of American capitalist bodies here. Gordon H. Micheler, chairman of the National Foreign Trade Council's committee on Germany, stated in an interview on January 30 that the outlook for private investment in Western Germany, which looked very bright six months ago, has turned sharply discouraging because of the co-determination measure.

Naturally it would be foolish to base a judgment on the true meaning of co-determination on the reaction to it of American businessmen who are inclined to regard the Fair Deal as socialistic and the British Labor government as very little short of full-blown communism, but the fact that they are strongly against it is worth noting.

THE BASIC GAIN. It should be obvious that even if the councils and workers' representation on senates are chosen democratically, the fact is that in the case of tie votes the "public" member makes the decision. Yet this limitation on the workers' power in these industries need not be decisive in evaluating the measure.

As in all cases in which the assertion of power in a new field

is involved, the decisive factor will be the militancy, determination, and consciousness of the organized workers. It is clear that if the councils and senates will in fact have the powers which the press ascribes to them, the workers' delegates will have to have access to all the industrial, commercial, and financial "secrets" which heretofore have been considered the exclusive property of the capitalists. They will have to make decisions which can be justified to the rank and file. And in their effort to get the support of the ranks for their decisions the information at their disposal will have to be made available to their constituents in one form or another.

In this way, and in a thousand other ways, the road CAN be opened for a much wider training and participation of the workers in the management of industry. In this respect the opportunities are far greater than those afforded the British workers in the industries nationalized by the Labor government.

If co-determination does nothing more than open the door for the workers into the "secrets" of capital and management, it will have accomplished much. The fact that the West German workers have been able to open the door this far is one of the big events in the post-war development of the working-class movement. American socialists and the most conscious trade-unionists will watch this development with the greatest interest, and with the warmest hopes for the success of their German brothers in this pioneering venture.

As in all cases in which the assertion of power in a new field

is involved, the decisive factor will be the militancy, determination, and consciousness of the organized workers. It is clear that if the councils and senates will in fact have the powers which the press ascribes to them, the workers' delegates will have to have access to all the industrial, commercial, and financial "secrets" which heretofore have been considered the exclusive property of the capitalists. They will have to make decisions which can be justified to the rank and file. And in their effort to get the support of the ranks for their decisions the information at their disposal will have to be made available to their constituents in one form or another.

In this way, and in a thousand other ways, the road CAN be opened for a much wider training and participation of the workers in the management of industry. In this respect the opportunities are far greater than those afforded the British workers in the industries nationalized by the Labor government.

If co-determination does nothing more than open the door for the workers into the "secrets" of capital and management, it will have accomplished much. The fact that the West German workers have been able to open the door this far is one of the big events in the post-war development of the working-class movement. American socialists and the most conscious trade-unionists will watch this development with the greatest interest, and with the warmest hopes for the success of their German brothers in this pioneering venture.

As in all cases in which the assertion of power in a new field

is involved, the decisive factor will be the militancy, determination, and consciousness of the organized workers. It is clear that if the councils and senates will in fact have the powers which the press ascribes to them, the workers' delegates will have to have access to all the industrial, commercial, and financial "secrets" which heretofore have been considered the exclusive property of the capitalists. They will have to make decisions which can be justified to the rank and file. And in their effort to get the support of the ranks for their decisions the information at their disposal will have to be made available to their constituents in one form or another.

In this way, and in a thousand other ways, the road CAN be opened for a much wider training and participation of the workers in the management of industry. In this respect the opportunities are far greater than those afforded the British workers in the industries nationalized by the Labor government.

If co-determination does nothing more than open the door for the workers into the "secrets" of capital and management, it will have accomplished much. The fact that the West German workers have been able to open the door this far is one of the big events in the post-war development of the working-class movement. American socialists and the most conscious trade-unionists will watch this development with the greatest interest, and with the warmest hopes for the success of their German brothers in this pioneering venture.

As in all cases in which the assertion of power in a new field

is involved, the decisive factor will be the militancy, determination, and consciousness of the organized workers. It is clear that if the councils and senates will in fact have the powers which the press ascribes to them, the workers' delegates will have to have access to all the industrial, commercial, and financial "secrets" which heretofore have been considered the exclusive property of the capitalists. They will have to make decisions which can be justified to the rank and file. And in their effort to get the support of the ranks for their decisions the information at their disposal will have to be made available to their constituents in one form or another.

In this way, and in a thousand other ways, the road CAN be opened for a much wider training and participation of the workers in the management of industry. In this respect the opportunities are far greater than those afforded the British workers in the industries nationalized by the Labor government.

If co-determination does nothing more than open the door for the workers into the "secrets" of capital and management, it will have accomplished much. The fact that the West German workers have been able to open the door this far is one of the big events in the post-war development of the working-class movement. American socialists and the most conscious trade-unionists will watch this development with the greatest interest, and with the warmest hopes for the success of their German brothers in this pioneering venture.

As in all cases in which the assertion of power in a new field

is involved, the decisive factor will be the militancy, determination, and consciousness of the organized workers. It is clear that if the councils and senates will in fact have the powers which the press ascribes to them, the workers' delegates will have to have access to all the industrial, commercial, and financial "secrets" which heretofore have been considered the exclusive property of the capitalists. They will have to make decisions which can be justified to the rank and file. And in their effort to get the support of the ranks for their decisions the information at their disposal will have to be made available to their constituents in one form or another.

In this way, and in a thousand other ways, the road CAN be opened for a much wider training and participation of the workers in the management of industry. In this respect the opportunities are far greater than those afforded the British workers in the industries nationalized by the Labor government.

If co-determination does nothing more than open the door for the workers into the "secrets" of capital and management, it will have accomplished much. The fact that the West German workers have been able to open the door this far is one of the big events in the post-war development of the working-class movement. American socialists and the most conscious trade-unionists will watch this development with the greatest interest, and with the warmest hopes for the success of their German brothers in this pioneering venture.

As in all cases in which the assertion of power in a new field

is involved, the decisive factor will be the militancy, determination, and consciousness of the organized workers. It is clear that if the councils and senates will in fact have the powers which the press ascribes to them, the workers' delegates will have to have access to all the industrial, commercial, and financial "secrets" which heretofore have been considered the exclusive property of the capitalists. They will have to make decisions which can be justified to the rank and file. And in their effort to get the support of the ranks for their decisions the information at their disposal will have to be made available to their constituents in one form or another.

In this way, and in a thousand other ways, the road CAN be opened for a much wider training and participation of the workers in the management of industry. In this respect the opportunities are far greater than those afforded the British workers in the industries nationalized by the Labor government.

If co-determination does nothing more than open the door for the workers into the "secrets" of capital and management, it will have accomplished much. The fact that the West German workers have been able to open the door this far is one of the big events in the post-war development of the working-class movement. American socialists and the most conscious trade-unionists will watch this development with the greatest interest, and with the warmest hopes for the success of their German brothers in this pioneering venture.

As in all cases in which the assertion of power in a new field

is involved, the decisive factor will be the militancy, determination, and consciousness of the organized workers. It is clear that if the councils and senates will in fact have the powers which the press ascribes to them, the workers' delegates will have to have access to all the industrial, commercial, and financial "secrets" which heretofore have been considered the exclusive property of the capitalists. They will have to make decisions which can be justified to the rank and file. And in their effort to get the support of the ranks for their decisions the information at their disposal will have to be made available to their constituents in one form or another.

In this way, and in a thousand other ways, the road CAN be opened for a much wider training and participation of the workers in the management of industry. In this respect the opportunities are far greater than those afforded the British workers in the industries nationalized by the Labor government.

If co-determination does nothing more than open the door for the workers into the "secrets" of capital and management, it will have accomplished much. The fact that the West German workers have been able to open the door this far is one of the big events in the post-war development of the working-class movement. American socialists and the most conscious trade-unionists will watch this development with the greatest interest, and with the warmest hopes for the success of their German brothers in this pioneering venture.

As in all cases in which the assertion of power in a new field

is involved, the decisive factor will be the militancy, determination, and consciousness of the organized workers. It is clear that if the councils and senates will in fact have the powers which the press ascribes to them, the workers' delegates will have to have access to all the industrial, commercial, and financial "secrets" which heretofore have been considered the exclusive property of the capitalists. They will have to make decisions which can be justified to the rank and file. And in their effort to get the support of the ranks for their decisions the information at their disposal will have to be made available to their constituents in one form or another.

In this way, and in a thousand other ways, the road CAN be opened for a much wider training and participation of the workers in the management of industry. In this respect the opportunities are far greater than those afforded the British workers in the industries nationalized by the Labor government.

representatives in the "senates." Actually this is not even completely clear with regard to the plant and mine councils. Will the workers have the right to recall representatives who do not carry out their wishes, including those appointed by the unions and the "public figure" who is supposed to represent them?

One factor which looks good for the workers is the opposition to the whole scheme expressed by spokesmen of American capitalist bodies here. Gordon H. Micheler, chairman of the National Foreign Trade Council's committee on Germany, stated in an interview on January 30 that the outlook for private investment in Western Germany, which looked very bright six months ago, has turned sharply discouraging because of the co-determination measure.

Naturally it would be foolish to base a judgment on the true meaning of co-determination on the reaction to it of American businessmen who are inclined to regard the Fair Deal as socialistic and the British Labor government as very little short of full-blown communism, but the fact that they are strongly against it is worth noting.

THE BASIC GAIN. It should be obvious that even if the councils and workers' representation on senates are chosen democratically, the fact is that in the case of tie votes the "public" member makes the decision. Yet this limitation on the workers' power in these industries need not be decisive in evaluating the measure.

As in all cases in which the assertion of power in a new field

is involved, the decisive factor will be the militancy, determination, and consciousness of the organized workers. It is clear that if the councils and senates will in fact have the powers which the press ascribes to them, the workers' delegates will have to have access to all the industrial, commercial, and financial "secrets" which heretofore have been considered the exclusive property of the capitalists. They will have to make decisions which can be justified to the rank and file. And in their effort to get the support of the ranks for their decisions the information at their disposal will have to be made available to their constituents in one form or another.

In this way, and in a thousand other ways, the road CAN be opened for a much wider training and participation of the workers in the management of industry. In this respect the opportunities are far greater than those afforded the British workers in the industries nationalized by the Labor government.

If co-determination does nothing more than open the door for the workers into the "secrets" of capital and management, it will have accomplished much. The fact that the West German workers have been able to open the door this far is one of the big events in the post-war development of the working-class movement. American socialists and the most conscious trade-unionists will watch this development with the greatest interest, and with the warmest hopes for the success of their German brothers in this pioneering venture.

As in all cases in which the assertion of power in a new field

is involved, the decisive factor will be the militancy, determination, and consciousness of the organized workers. It is clear that if the councils and senates will in fact have the powers which the press ascribes to them, the workers' delegates will have to have access to all the industrial, commercial, and financial "secrets" which heretofore have been considered the exclusive property of the capitalists. They will have to make decisions which can be justified to the rank and file. And in their effort to get the support of the ranks for their decisions the information at their disposal will have to be made available to their constituents in one form or another.

In this way, and in a thousand other ways, the road CAN be opened for a much wider training and participation of the workers in the management of industry. In this respect the opportunities are far greater than those afforded the British workers in the industries nationalized by the Labor government.

If co-determination does nothing more than open the door for the workers into the "secrets" of capital and management, it will have accomplished much. The fact that the West German workers have been able to open the door this far is one of the big events in the post-war development of the working-class movement. American socialists and the most conscious trade-unionists will watch this development with the greatest interest, and with the warmest hopes for the success of their German brothers in this pioneering venture.

As in all cases in which the assertion of power in a new field

is involved, the decisive factor will be the militancy, determination, and consciousness of the organized workers. It is clear that if the councils and senates will in fact have the powers which the press ascribes to them, the workers' delegates will have to have access to all the industrial, commercial, and financial "secrets" which heretofore have been considered the exclusive property of the capitalists. They will have to make decisions which can be justified to the rank and file. And in their effort to get the support of the ranks for their decisions the information at their disposal will have to be made available to their constituents in one form or another.

In this way, and in a thousand other ways, the road CAN be opened for a much wider training and participation of the workers in the management of industry. In this respect the opportunities are far greater than those afforded the British workers in the industries nationalized by the Labor government.

If co-determination does nothing more than open the door for the workers into the "secrets" of capital and management, it will have accomplished much. The fact that the West German workers have been able to open the door this far is one of the big events in the post-war development of the working-class movement. American socialists and the most conscious trade-unionists will watch this development with the greatest interest, and with the warmest hopes for the success of their German brothers in this pioneering venture.

As in all cases in which the assertion of power in a new field

is involved, the decisive factor will be the militancy, determination, and consciousness of the organized workers. It is clear that if the councils and senates will in fact have the powers which the press ascribes to them, the workers' delegates will have to have access to all the industrial, commercial, and financial "secrets" which heretofore have been considered the exclusive property of the capitalists. They will have to make decisions which can be justified to the rank and file. And in their effort to get the support of the ranks for their decisions the information at their disposal will have to be made available to their constituents in one form or another.

In this way, and in a thousand other ways, the road CAN be opened for a much wider training and participation of the workers in the management of industry. In this respect the opportunities are far greater than those afforded the British workers in the industries nationalized by the Labor government.

## To Western Imperialism—

# HISTORY SAYS: 'NO EXIT'

By JAMES M. FENWICK

The commitment of United States forces in Korea a bare seven months ago by the Truman administration—an irresponsible move that was acted on by neither Congress nor the people and was given only a post-facto endorsement by the United Nations—has been followed by an almost continuous series of crises in United States foreign policy.

The latest crisis centers around the attempt by the United States to condemn Stalinist China as an "aggressor" and to impose sanctions upon her. It is a crisis the basic facts of which have been obscured, thanks to a great deal of distortion by U. S. leaders and less deliberate but more ignorant misrepresentation by the country's press.

Objections to present U. S.

policy come from two sources: (1) Western European capitalist countries and the British Commonwealth, and (2) non-Stalinist Middle East and Far Eastern countries, the most powerful and typical representative of which is India.

The general objection of the West powers to the Far Eastern policy of the United States is that the ultimistic approach of the U. S. may lead to a large-scale war in the Orient which would divert manpower, material, and interest to the Far East—to the detriment of the key area, Europe. The U. S. policy is viewed with all the more misgiving in that, over and beyond this, it is at the moment incoherent, without a set perspective for the immediate and near future, and is the subject of party politics.

France tends toward the British position. It is reported she would have long since recognized the Chinese Stalinist regime had not the United States, upon whom she is dependent for economic and military aid, applied pressure—and had not the Chinese Stalinists recognized the Ho Chi Minh government in Indo-China. When Attlee made his recent hasty trip to the United States following Truman's off-the-cuff philosophizing about using the atom bomb in the Orient, he came with a policy endorsement by French Premier Pleven.

Germany,

# Vote Our Way or Starve! --

(Continued from page 1)

in the UN who does not jump a foot when the American delegates crack the whip.

And now: the Senate Foreign Relations Committee has publicly announced that it has decided to delay action indefinitely on the grant.

Even though nearly a hundred million people stand on the verge of starvation.

Because their government is presently spearheading a powerful movement inside the United Nations to block Washington's demand for war moves against the Chinese regime.

## Three Thoughts

In every other issue of the day's newspapers, we see tear-jerking pictures of Korean refugees, homeless, hungry and hunted, innocent casualties of the war which is being fought over their bodies. The captions tell us that there are the victims of the Stalinist invaders. They are the victims of the U. S. "liberators" who have been even more efficient, if not more callous, in bombing out their villages and laying waste their land. But whatever the crimes of the imperialists, the Korean refugees' hunger is still there and their homes are still gone. The U. S. government, as part of its war, has raised an apparatus to feed them and house them and succor them—at least half as efficiently, we trust, as it organized to render them refugees in the first place.

Why does it refuse to do as much for nearly a hundred million Indian people?

There is something you can do about it.

The current terrible famine in Yugoslavia has received more publicity in this country. The U. S. government has moved to assist them on a massive scale. It did so even though in this project it had to overcome virulent distrust from elements who oppose Tito's regime as "communist" and many who do or did not even believe that the Belgrade-Moscow split was a real one. It put its assistance program through against these obstacles. It meant life for masses of Yugoslav workers and peasants, and it helped the Yugoslav people defend their country against the

Kremlin's conspiracies. Truman proposed this aid, he openly said, in order to try to gain an ally for the U. S. in the cold war.

Why does he withhold life from the Indian people?

This government uses its "charity" as a weapon—at a price.

There is something you can do about it.

Take all the liberals in the country who have given out with hosannas about the outstanding "liberal" plank in Truman's foreign policy, Point Four and its bold new program to aid backward peoples. Lay them end to end and they will not reach quite as far as the millions of Indian people who are facing starvation. But ask them why the U. S., which advertises so loudly that it wants to improve the living conditions of the smaller nations, which advertises its Marshall Plan as a philanthropic institution, is cold-bloodedly condemning nearly a hundred million people to death in order to ram its demands through the UN.

There is something you can do about it.

## It Can Be Stopped

You can demand that the U. S. government begin immediately and without delay to send wheat to India from its plentiful stores. You can raise your voice. Not only by writing to your congressman, but by raising your voice in your trade union!

Your labor leaders have been telling you about the wonders of Point Four (as it will be . . . some day) and the beneficence of the Marshall Plan, and about the horrifying "ends justify the means" philosophy of the damnable Reds and about how that's why they have to be wiped out with atom bombs if need be, and about their callous disregard of life in the Russian slave camps, and the rest—

And any labor leader who remains silent about the blackjacking of the Indian people, while he sings this song, should be booted out of the hall.

Will it be possible to explain to the Indian people why American labor remained silent while its government committed as massive a crime as any brutal world conqueror in history?

The labor movement can do something about this crime. It can change the government's policy on this point at this time. It can, if it has the conscience, the sincerity and the courage of its professions, make the State Department's holdup a stench in the nostrils of public opinion.

Now that the U. S. has succeeded in slugging its resolution through the UN, Washington may consider that it can afford to turn "magnanimous" again, pocket its billyclub, and aid India. It may or may not. It may also yield to that section of bourgeois opinion which thinks it "unwise" to show the mailed fist in full view. Labor CAN swing it.

On a different level, it can also do something else. Only government resources, of course, can bring large-scale relief to so far-spread a calamity as has befallen the Indian people. No lesser agency can do that job. But we remember that about three months ago, the AFL's Labor League for Human Rights together with a CIO agency sent 80,000 pounds of CARE parcels for the relief of striking textile workers in Bombay. . . .

Not even twice that would, we know, relieve the famine. But it would mean, to the Indian people, that American labor repudiates the blackjack strategy of its government, it would be a token of honor. And the American labor movement is strong and rich enough, if not to relieve the famine, at least to make a great contribution toward the life of hundreds of thousands.

Americans have asked, in their ignorance: "How was it possible that the German people sat by idly while Hitler ravaged Europe and the World? Are they, the people, not also responsible?"—They asked this of a people who were Hitler's first victims, crushed under a totalitarian regime where they could not even express their thought, let alone act, without sacrificing their lives and freedom.

And you, in America? Will you be responsible for the starvation of nearly a hundred million Indian people, while you complain quite justifiably about the high price of good red steak?

Ask Philip Murray, ask William Green, ask Walter Reuther, ask your local union's president, vice-president, secretary and sergeant at arms, and ask your fellow trade-unionists. Anyone who does not raise his voice is an accomplice.

# Wage Freeze Soaks Labor --

(Continued from page 1)

against the wage freeze. They only had to vote against it, to say no and the alarm would have been sounded. The full board knew that "a split decision now would mean a precarious launching of the board's career." These words, from the New York Times, mean in simple English, that labor would be in a position to defend itself; that the deceitful cover of impartiality would be ripped off the decrees.

But the labor representatives, again according to the Times, were "ready to live under those conditions [wage freeze] and cooperate in administering the policy." But they were too cowardly to take responsibility for what they agreed to accept; they refused to sign the decree because they would then have to face the reactions of their own rank and file.

Eric Johnston, Economic Stabilization administrator, was eager to get the full membership of the

Wage Board, including its labor representatives, to sign the wage-freeze decree. But all board members, including the representatives of the employers, understood the embarrassing plight of the union officials. Thus the final order appears under the signature of Johnston alone.

## QUILL LETS GO

From first reports it appears that Mike Quill, alone among the prominent labor officials, characterized the wage freeze for what it is. He said: "The order is a shocking blow to American wage-earners and consumers. It is a cowardly retreat on the part of an administration reeling under the blows of profit-mad Wall Street lobbyists." At this moment, we do not have the full text of his statement before us. Does he intend to begin a fight against the "administration" he helped put in office? If not, his bold words become whining in the wind.

William Green marked time with an evasive statement which said in part, "we will await with interest the correct and final interpretation of the order." Like so many other officials, he seeks consolation in future decrees which may modify the rigid aspects of the order in response to dignified requests from hopeful unions politely made. We note however, that the labor representatives on the Wage Board seem to have given a behind-the-scenes nod to the decree in pledging their readiness to comply without waiting for guarantees and without demanding "final interpretations." John L. Lewis and Philip Murray had no comment.

Major UAW contracts provide for automatic annual wage increases to give the workers at least a minimum benefit from rising productivity; in addition, "escalator clauses" protect wages, at least in part, against rising costs of living, by providing for automatic adjustments of wages

every three months. If the price index rises, wages go up in proportion. If the index falls, wages go down within certain set limits. What will be the fate of these provisions?

That is the first test of how deeply the wage freeze will cut into the workers' standard of living. The next adjustments are due on March 1. This question has a very interesting background.

On December 22, the Wage Stabilization Board and the Office of Economic Stabilization clamped a freeze on auto wages until March 1, presumably as a "temporary" measure. The UAW, ten days before, had learned of the imminence of this action. Through Reuther, the UAW immediately appealed to the rest of the labor movement for support. The escalator clause and annual wage improvement were in danger. He reported to all UAW officers, stewards, and committeemen in a special letter, excerpts from which are printed on this page.

## UAW GAINS MENACED

This letter was printed before the recent general price-wage freeze. A United Labor Policy Committee, composed of delegates from the CIO, the AFL, the Machinists, and the railroad brotherhoods pledged itself to defend the UAW contracts. Reuther was able to report, by the end of December, "I am happy to advise you that our aggressive intervention and hard work was crowned with success. The order of the Wage Stabilization Board and the Office of Economic Stabilization, issued December 22, 1950, does not in any way jeopardize or set aside our cost-of-living escalator clauses or the provisions for annual wage improvements."

But the happy confidence of December is outdated in January. The escalator clause is in jeopardy! Asked what would be done about such clauses, Eric Johnston replied, that this is "one of the tough problems." Cyrus S. Ching, chairman of the Wage Board, "was vague about the legality of . . . the escalator clauses in automobile workers contracts," reported

the Times on January 30. It is clear that a decision still has to be made; that labor has not been victorious; and that the fight lies ahead. And so far, there has been no indication of any kind that the government agencies are even toying with the possibility of permitting the annual improvement wage increases.

On the Wage Stabilization Board sit the following three men: Harry Bates of the AFL bricklayers; Emil Rieve of the CIO textile workers; and Elmer Walker of the machinists. Two of them represent not themselves, not even their own internationals, but the CIO and the AFL. And they have permitted the wage freeze; they have allowed the UAW contracts to be endangered without a sharp, public protest. How does this square with the pledges made to the UAW?

The wage freeze calls for the mobilization of the whole labor movement in defense of the living standards of its membership. To quote from Reuther's letter to the UAW, this is "the key to the future economic position of all American labor." In fighting the freeze, the UAW will have to begin what it has been postponing too long: a fight inside the labor movement for militant policies, especially at the conventions and congresses of the CIO. If not now, when?

## Will the Freeze Scrap UAW Gains?

On December 22, the wages of auto workers were "temporarily" frozen, a forewarning of the general wage freeze to come. Walter Reuther, president of the United Automobile Workers (CIO), appealed to the Wage Stabilization Board for assurance that the union's contracts, embodying escalator clauses and provisions for annual wage increases, would be protected. In a letter "to all UAW Officers, Stewards, and Committeemen" toward the end of December, Reuther reported on his work. The passages from this letter given below show what is at stake in the present wage freeze and give labor's case. Reuther is quoting what he then told the Wage Stabilization Board.

"It is obvious that the cost-of-living adjustments provided in our contracts are not inflationary, since they follow the movement in the price index by 90 days. They do not determine the index. They do not cause prices to rise. They reflect the increase in prices 90 days after such increases take place. The purpose of such cost-of-living clauses is to protect workers after such price increases have already taken place. . . .

"Cancellation of the cost-of-living adjustment would in effect serve notice upon workers at the very beginning of the mobilization program that the government does not intend to stabilize the cost-of-living, but, on the contrary proposes to inflict upon them the penalty for its own failure to take effective action to hold prices down. . . .

"The improvement factor in our contract is based upon recognition by management of the right of workers to share in the proceeds of improved technology and increased output per man-hour. It is not more for the same. It is more for more. It does not raise costs. It represents the workers' equity in the expanding productivity of American industry. To cancel this provision of the five-year contract would amount to a decision by the Economic Stabilization Agency that, throughout the years of national mobilization, workers are to be compelled to turn over to employers their hard-won right to share in the proceeds of increased productivity. There is no just basis on which a government agency can make this decision against the workers for the benefit of their employers."

By LEON TROTSKY

## Marxism in the United States

35 Cents . . . . . Order from Independent Socialist Press  
114 West 14 Street  
New York 11, N. Y.