

LABOR ACTION

Independent Socialist Weekly

MARCH 5, 1951

FIVE CENTS

TITO'S TURN TO THE WEST ... page 6

NAACP in New Fight on Jim Crow ... page 7

Socialist Party in Turmoil Again ... page 5

All Hands Chin-Deep in RFC Dirt ... page 2

give!

Dear Readers:

Most of you know that the subscription price barely begins to pay for what it costs us to bring LABOR ACTION to you every week. It never has. In addition, today there is the ever rising cost of publishing . . .

We don't know anyone in Truman's offices who will get us a fat loan from the RFC. We don't want to ask Congress for an aid-to-LABOR ACTION bill while they still haven't gotten around to millions threatened by starvation in India. We don't expect Eric Johnston to roll back the high cost of newspapers.

That leaves—you. And we know that you've always come through. It was never more important than in 1951.

The Independent Socialist League is now launching this year's fund drive for \$12,500, most of which goes to finance the Independent Socialist press—and most of that goes for LABOR ACTION. It also supports *The New Internationalist* and, of course, the ISL itself.

The rest of the story is on page 3.

Won't you help?

The EDITORS

NEW MOVE SHOWS WAY TO SMASH PHONY WAGE DEAL—

Unions Pull Out of All War Boards; Labor-Truman Alliance in Crisis

Will Reuther Take On Post in Wilson's Setup?

By WALTER JASON

DETROIT, Feb. 25—Last week Walter P. Reuther, president of the United Auto Workers (CIO), was prepared to step into high office in the war mobilization setup under Charles E. Wilson, business czar of the organization.

Reuther's appointment had the OK of Wilson and of labor's United Policy Committee.

Although Reuther was ready to assume this new position and thus gamble his future as a union leader, the deal suddenly fell through.

It was called off, because one vital commitment would not be made by Wilson and the business interests who are running the show in Washington.

That commitment was that labor's main demands on the war mobilization setup be granted, demands which vitally affect UAW contracts.

The crisis in Washington and in the UAW is caused by the determination of Wilson and the business interests to deny the UAW members this protection.

It was Reuther, according to press reports, who introduced the motion in the United Labor Policy Committee to pull out of all mobilization boards, as reported elsewhere on this page.—Ed.]

Reuther's hope for a nice and peaceful adjustment of this dispute, and his belief that "economic justice must prevail," have been shattered.

Unless the UAW obtains this minimum agreement in Washington, the auto industry is going to be a hotbed of dissatisfaction and wildcat strikes, even if President Truman or anyone else calls the auto workers "a bunch of Russians" a thousand times.

THREATEN STRIKES

Washington just doesn't know what a keg of dynamite it is storing up for explosion in March or in June, or at any other time that the UAW ranks are denied the provisions of their contracts. Reuther knows, and the entire UAW leadership knows. That is one reason why such efforts are being made to win concessions from Wilson in Washington.

In the past week, Reuther ordered every international union representative to contact all companies he negotiates with, and inform them that if Washington canceled the wage provisions of the UAW contracts the companies could expect a strike.

Management took the hint, and in most cases called Washington and suggested that if Washington wanted war production they had better give the UAW its minimum demands.

This is such a hot issue that Reuther hasn't called huge auto workers' mass meetings to ex-

(Continued on page 5)

BULLETIN

MARCH 1—Labor's walkout from all war mobilization agencies precipitates a crisis in its strained relations with the Truman administration. The charges and demands that accompanied their resignation from the wage board were repeated by the United Labor Policy Committee in even more extreme language. "To continue to serve on defense agencies," said its manifesto, "would merely delude the public and the wage earners into believing that labor acquiesces in what is being done." It repeats that they are "thoroughly disillusioned."

After excoriating Wilson who wants "window dressing, supplied by labor to cover the back-room activities of the leaders of industry, it adds: "He will get no such window dressing from the men and women of American labor." These are almost exactly the words and phrases employed by Walter Reuther who suggested that labor will pull out representatives from all boards over a week ago. It would appear then, that this time Reuther has seized the chance of giving the labor movement a sharp push toward militancy.

It becomes increasingly difficult for labor leaders to escape a drastic reconsideration of their attitude toward Truman. "We have spelled out our indictment in detail to the president," they report. But it is perfectly clear that Johnston's approval of "Regulation 6," which exploded into a sharp fight, was not an action taken on his own initiative but a result of a conscious decision of Truman, who is now about to retire from the scene for a vacation in Florida where the weather is more healthful. The ULPC repudiates efforts of Truman to escape responsibility: "We are offered the lame excuse that on other important policies the decisions must be made by a Congress which is not cooperating with the administration." And this "lame excuse," treated so contemptuously, is identical with the argument employed by these same labor leaders, in the past, to justify their support of an administration which carried on no fight for labor's rights. How can they justify such a policy in the future?

One outstanding "friend of labor," Senator Humphrey of Minnesota, elected with union help, thinks that an investigation is necessary to discover "just what are the elements of discontent." Where has he been for the last few weeks? And for that matter, where are all the "friends" of labor? Why don't they speak out in ringing words? Why don't they rally to the support of labor and defend its actions to the world? These "Fair-Deal" Democrats show what they really are in such crises as this: fair-weather dealers, never around when a real fight breaks out.

Where do we go from here? One danger sign is evident. The ULPC expresses its willingness to rejoin a "reconstituted wage board." That could only mean a resumption of a "window dressing role." First step: Off the wage board. Second step: Off all boards. And now for the indicated and necessary third step: Out of the Democratic Party, for a Labor Party!

[The stories that follow describe the situation as it developed during the week.—Ed.]

By BEN HALL

FEBRUARY 28—Stabilization Director Eric Johnston has finally come out with the "compromise" proposal on wages which, he evidently thinks, will lure labor's representatives back onto the Wage Stabilization Board to resume their "window dressing" role. It adds up, however, to virtually nothing more than the deal already offered by Truman, which labor had already rejected. It is, in effect, a slap in the face of the United Labor Policy Committee. Johnston has signed the order limiting wage gains to 10 per cent.

As a substitute for any real concessions, Johnston has offered the maintenance of fringe benefit payments where these are already provided for in existing contracts, but he prohibits such provisions in new contracts except as part of the 10 per cent. Every unionist knows what this means especially in hampering organization of the unorganized. Another "concession" is limited allowance for escalator clauses and annual-improvement provisions.

(Turn to last page)

Congress Strains 'Quality of Mercy': India Aid Still Keyed To U. S. Foreign Policy

By ABEL BAKER

Hearings on the bills to send wheat and other foods to India got under way in Congress this week with the kind of ill will and lassitude that has become standard practise whenever a measure containing an element of progressiveness comes before it. Predictions were freely made that it would be some time before the bills were actually reported out of committees, even though large groups of congressmen had presumably endorsed them.

The possibility also loomed that whatever was finally enacted might be too late, unless additional pressures were brought to bear. Shadowing the entire proceeding is the reality of threatening starvation for unknown millions unless substantial food shipments are made by June. The summer months are crucial and it will take some time to get the program under way even after Congress has acted.

The testimony that made most

news was that given by J. J. Singh, head of the India League, who tried to deny any serious differences between the attitudes and policies of the State Department and of Nehru. Singh gave the congressional committee the kind of assurance it wanted to hear: that India will not depart from the basic policy lines of Washington and that the New Delhi government is just as dedicated to fighting Stalinism as Washington itself.

It is interesting that the political question continues to be the focus of the entire issue. In spite of assertions by both Truman and Acheson, most of the questions posed by the committee which has to give sanction to the aid were around India's foreign policy and its differences on the Korean question. It is clear that a maximum of moral pressure is being used against India. Protestations of humanitarianism are a cover for the kind of

(Turn to last page)

BIG BUSINESS WAS THE 'FIXER'—

All Hands Chin-Deep in RFC Dirt, Including Congress Investigators!

By PETER WHITNEY

Need a loan? Just drop into the friendly office of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation where helpful directors will stumble all over themselves to do you a favor.

Of course, before you visit the RFC, protocol demands that you drop in on your senator and congressman, telling him if it's \$300,000 or \$500,000 that you need, and he'll write you the proper recommendation. Really not much trouble at all for him; he could practically dash it off before you could say RFC.

After all, since 1941 congressmen have written some 900 letters to the RFC on behalf of loan applicants. By now the more enterprising members must have mimeographed forms which just have to be filled in. These 900 letters were saved from oblivion in the RFC files by President Truman's demand that they be turned over to him—and not because of any literary interest on his part in making a comparative study of letter-writing techniques, a field in which he has had some recent difficulties.

Well does Truman know how embarrassing letters can be! In this case, they were to be used as a bludgeon against the Senate banking subcommittee which is presently investigating political influence and favoritism in RFC loan operations. Among those who wielded the influence to get loans running into the millions of taxpayers' money were Donald Dawson, presidential patronage aide; E. Meri Young, ex-RFC examiner and husband of a White House employee; RFC directors themselves; and prominent Washington lawyers, including the Democratic national chairman.

The president, an experienced hand at such retaliatory moves, requested the file of these letters shortly after the committee's first report, which he denounced as "asinine," revealed that White House circles had played the influence game along with everybody else. This news "leaked" out to the committee just after it had put several witnesses through some grueling questionings.

POT AND KETTLE

Young denied the committee's charge that he had been ready to sell his influence around the White House (at times posing as a relative of Truman) for sizable sums of money including a demanded fee of \$85,000 to push through a Texan's petroleum loan.

Another witness on the stand, present RFC director William Willett, admitted that he had played hop-scotch with authorized procedure and helped out a friend to the tune of a \$300,000 loan. Just to make the picture real cozy, the friend was C. Edward Rowe, who later became a director himself and even worked his way up to vice-chairman. These two directors were origi-

nally renominated by President Truman for their posts despite the committee's findings.

Other interesting revelations concerned an RFC examiner who recommended a loan of over \$6,000,000 to the Central Iron & Steel Company. Hardly had the money changed hands when the examiner moved into the firm's law offices at a salary of \$15,000 a year, with \$5,000 paid in advance (for services rendered?). In addition, there was much testimony about Kaiser-Frazer auto loans, which the committee members conservatively labeled as "self-contradictory" and "evasive."

The committee was not much more successful when it attempted to get to the bottom of the when, why, and wherefore of President Truman's request for the file of congressional RFC letters. Despite the unusual nature of this request, no one seemed willing to shed light on its origin. After much hemming and hawing, the source was determined as President Truman himself, and his patronage dispenser, Dawson, named in the committee's report as a suspect himself. By strange coincidence, the RFC's files are in charge of Mrs. Dawson, and the request for them was OK'd by the RFC's chairman himself.

The president's request for the congressional letter-writing file led to prompt confessions from the Senate subcommittee members that they too had the letter-writing habit. In particular, the committee's chairman, Senator Fulbright of Arkansas, was asked by a radio commentator if he had intervened with the RFC on behalf of an Arkansas constituent back in 1948. "From the circumstances," Fulbright stated, "it was obvious that the commentator was checking up on a tipoff from someone informed by or within the RFC." Fulbright insisted that this was just an attempt to embarrass him and discredit the work of the committee.

BIG BUSINESS ROLE

Another committee member, Paul Douglas of Illinois, quickly revealed that he too had been guilty of putting pressure on the RFC and admitted that he now considered such action "improper." The question now is: Who will investigate the investigators?

There is no love lost between President Truman and Senator Fulbright. It was Fulbright who suggested that Truman resign from the presidency after the 1946 elections revealed his waning support, and Truman is not known for his forgiving spirit. So far both have proved about equally adept at slinging mud, and both appear to have a rich supply to work with.

For our part, we hiss them both on, and in the process we may get a clearer picture of the political corruption and spoilsism in action. However, since everybody in Washington seems to be

in on this act, we're wondering if there are sufficient influence-free people to form an investigating committee.

It should be kept in mind that this is not just an ordinary case of "corruption in government." In the first place, it is hard to recall any previous scandal which so thoroughly infiltrated every level of the government and every nook and cranny of the ruling parties (both of them).

In the second place, that portion of the dirt which has come to the surface is enough to show that big business, where its immediate interests are involved, uses direct and indirect corruption and bribery as a systematic means of getting what it wants. The methods are pretty crude and indirect

when it is a matter of loans in cold cash. The methods are more subtle when it is a matter of getting their interests written into laws.

A thought for the reader: In the recent New York basketball scandal, most commentators put the emphasis on punishing the corrupters, rather than the individuals corrupted. In the RFC scandal, it is not unlikely that some minor and unimportant heads will fall in the latter category; but the corrupting agents, the confidence men of big business... are being and will be set to work running the war mobilization setup! In this capacity, the dollar-a-year men don't have to be corrupted; they are more than ready to give big business what it wants in all "honesty."

PHILADELPHIA

Unions Form Anti-Racist Group

By FRANK HARPER

PHILADELPHIA, February 24 — A conference on "Labor and Human Rights" was held today in the Broadwood Hotel under the joint auspices of the CIO, AFL and the railroad brotherhoods. The conference was organized by a joint local Labor Committee for Human Rights and was the first of a series to be held each year during "Brotherhood Week."

The keynote session was chaired by James L. McDewitt, president of the Pennsylvania Federation of Labor, with greetings extended by Henry F. Shipper, president of the Philadelphia CIO. The first speaker, Dr. Frank Loesch, is director of the Philadelphia Fair Employment Practices Commission. He expressed pride in the work of the local FEPC but warned that dangerous racial, religious, and national tensions continued to exist in the city. The city—with one-third of its population white Protestant, one-third white Catholics, one-sixth Jewish, and the remaining one-sixth Negro—is a breeding ground for discrimination and bigotry.

The keynote address was given by Charles S. Zimmerman, vice-president of the International Ladies Garment Workers (AFL). Prejudices have always been nurtured and exploited by the reactionaries to attack the union movements, he said. Tracing the course of anti-Semitism in modern times, the speaker recalled that the term "Jew" had been used in Germany since the late 19th century to use ethnic prejudices as weapons against the socialist and labor leaders. Zimmerman stressed that unions must work to wipe out bigotry and discrimination both within the unions and in the community. There must be no discrimination in the union itself. Membership should be open to all, and every union administration, activity, and function should be operated in the most democratic manner without regard to race, color, creed, and national origin. He warned that

in the present and coming periods of stress and hardships many of the smoldering coals of racial and ethnic hate would flare up, and stated that the unions, as the most vital and democratic force in society, must provide the leadership to quench the flame. One essential step is the passage of a national FEPC law.

BEHIND THE TIMES

Curiously enough, the keynote speech, although enlightening and vigorous, seemed archaic. The speaker did not deal at all with the curtailments of civil liberties that have taken place here in America in the post-war period and the possible further curtailment due to increasing militarization, concentration of governmental power, and war mobilization in the period ahead. His few

BUFFALO HEARS MAX SHACHTMAN ON "THIRD CAMP"

BUFFALO, Feb. 14—Fresh from his debate with Alexander Keren-sky at the University of Chicago, Max Shachtman spoke at a successful meeting here on February 11, sponsored by the local branch of the Independent Socialist League. The topic was "The Third Force in World Politics."

Comrade Shachtman drew a detailed picture of American and Russian imperialism, their futile, devastating struggle for supremacy, and the impermissibility of socialists and internationalists supporting either side in this conflict.

Dramatically illustrating the hopeless plight of the Korean people, the speaker asked the audience to imagine their own reactions in a hypothetical war between Mexico and Canada in the streets of Buffalo. A lively question and discussion period followed the presentation, in which a number of University of Buffalo students present in the audience participated.

ISL FUND DRIVE \$12,500 Is the Goal —

Give — for Independent Socialist Press!

By ALBERT GATES
ISL Fund Drive Director

On March 1 of this year, the Independent Socialist League opened its annual National Organization and Press Fund Drive. This year, the goal is \$12,500.

As all militants and socialists know, a socialist working-class organization always has difficulty financing its political and propaganda activities. Its only source of income is its members and sympathizers. They bear the brunt of the demands of their organization and its press.

The ISL is no exception to this rule. Its regular day-to-day income never suffices (it never has) to pay the costs of its staff or its press, and this income needs always to be supplemented by special efforts such as the annual fund drive with which readers are familiar.

Foot the Bill for 1951!

Inflationary printing costs make our task more difficult. As all our readers know by their own personal experiences, living costs are at a record high. As one old wag put it: "You can't beat the system." And so we have to ask for assistance to keep our wonderful LABOR ACTION and New International going.

A successful Fund Drive would insure the operations of the ISL and the maintenance of LABOR ACTION and The New International FOR ANOTHER YEAR!

If our readers will remember, the Fund Drive of 1950

had among other objectives the issuance of *The New International* in a new format and bi-monthly. As you now know, we succeeded in that venture because the drive was successful and we have given you an excellent theoretical magazine.

We want to do even better in the coming year, during which period the Independent Socialist League will hold its sixth regular convention. The convention will make important decisions about the propaganda work of the ISL and the fund drive will help considerably in making that convention a success.

Our Friends Must Help

Next week, LABOR ACTION will begin to carry the box score on the drive. Branches of the ISL have already selected their drive directors and we have been given assurances from various centers that the goals set for them will be met. The Socialist Youth League, which went way over its quota last year, promises to go beyond its higher quota of 1951.

We are now calling upon all our friends, readers of our press and sympathizers, to join in this campaign and to help us beat our goal.

Send all moneys to, and make checks payable to the Independent Socialist League or Albert Gates, 114 West 14 Street, New York 11, N. Y.

Quotas are given in the accompanying box.

QUOTAS	
TOTAL	\$12,500
Akron	100
Baltimore	50
Boston	50
Buffalo	850
Chicago	1800
Cleveland	300
Connecticut	50
Detroit	800
Indiana	100
Los Angeles	550
Minnesota	10
New York City	4200
Newark	300
Oakland	650
Oregon	50
Philadelphia	450
Pittsburgh	150
Reading	100
St. Louis	50
Seattle	300
Soc. Youth League	500
Streator	25
Youngstown	100
General	975

CONTRIBUTE to the ISL FUND DRIVE!

Independent Socialist League
114 West 14 Street
New York 11, N. Y.

Enclosed is \$..... as my contribution to the ISL's 1951 Fund Drive.

NAME
ADDRESS
CITY STATE

(Make checks payable to Independent Socialist League or Albert Gates.)

German Group Appeals to Stop Stalinist Kidnapping in Berlin

The resolution from a German group which we print below was sent to LABOR ACTION with a request that we publicize it and endorse it. This we do gladly, and we urge readers of our paper to draw its contents to the attention of those political and labor organizations to which they belong.

It will be noted that the resolution directs its demands for protection against the Stalinist gangsters in Germany to the government of the West German republic and to the occupying authorities. It is perfectly proper for German socialists and liberals, whose country is still occupied by foreign troops, to demand that the powers who unjustly retain decisive control in their country also assume the normal governmental obligation to protect them from gangster-like political attacks. We in the United States, and particularly the American labor movement, have the duty of demanding of Washington that it take effective measures to protect the civil liberties of the German anti-Stalinist socialists and liberals.

RESOLUTION

The brutal disregard for basic democratic rights by the government which rules in the East Zone of Germany has assumed such proportions that it has aroused the protest of all people who do not live under dictatorships. Just as under Hitler, freedom of political opinion has been practically abrogated for years in the Soviet zone of occupation. Tens of thousands of guiltless people have been thrown into concentration camps, and many hundreds have been sentenced to decades of forced labor or even death without legal trial. As if this were not enough, the despots of the East Zone are increasingly attempting to extend their terrorist practices to the territory beyond the borders of their sovereignty.

Acts of violence against political opponents of the Soviets are increasing in number. Such crimes, like the kidnapping of the high school teacher Alfred Weiland in Western Berlin, and the attempts which failed at the last moment on the journalists Niekie and Dewald and many others, indicate clearly the terrible danger which emanates from the East German totalitarianism. It is high time for a united

This demand must be pressed firmly. However, at the same time it is likely the duty of independent socialists to emphasize that the whole experience of the anti-Stalinist socialist and labor movement demonstrates that the most effective defense against Stalinist gangsterism can be achieved only by the organized independent action of the workers themselves.

The workers of Western Berlin should demand that they be permitted to form defense guards, and to arm them effectively. The American labor movement should press the American government

DETROIT UAW Elections — Reutherites Sweep Vote

DETROIT, Feb. 25—Returns from a major United Auto Workers local elections show a very strong organizational victory for the pro-Reuther forces, and indicate that the Reuther leadership remains in undisputed control of the UAW.

For the first time in recent years, the large Hudson local union elected a pro-Reuther delegation to the forthcoming international union convention. At the big Briggs, Dodge and Chrysler locals, the Reuther forces won without much trouble.

At Ford Local 600, Carl Stellato established himself as an up-and-coming figure in the UAW by his triumph in the local union elections. His 15,000-odd votes were almost double those of his two major opponents, Tommy Thompson, middle-of-the-road candidate for president, and Joseph Hogan, left-wing candidate.

Thompson's poor showing was a surprise. Hogan's 8,000-odd votes were more than Reuther forces conceded he would obtain. The tragic fact is that Stellato's re-buffing campaign for the past year, backed by plenty of campaign funds and forces from the Reuther leadership, assured him of victory.

A run-off is necessary because Stellato failed to get a clear majority of all votes cast, but his election is assured.

Already there is much talk that Stellato might be promoted to the post of regional director because of his show of strength.

In these and other important elections covering more than 200,000 workers in the Detroit area, the Reuther forces triumphed easily. In fact, the results were far greater than they expected.

IN BROOKLYN:

WAR BETWEEN EAST AND WEST— IS IT INEVITABLE?

MAX SHACHTMAN, National Chairman ISL
A. J. MUSTE, Fellowship of Reconciliation
COURTLAND HASTINGS, World Federalists

WEDNESDAY, March 7 at 8:30 p.m.

At P. S. 167, Eastern Pkway. & Schenectady Ave.
Auspices: Parkway Community Council Admission free

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.

THE BRITISH POLITICAL SCENE IS PORTRAYED EACH WEEK

— IN — THE SOCIALIST LEADER Britain's Foremost Weekly

Yearly Subscription—Three Dollars
Shorter Periods Pro Rata

Order from:
SOCIALIST LEADER

318 Regents Park Road
Finchley, London, N. 3, England

Subscribers — Attention!

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

15-10

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

RENEW NOW!

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

GROUP ORGANIZATION UNDER THE LENS

By CARL DARTON

"In most of our daily lives we operate not simply as individuals but as members of groups. . . . Philosophers and social scientists have given a great deal of study to specific forms of group organization—the family, the state, the church, commerce, industry, and so forth. But what about the basic laws of organization itself? Are there laws that apply to the behavior of human groups in general regardless of the particular activity?"

There are probably few investigations which would be of more concern to socialists than the kind described in the above quote from "People in Groups" by David B. Hertz and Sandra Lloyd Lesser in the *Scientific American*, February 1951.

One of the most important tenets of Marxism is that, in the developed capitalist society, the individual becomes a part of a new group—the workers in the factory. This new group is of more importance than previously existing groups such as the family. Most socialists advocate that the factory groups be organized under workers' control in the belief that, even in matters of factory production, "we can do it better democratically."

One of the investigations outlined by Hertz and Lesser was conducted at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology to determine "how various patterns of communication would affect a group's behavior."

"They gathered a group of five people and gave them problems to solve jointly. The five did not discuss the problem as a group but sat in separate cubicles, communicating with one another only by written messages. . . .

"Several patterns of communication were tested. . . . In the first, the five cubicles were arranged in a circle. . . . The significant feature of this arrangement is that each of the five is exactly on a par with the others in ease of communication with his colleagues. In the second pattern the five members were placed in a straight line. Now one member of the group [the person in the middle] had a marked advantage over the others. . . . The third arrangement, which represents a pattern of communication which occurs commonly in business organizations, placed the members in an inverted Y pattern. . . . Here one person at the hub of the group controls all the others because they can only communicate through him."

The results of this investigation showed:

- (1) "The less democratic arrangements results in a faster solution of the problem."
- (2) "In both the straight line and the inverted Y pattern the person in the central position invariably becomes the leader."
- (3) "Yet after a while the gain from high centralization of authority in these experiments was offset by another factor: the outlook of the group members. In general, all persons in the circular pattern were happy at the task. . . . In the less democratic group only the central member expressed comparable satisfaction. The other four members of his team became dissatisfied and their work performance dropped."

Interesting Questions Raised

These investigations raise the very interesting question: "Is leadership primarily a function of one's position in a communication pattern or of inherent personal characteristics? What factors affect the quality of leadership?"

Several other investigations are summarized. An Ohio State University group studied organizational charts of various industries. They found that: "The formal organization, important as it is for the maintenance of authority and control, may become inefficient for getting work done. Informal communications then evolve. Individual contacts are concerned with those who are actively engaged in carrying out the same work regardless of level in the organization and of the formal communications pattern." (It would appear that many key administrators, executives, and managers are nothing but dead wood and top brass.)

The third set of studies summarized is of the interaction of people in groups. "Whenever a group attempts to perform a task, tensions are likely to arise among its members. The tensions may become so acute that the members are sidetracked into an attempt to solve their socio-emotional problems instead of proceeding with the tasks at hand."

In charge of these studies is Robert Bales, a Harvard sociologist. "Bales is carrying out investigations to show that the interactions of small groups is a key to what may be expected of larger similar groups. . . . By the use of standard techniques in the various social sciences the Harvard investigator is attempting to apply his findings to the analysis of full-scale social systems."

All of these investigations are but fragmentary and limited in scope and no generalizations should be made. However, socialists realize that much greater insight may be gained from these and similar studies of social organization than from either probing of man's moral nature or from mechanical extensions of Darwinian theories of natural selection.



LABOR ACTION

Independent Socialist Weekly

Vol. 15, No. 10

March 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 4-4222.

Subscription rate: \$2.00 a year; \$1.00 for six months. (\$2.25 and \$1.15 for Canada and Foreign.) Re-entered as second-class matter May 24, 1940, at the Post Office at New York, N. Y., under the act of March 3, 1874.

Editor: HAL DRAPER

Assistant Editors: MARY BELL and L. G. SMITH
Business Manager: L. G. SMITH

Opinions and policies expressed in the course of signed articles by contributors do not necessarily represent the views of Labor Action, which are given in editorial statements.

Reading from Left to Right

BRITAIN HAS HER "KOREA" TOO, by Joseph Fromm—U. S. News & World Report, March 2.

It is probably necessary to remind our readers that Britain (like France in Indo-China) is still carrying on its own little "dirty war" in Asia, while Korea gets the headlines. And it's still a stalemate: while Stalinists seem to be in the leadership of the guerrilla struggle, there can be little doubt that behind the struggle is the desire of the native people for independence from imperialist control.

The magazine's regional editor cables that the guerrillas are "tying down 25,000 British troops and a native force of 110,000"—not a very small war. "Fighting costs, to Britain, are running at 100 million dollars a year, and the figure is going up all the time. . . . The British figure they might gain the upper hand in 3 to 5 years. But, so far, they are barely able to hold their own."

The fighting "is making life miserable for European rubber and tin producers at a time when their enterprises are booming." And profits too: "In fact, Malaya is in the midst of the greatest boom in its history, where a year ago it was on the brink of depression. World-wide rearmament has sent the prices and demand for tin and rubber skyrocketing. And Malaya [that is, the plantation and mine owners] sells to any country willing to pay the price—east or west." The British argue that the Russians could get their rubber elsewhere anyway, particularly from Indonesia.

Fromm makes quite clear in the course of his rather objective account that the British cannot rely in the least on the Chinese who form a large part of the population (and of the exploited working class). The guerrillas depend on the people for their support; the British want to cut between the two. So: "To do so, they are carrying on a mass transfer of 400,000 Chinese squatters to new settlements, away from the jungle's rim, where they can be kept under police protection [sic] and observation. More than 100,000 already have been moved." The West writes about such mass uprooting of people too, when it happens behind the Iron Curtain.

"As a consequence, the cost of the war is going steadily upward. The program of moving the squatters alone runs into hundreds of thousands of dollars. But this mounting price of the war is more than offset by the soaring earnings from rubber and tin."

To what extent the guerrilla movement is organized as a genuine national-liberation movement and to what extent it has been rendered completely subservient to Stalinist (i.e., Russian) interests, we have unfortunately no means of knowing in this country. But whatever the answer to that question, and the conclusion from it, it is perfectly clear that the Stalinists have made themselves a base there by capitalizing on the just and legitimate anti-imperialist and nationalist aspirations of the people—against a British imperialism which has definitely not changed its spots wherever it could help it.

WORLD POLITICS

ITALIAN CP REBELS FACE QUESTION: "WHERE TO NOW?"

By PAUL ROBERTS

The rebellion against Moscow control within the Italian Stalinist Party continues to spread. Latest reports from Italy speak of the spread of the revolt to the city of Mantua, in North Central Italy, where the break from the Communist Party is led by party leader Zaccaria, director of the cooperative movement Bertazzoni and former Trade Union Council head Bonventi.

Further, in the village of Capaccio, near Salerno in Southwest Italy, the Stalinist mayor and the local CP secretary have also broken. In the meanwhile the revolt has been doing some spreading in the ranks of the CP-puppet "socialist" party of Nenni. The revolt in the Nenni party is led by Gian-Carlo Matteotti. Matteotti, one of the sons of the famous socialist who was murdered by the Fascists, had been showing signs of revolt for some time, but has now come out and broken. (This Matteotti is not to be confused with his brother, who is a member of an entirely non-Stalinist group.)

A United Press report speaks of the number of people who have openly announced their break from the CP in support of the original rebel leaders Magnani and Cucchi as being in the neighborhood of 700. It is believed that the rebel leaders are planning on meeting soon to call a congress in Milan to launch a new party. Judging from the scattered quotations thus far received of their programmatic stand (see LABOR ACTION, Feb. 19 and 26) the new group has something in common with a similar group in Germany, although this is somewhat modified by the influence of Ignazio Silone and the PSU (left

center socialists).

The German group, the Independent Workers Party, has won over hundreds of CPers, both local and national. Leaders of this group, including men like Joseph Schappe, who both before and after World War II was one of the editors of the CP central newspaper, and Wolfgang Leonhard, Russian-trained leader in the Russian-zone CP who fled to Belgrade and thence to West Germany, are noted for their sympathetic attitude toward Tito's Yugoslavia.

The German Stalinist party

having always been a much more "solid" and disciplined organization than the Italian CP, it is to be expected that the group led by Schappe will be much more close-knit than that led by deputies Magnani and Cucchi.

As a matter of fact, there are already some signs that some of those who broke with the CP "in solidarity with" the two deputies, are finding their way over to the right. This is particularly true of some of the Stalinists' former following in backward peasant regions in Southeastern Italy.

Nehru Regime Takes It Out On Censor after LA's Exposure

Sequel to LABOR ACTION's expose of the illegal mail censorship being carried on by Nehru's government in India:

In our July 31 issue last year, LABOR ACTION reproduced a document, enclosed by mistake in a bundle of literature sent us by the Socialist Party of India, which turned out to be the secret form used by Nehru's political-police department to keep tabs on mail which it has opened.

Janata, the Indian SP's weekly, later republished it together with our accompanying story.

Now, in the December 10 issue of Janata, we find the following report, which explains itself.

"Readers of Janata may remember the CID Interception Report of a packet of party literature sent to America, which we reproduced from Labor Action. That had called the bluff of our embassy staff in New Delhi, went on loudly proclaiming that censorship of private mail was unheard of in this democratic country! It has also exposed to the hilt the limits to which the Congress Party bosses could go to suppress all opposition. "We now understand that instead of correcting their ways and

making amends for the wanton breach of fundamental rights guaranteed under the Constitution, the government of India have launched on vindictive punitive action against an officer who was made the scapegoat of the grand exposure. We hear that a sub-inspector attached to the section which deals with censorship is being discharged from service on account of that exposure.

"It is not our intention to penalize the subordinate employees who, after all, carry out the dictates of their bosses. The purpose of that exposure was to show the authorities in their true colors. It is unbecoming of the government to use it against an ordinary employee, to safeguard whose anonymity we had deliberately blacked out the signature. Will anybody in the parliament get up and ask the prime minister or the home minister about this? Will they find out whether a petty officer could be penalized thus?"

WEEK by WEEK...

LABOR ACTION screens and analyzes the week's news, discusses the current problems of labor and socialism. A sub is only \$2 a year!

SP Leaders Move to Reverse Line Of Convention on Political Action

By GORDON HASKELL

Just nine months ago the Socialist Party of the United States held a convention in Detroit. By a thumping majority of 70-37 that convention defeated a proposal that the party de-emphasize electoral activity, and that members of the party be permitted to support "progressive" candidates on the tickets of the Democratic or Republican Parties whenever the SP is not running candidates. The majority reaffirmed the necessity of running SP candidates wherever possible, including in national elections, and elected a majority of its national committee on the basis of this stand.

At that time, our report on the convention stated: "There was no significant talk of split after the crucial vote on political action, but it is a fact that Thomas' forces [the minority] are determined to change the course of action adopted by the convention." (June 19, 1950)

And now, just nine months later, this effort which started right after the convention, has resulted in an 11-2 vote of the National Executive Committee to conduct a national referendum in which substantially the same proposal to de-emphasize electoral activity is favorably recommended by the committee.

We do not wish to comment here primarily on the political implications for the SP of an adoption or rejection of the proposal. The broad-scale political problem which is wracking the SP is clear enough: What future is there for a political organization which in policy and program has nothing more to offer than the much more powerful and appealing force of the liberal wing of the labor movement and its political reflections, the ADA and Liberal Party?

Says Many "Ignored" Convention Line

But the present immediate straits of the party are the product of a much smaller, a more petty political-organizational problem: How can a political organization continue to live if a powerful minority in it feels a greater loyalty to outside forces than to the party, and the majority does not have the courage or the political and personal resources with which to replace this minority in the leadership of the party?

The referendum call which appears in the current February 23 issue of the Socialist Call, bi-weekly organ of the SP, is accompanied by two statements on why, nine months after a convention decision, the party is confronted with a referendum the purpose of which is to reverse that decision.

The statement for the majority of the NEC, signed by Darlington Hoopes (a former leader of the anti-Thomas majority) and by Norman Thomas, states that life itself had demonstrated during the past election that the party could not run candidates in many vital districts:

"Lacking Socialist tickets to support," write Hoopes and Thomas, "or affirmative Party action of any sort with regard to any candidates, the Party over large areas was hurt on the one hand by apathy and on the other by disregard for the Detroit resolution. The latter was ignored by many socialists who, still loyal to democratic socialism, felt that they could not be completely inactive in campaigns. The Michigan party reported that it had suffered greatly under these circumstances and that it found that it could restore morale and initiate new activity on the basis of the substitute resolution which it presented to the NEC." (This resolution was the basis for the one presented in referendum.)

"Deliberately Violated Decision"

What do these ambiguous lines refer to? Samuel H. Friedman, who signed the minority statement on the referendum, is quite specific:

"To explain how the NEC came to consider such a recommendation the statement would have to report that prominent members of the minority position at Detroit had gone back to their localities and deliberately violated the majority decision and that in some instances—the Michigan instance cited favorably is a case in point—had launched a campaign against the Party decision (publicly supporting Democratic Party candidates, and keeping the Party in constant turmoil so that both electoral and other work was stymied) and had forced the Michigan comrades to arrive at a 'compromise'—a compromise where the side which represented the Party decision GAVE IN and thus 'morale' was restored."

Friedman goes on to point out that when the Bridgeport SP had

lined up with reactionaries, the NEC at first didn't condemn them, and then proposed that "every section of the party be permitted to do the same thing." He states, further, that although he was in favor of the party re-examining the situation, he was against a recommendation by the NEC when prominent members of it had contributed to the crisis in the party which requires this re-examination by openly violating the convention decisions.

From the above it is clear that the determination of the Thomas forces to change the party position was so great that all considerations of party loyalty and democratic procedure were brushed aside. In Michigan, where the UAW leadership was in an all-out campaign to capture the Democratic Party, the pressure on the Thomasites to go along was so heavy that on this political question they dumped the line of their own majority for that of the Reutherites.

Which way will the membership vote in this referendum? Actually, that is not too important. For the vote will only determine the way in which the Socialist Party will disappear from the American scene as an organized political force.

Our reporter, Walter Jason, in the LABOR ACTION article mentioned above wrote: "Furthermore, there exists so much confusion in the SP ranks on the nature of the dispute, its basic meaning and its portent of the future, that it is safe to say that the dispute will get sharper, and lines become more crossed up on a national scale. The sum total result can only be political impotence, in our opinion."

At the Detroit convention the main leaders of the majority came from the "municipal" socialists of Connecticut and Reading (Pa.), combined with some hangers-on of the old center caucus of the SP. Thus there is no line of principle, nor even of policy, which unites the old majority against the Thomasites. These "municipal" socialists have no desire to "take over" the party nationally and direct it on a new course (or even keep it on the old one). They just want to be left alone to run their little political machines. It seems that they have now voted for the Thomas wing.

Thus, if the national membership should once more reject the proposal which would permit SP members to support any political candidate they choose (except where their party runs candidates, as in Reading), what would happen? Would they cease bowing down to Thomas as the indispensable leader of the party? Would they dare take disciplinary action against those leading lights of the party who have already violated the convention decisions . . . provided these would stay in the party long enough so they could be disciplined?

Dying Convulsion

The SP members have shown no stomach for such actions to date, and we doubt if they have any idea of showing it in the future. Thus a rejection of the NEC proposal would in all probability lead to a more rapid and total disintegration of the present party structure, without any prospect of replacing it with another one.

But if the membership accepts the NEC proposal, what then? Then the last thing which distinguishes the Socialist Party from the political tendency represented in its broadest aspects by Walter Reuther in the UAW and David Dubinsky in the AFL will have vanished. This was the electoral activity of the SP in the course of which they proclaimed their allegiance to the abstract ideal of socialism. (At least this was the distinguishing content of their campaigns everywhere except in those places like Bridgeport and Reading where they had a chance to win.)

Of course, the shadow of the party may linger with us for some time, regardless of the outcome of this referendum. Political organizations can exist for some time even after they have been deserted by their leaders or have cut themselves off from any source of political nourishment. But this crisis of the SP can correctly be described as one of its dying convulsions. Again, as our Walter Jason wrote last June:

"In short, here was a political tendency with a basic program not one whit different from the new American labor aristocracy. It is being torn apart by the conflicting pressures of its past, its traditions and the influence of the labor movement. It lacks a fundamental reason for independent existence because it lacks an independent class program. The process of SPers becoming ex-socialists and labor officeholders will continue apace, and its political history is already in its past."

NEW YORK

For Your Calendar:

ISL BRANCH FORUM

Thursday, March 8 at 8:30 p.m.

Ben Hall, N. Y. Organizer, on "Labor's Fight against the Wage Freeze"

SPRING SOCIAL & DANCE

Saturday evening, March 17

Dancing, Refreshments, and a gala evening, all under the pretense of anticipating the arrival of Spring by four days.

Labor Action Hall
114 West 14 Street, N.Y.C.

Will Reuther —

(Continued from page 1)

plain the details of the finagling in Washington, for at such meetings the ire of the men in the shops would explode and there might be major strikes now.

What Reuther has in mind, if necessary, is controlled "strikes" that just put enough pressure on Washington to force them to retreat a bit, and grant something. But even this kind of compromise idea seems to find no hearing in Washington, which is bent on a real "equality of sacrifice" program: every WORKER will suffer equally, with no exceptions! How times have changed may be suggested by reminding oneself that it was only six months ago, on August 16, 1950, that Eric John-

You're Invited

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

TITO'S TURN TO THE WEST

Yugoslav Regime Abandons 'Neutralist' Line under Dual Pressure

By HAL DRAPER

The Yugoslav Titoist regime's turn toward the West in the international power lineup, which began with the outbreak of the Korean war, has now expanded considerably further. It is not yet, to be sure, a full military alliance, but what is definite is Belgrade's abandonment of its previous line of neutralism, of expressions of opposition to both sides in the cold war, of its previous variety of "Third Force"-ism.

Washington and the Atlantic Pact leaders are now adding the numbers of Yugoslav divisions to their calculations looking toward the matching of forces in the third world war. This does not mean that Yugoslavia is necessarily moving to become an open partner in the Atlantic Pact: Tito most certainly is still as anxious as ever to avoid this commitment; the U. S. does not want to and does not have to press for it.

The reasons for this further development of Tito's foreign policy present no puzzles. They are:

(1) Fear of attack by Russia—a fear that has considerably sharpened in the past weeks with reports of "obvious preparation" for action by Yugoslavia's satellite neighbors. In reply, the Truman administration and also Britain have gone pretty far in making it clear that they will intervene if Yugoslavia is attacked, thereby transforming such a war into a war with the United States and the West.

Limited Turn

(2) The economic crisis in Yugoslavia, which the U. S. decided to aid with relief. Truman's presentation of Yugoslavia-aid action to Congress was bald in its approach: he put it forward bluntly as a measure in the West's cold war against Russia. There is no doubt that Tito would have preferred a less blunt formulation, for the Cominform's propaganda against Tito thereby received a boost; they had only to quote Truman and Acheson to document their round-the-clock broadcasts arguing that Tito has "gone over to the West."

But if the propaganda of the Cominform and of the Stalinists everywhere blares away at the theme that Tito has "gone over to the West," their claims contain the well-known kernel of truth only to a limited degree, and of course not at all toward the conclusion they seek to establish—which is the absurd notion that Tito is pointing toward restoring capitalism, becoming a "puppet" of Wall Street, etc.

The fact is that Tito's new turn to the West, which is real enough and sufficiently in contradiction with the Yugoslavs' claims to represent Marxist and Leninist policy, is on the plane of foreign-policy and military power politics, and does not involve any fundamental social or political concessions at home, touching the nature of the regime.

What Neutralism Meant

Tito's turn to the West is of the same nature as Russia's own marriage of convenience with the West during the honeymoon period of the Second World War, and has the same relationship to the nature of its regime.

What Tito has given up is his initial attempt to steer an independent role in the cold war between the Western and Russian blocs. This policy of neutralism, touted as a "socialist" policy by his friends, was never that of a Third Camp fight against both war blocs but rather that of a plea for "co-existence of the two worlds."

Neutralist sentiment still remains in words in the Tito regime's speeches, but in practice Yugoslavia's representatives at the UN have not even shown the consistency in this direction that India has demonstrated. Yugoslavia abstained in the vote which declared China the aggressor in Korea, refusing to join India and Burma against the blackjack swung by Washington.

As far as the social and political nature of his regime is concerned, Tito grimly insists that there will be no change. The whole Yugoslav turn was accompanied by constant government propaganda that the U. S. was not demanding any such concessions.

The line of the government's declarations did not neglect to point out that the U. S. had its

own fish to fry in helping Yugoslavia, but it coupled this realistic analysis with formulations about America's humanitarian considerations. It is not necessarily to be supposed that anyone in Yugoslavia took the latter seriously, but it undoubtedly looked good for the benefit of the Americans.

"Keep Your Mouth Shut!"

At the same time, Tito warned in his typical language, which is rather more brutal even today than his suaver lieutenants:

"Our reactionaries are now saying that their turn has come and that pressure should be exerted. [He means: pressure by the West for social and political concessions by the Tito regime—H. D.] They cannot start anything here because they are too weak—a slight knock and they all disappear into their holes like mice. But they are saying that the Americans, because we asked for foodstuffs, should place knives at our throats and tell us 'introduce this and that, introduce the old democracy, and so forth.' This would mean that we hand back to our reactionaries the property which they have lost because they had gained it unjustly by plunder. To both sides I am saying from this platform that they are mistaken if they think that their propaganda will achieve anything. I am telling our reactionaries to keep quiet as they used to for a while. It is better for them to keep quiet because we are not willing to joke when we have had enough of it."—from Tito's speech to Anti-Fascist Women's Congress in Zagreb, over Zagreb radio, last Oct. 29.

Lesser compromises can be made. Tito has thrown out more than one feeler for such compromise on the case of the Catholic Church's Stepinac, now in prison. He has made it plain that he is not anxious any more to press his claims on Trieste, which embroils him with Italy, but that he is willing to let that sleeping dog lie. He claims, very likely with truth, that he is more anxious than the Greek government to arrive at a settlement of the dispute between the two countries, one of the sore points being repatriation of Greek Macedonian children now in Yugoslavia as a result of the Greek civil war. And, as before, every three months will likely see new announcements of "sweeping democratic reforms" internally, all of which will be hailed by the N. Y. Times' correspondent M. S. Handler, in the full tradition of Walter Duranty's stewardship for the Times in Moscow during a different day and age.

The Road since Korea

Tito's turn to the West, as we have defined it, has been marked by the following steps so far:

(1) The Yugoslavs refused to support the Stalinist invasion of South Korea, but rather, after a period of hesitation, denounced it as aggression.

(2) Nor did they change their line on this when Mao's Chinese armies came into the foreground of the picture, even though they claim that Mao moved in opposition to Stalin's preferences, and even though they did for a long time entertain high hopes of lining Mao up on their own side. As we mentioned, they did not even support India's position in the UN on the question.

(3) They have pledged themselves to abide by the UN's denomination of an aggressor.

(4) They have more recently stated that they are interested in repelling aggression (that is, Russia) in an attack anywhere in Europe that "threatens the peace," and not only in defending Yugoslavia. This, of course, could mean Germany; more important, it is a statement which would tend automatically to draw them into the Atlantic Pact side of any war breaking out in Europe.

(5) They have become very mild indeed about the Marshall Plan. Presented with the question in an interview with Sulzberger of the N. Y. Times, Tito tried to ride both horses: "I would not like to answer this question," he began by saying, understandably. "You know our attitude toward the Marshall Plan. . . . Our attitude on the Marshall Plan is the same as before, but we do not consider that its influence is so catas-

trophic as is thought in some countries, the more so because it has given considerable help to certain countries, for example France and Italy."

(6) A United Press dispatch from Belgrade, February 19, reported that the Yugoslav CP has been pounding home new instructions to its party propagandists with regard to attitude toward the U. S. "Anyone who questioned his policy of cooperation with the West" is to be warned that he will be treated as "an enemy of the party." Further: "Party cells will be told to stop regarding the Western powers as 'imperialists' and to begin calling them 'friends.' . . . Non-Communists in Belgrade reported that the meetings had an immediate effect on their Communist acquaintances. Sneering references to the 'imperialist Anglo-Americans' disappeared from Communist talk." (N. Y. Post, Feb. 19.)

(7) Tito has also let it be understood that he has no categorical objections to rearmament of Italy above treaty limits. We have no information on how close are the ties between Belgrade and the new split-off group from the Italian Communist Party led by Magnani and Cucchi, but it is interesting to note that the Italian "Titoist" dissidents seem to be taking a rather equivocal position on the same question, according to the rather fragmentary reports on their statements in the U. S. press. They speak of "armed neutrality" by Italy, necessity to repel any invader (which could mean that the armed force for the purpose is also necessary), etc.

The Theory Is Fitted

This turn to the West in Yugoslavia has been likewise accompanied by ideological changes, shaping the Titoists' "theory" to line up with its foreign policy orientation.

As we indicated elsewhere last year, one of the questions on the theoretical field which has been in the air in Yugoslavia ever since the break is the question of the nature of the Russian state. What we mentioned then was that it was obviously increasingly difficult for the Yugoslavs to maintain that Russia is a socialist state, albeit a bad one, while at the same time they are forced to launch denunciations and accusations against this "socialist state" which make it out (quite justly) to be as bad as or worse than a fascist regime.

For a year and a half there have been straws-in-the-wind in the Titoist press obviously preparing the ground for a change in the "socialist" label. We had intended to write an article on these developments, but this is no longer necessary, perhaps fortunately. The Yugoslavs, through the voice of Djilas, have now come out with the announcement that Russia is not socialist, not a workers' state at all, but a capitalist state—state capitalism.

The theorizing on this question given by Djilas is truly pitiful stuff, and we shall recur to it on another occasion; it is, of itself, of little interest, from the theoretical point of view. That is the mildest thing that can be said of a theory according to which Russia is a capitalist state without any capitalist class whatsoever, or indeed, apparently, any ruling class whatsoever.

Russia Now "Main Enemy"

But the theory is not important to the Titoists. It is the basis, however, of a new formula being used by them, in line with their foreign policy: it is Russia and the Cominform that is the "main enemy" of progress in the world: "the hegemony and revisionism of the leaders of the Soviet Union" is "the main obstacle to the struggle for socialism and the main enemy of the building of socialism in Yugoslavia in particular." And the "leadership of the Soviet Union represents today the main brake on the struggle against imperialist subjugation and capitalist exploitation, and the greatest danger for the workers' movement, socialism and human progress in general." (Belgrade radio, Nov. 6)

With the Russians as the "main enemy," the indicated conclusion (according to the politics which Tito learned from Stalinism and still holds) is that it is necessary to support and join forces with all men of good will who are fighting

(Continued bottom of next page)

NAACP Launches Battle in Southern States To Abolish Jim Crow in Elementary Schools

By KATE LEONARD

The "sovereign states" of Georgia and South Carolina have a spotlight turned upon them these days.

In these two states Negro children and their parents, with the guidance of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, have brought suits which raise before the federal courts, for the first time since 1896, the issue of segregation in the common schools of the South.

It was in 1896 that the Supreme Court in Plessy vs. Ferguson gave legal sanction to segregated schools, establishing the doctrine that state-imposed segregation does not violate constitutional prohibitions against discrimination as long as the facilities afforded are "equal." Thus it was that the "separate and equal" legal fiction began its long life. It is still sitting up and taking nourishment, even though everybody from Walter White of the NAACP to Governor Talmadge of Georgia knows it for a fairy tale.

Official opinion in Georgia even admits the fairy tale freely. On February 13, Roy V. Harris, the power behind the Talmadge throne, told the Georgia Senate: "You can't give them [Negroes] equal facilities in one year, or even five or ten. With some counties having 70 per cent Negro population, to build enough school houses would 'burst' the county and the state too."

The current cases begin on the "separate and equal" ground, but go beyond this. They are in line with the NAACP's consistently held position that there can be no such state of affairs as "separate but equal" in the field of education, no more than anywhere else in civil life.

In Atlanta, 200 Negro parents have filed suit in the U. S. district court for the Northern District of Georgia, Atlanta Division, against the Board of Education of the city of Atlanta, petition-

ing that "the court enter a judgment or decree declaring that the policy, custom, practice, and usage of the defendants in refusing to allow the infant plaintiffs and other Negro children to attend elementary and secondary public schools in the city of Atlanta which are maintained and operated exclusively for white children, and where educational opportunities, advantages and facilities are far superior to those educational opportunities, advantages and facilities afforded and available to Negroes, is a violation of the equal protection of the 14th amendment to the Constitution of the U. S. and is therefore unconstitutional and void."

Similar action is brought by Negro parents from Clarendon County, S. C. In South Carolina there was good advice from Judge J. Waties Waring—namely, to bring the action before a three-man federal court, which automatically permits appeal to the U. S. Supreme Court. It is probable that the South Carolina case has the better chance to remain a longer time before the courts.

OTHER CASES LAID BASIS

The Atlanta and Clarendon County, S. C., suits could only have been brought in 1950-51. First of all, they are the latest step in the NAACP's campaign on the education front. This campaign has had limited success in its preliminary skirmishes involving discrimination, such as the Sweatt and McLaurin cases affecting graduate schools, or the Delaware college case. This preliminary groundwork was necessary. And in much the same way, this beachhead could not have been gained without long years of prior agitation, and in the atmosphere of a growing concern for and interest in civil rights which has been accumulating within the last decade, and which received a real boost with the report of the President's Committee on Civil Rights.

Also abroad in the land today is a new concern about the state of education generally, over and above the usual public interest in education typical for this country. Who you are conditions how this new interest in education is expressed. The army, or Governor Byrnes of South Carolina for example, is concerned because 40 per cent of the draftees from the Southern states are disqualified for not meeting the army educational tests, certainly a rather low standard. Industry knew long ago that "the man with the hoe" is a less competent hired hand. It is not possible to pick up a newspaper without reading of the necessity to rearm the educational system, to equip it to deal

Feeler to Social-Democracy

At the same time, the clandestine honeymoon between Titoist propaganda agencies in Europe and the official-Trotskyists of the Fourth International groups seems to be in a sad state of disrepair. The lovers are now throwing rolling-pins. Those hurled from the side of the official-Trotskyists, of course, will scarcely totter the foundations of Tito's dictatorship—they are plaintive outcries of pain and hurt at Tito's betrayal of the international working class in his foreign policy—but in addition the Titoists have been sufficiently complimentary to take notice of them. This was done in a brusque statement denouncing the Trotskyists as fundamentally Stalinist in their foreign policy. The reaction by the French Trotskyist organ *Verité* was gruesomely funny: the writer bitterly reminded himself (for the first time since 1948) that after all Tito had been raised in the Stalinist school of calumny and falsification. . . .

To return to serious matters, however, an-

other accompaniment of the Yugoslavs' turn has been another new line, with respect to the European social-democracy, in particular the British Labor Party but also the Italian socialist movement, the West Social-Democratic Party and the French SP. Here also there have been straws in the wind in the last year, but the clearest development was signaled by an interview with Tito by an Italian correspondent on January 13. The discussion concerned a "progressive rapprochement" and "collaboration" between the Yugoslav Titoists and the socialists. It was obviously a feeler by Tito.

This also cannot be understood without reference to Tito's new line in foreign policy. If obvious differences in circumstances are allowed for, Tito's bid to the European social-democracy is analogous to the "People's Front" line of the Stalinists in the period when they sought alliance with the Allies against the Nazi threat. Tito is merely less fortunate in not having his own parties in the Allied countries to become the organizers of such a formation.

The Tito interview on this point was accom-

panied by use of the term "third force" but Tito himself added: "not as a third bloc, but, as you say, as a third force that could serve to maintain a balance. . . ." This distinction between "third bloc" and "third force" indicates the point indeed: Tito is looking for a coalition force WITHIN the Western bloc which will serve to diminish the overwhelming decisive power of the U. S. WITHIN its own bloc.

From neutralism, then, Tito has shifted his foreign-policy orientation within the Western war bloc, but neither then nor now has the policy of his regime borne any resemblance to an internationalist socialist policy, let alone a Third Camp policy.

From neutralism, then, Tito has shifted his foreign-policy orientation within the Western war bloc, but neither then nor now has the policy of his regime borne any resemblance to an internationalist socialist policy, let alone a Third Camp policy.

From neutralism, then, Tito has shifted his foreign-policy orientation within the Western war bloc, but neither then nor now has the policy of his regime borne any resemblance to an internationalist socialist policy, let alone a Third Camp policy.

From neutralism, then, Tito has shifted his foreign-policy orientation within the Western war bloc, but neither then nor now has the policy of his regime borne any resemblance to an internationalist socialist policy, let alone a Third Camp policy.

From neutralism, then, Tito has shifted his foreign-policy orientation within the Western war bloc, but neither then nor now has the policy of his regime borne any resemblance to an internationalist socialist policy, let alone a Third Camp policy.

From neutralism, then, Tito has shifted his foreign-policy orientation within the Western war bloc, but neither then nor now has the policy of his regime borne any resemblance to an internationalist socialist policy, let alone a Third Camp policy.

From neutralism, then, Tito has shifted his foreign-policy orientation within the Western war bloc, but neither then nor now has the policy of his regime borne any resemblance to an internationalist socialist policy, let alone a Third Camp policy.

From neutralism, then, Tito has shifted his foreign-policy orientation within the Western war bloc, but neither then nor now has the policy of his regime borne any resemblance to an internationalist socialist policy, let alone a Third Camp policy.

From neutralism, then, Tito has shifted his foreign-policy orientation within the Western war bloc, but neither then nor now has the policy of his regime borne any resemblance to an internationalist socialist policy, let alone a Third Camp policy.

From neutralism, then, Tito has shifted his foreign-policy orientation within the Western war bloc, but neither then nor now has the policy of his regime borne any resemblance to an internationalist socialist policy, let alone a Third Camp policy.

Point of Support within Bloc

In terms of Tito's situation, he is seeking rapprochement with the social-democracy as a door to the West and as a point of support in the course of such alliance with the West. In an alliance with the West (he feels, quite rightly from his own point of view) he needs levers of influence in the councils of his partners. For him this can only be the social-democracy. A special political alliance with the British Labor Party leaders in particular (since they control a government) gives him a far more influential voice in the partnership.

The Tito interview on this point was accom-

panied by use of the term "third force" but Tito himself added: "not as a third bloc, but, as you say, as a third force that could serve to maintain a balance. . . ." This distinction between "third bloc" and "third force" indicates the point indeed: Tito is looking for a coalition force WITHIN the Western bloc which will serve to diminish the overwhelming decisive power of the U. S. WITHIN its own bloc.

From neutralism, then, Tito has shifted his foreign-policy orientation within the Western war bloc, but neither then nor now has the policy of his regime borne any resemblance to an internationalist socialist policy, let alone a Third Camp policy.

From neutralism, then, Tito has shifted his foreign-policy orientation within the Western war bloc, but neither then nor now has the policy of his regime borne any resemblance to an internationalist socialist policy, let alone a Third Camp policy.

From neutralism, then, Tito has shifted his foreign-policy orientation within the Western war bloc, but neither then nor now has the policy of his regime borne any resemblance to an internationalist socialist policy, let alone a Third Camp policy.

From neutralism, then, Tito has shifted his foreign-policy orientation within the Western war bloc, but neither then nor now has the policy of his regime borne any resemblance to an internationalist socialist policy, let alone a Third Camp policy.

From neutralism, then, Tito has shifted his foreign-policy orientation within the Western war bloc, but neither then nor now has the policy of his regime borne any resemblance to an internationalist socialist policy, let alone a Third Camp policy.

From neutralism, then, Tito has shifted his foreign-policy orientation within the Western war bloc, but neither then nor now has the policy of his regime borne any resemblance to an internationalist socialist policy, let alone a Third Camp policy.

From neutralism, then, Tito has shifted his foreign-policy orientation within the Western war bloc, but neither then nor now has the policy of his regime borne any resemblance to an internationalist socialist policy, let alone a Third Camp policy.

From neutralism, then, Tito has shifted his foreign-policy orientation within the Western war bloc, but neither then nor now has the policy of his regime borne any resemblance to an internationalist socialist policy, let alone a Third Camp policy.

From neutralism, then, Tito has shifted his foreign-policy orientation within the Western war bloc, but neither then nor now has the policy of his regime borne any resemblance to an internationalist socialist policy, let alone a Third Camp policy.

From neutralism, then, Tito has shifted his foreign-policy orientation within the Western war bloc, but neither then nor now has the policy of his regime borne any resemblance to an internationalist socialist policy, let alone a Third Camp policy.

Read

The NEW INTERNATIONAL

'VPERED'

is the organ of the Ukrainian socialist resistance movement, published by its section in emigration in West Germany, recording the thinking and activities of the new anti-Stalinist underground fighting behind the Iron Curtain. It is written in Ukrainian, of course, but an English summary of the contents appears in each issue.

For Ukrainian friends, *Vpered* is a must. Others will find the English page of extreme interest—and can help the movement by subscribing.

One dollar for 5 issues.

Order through: LABOR ACTION BOOK SERVICE

114 West 14 Street, N. Y. C.

Phony Wage Deal for Labor --

(Continued from page 1)

Even these promises, meager as they are, come with strings attached. Relaxation of "Regulation 6," assuming that a newly constituted board will go along with Johnston's recommendations, would go into effect only until June 30. Then, after labor's claws have been drawn, the directors of administration policy can hope to tighten up the freeze once again.

The proposed method of granting annual-improvement wage increases would set a terribly dangerous precedent. It would not grant these increases in cash but in what Johnston calls "deferred payment," some kind of forced savings. Wage increases, so the trite argument goes, cause "inflation." All during the last war, the enemies of labor tried to foist some such plan upon the unions but they resisted. Obviously, if the principle of forced savings can be smuggled in now, almost without fuss, its application will spread rapidly. Why increased wage payments in cash would lead to "inflation" but not the mounting totals of increased profits and dividends, is a point which Johnston does not attempt to explain.

The response of labor leaders, as indicated in first news flashes, was at best vague and indefinite but conciliatory.

At the same time, Price Administrator Michael V. DiSalle announced a new system of price controls to cover an estimated 200,000 items. This dubiously impressive figure does not include food; and furthermore, no one knows whether it will lead to an increase in prices or a decrease.

Least of all DiSalle. When asked if prices would roll backwards or forwards, he replied: "We have got a pool on that. My guess is that rollbacks will exceed roll forwards. That is just a guess. Some of my staff don't share the view." Here is an unusual opportunity for lucky betting men to make a killing!

It was Truman who first suggested that the disputed freeze order be approved and that modifications be discussed after labor had returned to the board. This was flatly rejected by union leaders who muttered dark threats.

If they return to the Wage Board now they will have to swallow their big fighting words. They will have given up the real battle for labor's rights before it had hardly begun.

Feb. 26—Despite promises to give Charles E. Wilson a free hand as director of defense mobilization, President Truman has intervened in the wage stabilization dispute. Conferences were held with labor leaders. Committees have been conferring. Day-long negotiations drag on. And yet the long-awaited relaxation of "Regulation 6," the wage-freeze order that led to the resignation of the labor members of the Wage Stabilization Board, is still . . . awaited.

The compromise that was to smooth over the crisis in the relations between the administration and the unions is not yet effected. The happy formula that would bring labor back into the fold as an obedient second-class citizen is yet undiscovered.

Rumors that the wage freeze might be eased slightly met with bitter denunciations from the employer members of the wage board, who bemoaned the "serious blow to the national economy" that would follow if wages were permitted to creep up another percent or two.

And when Wilson tried to pacify angry union officials with a vague hint that "wage policies are being modified again," they replied that they would be "more convinced to see some implementation rather than hear statements." And these are labor leaders who have cherished, honored and obeyed Truman since his election in 1948.

NO EASY PATCH-UP

All symptoms point to a deep-going, not-easily-reconcilable antagonism between labor and the Democratic Party, including its Fair Deal administration. Whatever patch-quilt compromise is finally pieced together to cover up the annoying disagreements for a time, it is certain that they will crop up again and again.

The squeeze on labor to carry the costs of war mobilization is only beginning. As time goes on, it can only become more and more irritating.

The bitter reaction of labor was reflected this week in another series of strike threats. Eight thousand CIO packinghouse workers in Minnesota stopped work for half a day in protest against

old job, warmly welcomed, when his valuable government services come to an end. Unionists naturally incline to the "suspicion" that perhaps he sympathizes with the views of his own company. . . . How pleasant for union officials to negotiate with Wilson, the "impartial" representative of an administration which they helped put in office!

WHITE HOUSE BLACKJACK

From another direction comes evidence of a smoldering resentment against the administration. The government still holds technical possession of the railroads; it was on this pretext that the recent rail strike was broken by the army. Roy O. Hughes, president of the Order of Railway Conductors, told a Senate committee what "taken seizure of the railroads by the government" means to labor. "Under this practice," he said, "the carriers cannot possibly lose financially but rather they gain additional profits as long as they can deprive their employees of just changes in wages, rules, and working conditions."

Another rail union official, Chase of the Trainmen, described his vain efforts to get fair treatment in Washington. He was told by Truman's representative that if the unions rejected certain terms "the president of the United States would ram the settlement down our throat." And he added, "I never thought I would be black-jacked in the East wing of the White House, but that has been my experience."

The union movement now stands united as never before; its actions are directed by a United Labor Policy Committee representing every important sector of labor except the United Mine Workers. In resigning from the Wage Stabilization Board it took its first step toward independence from government boards and toward that fighting policy which

is so necessary if the workers are to defend themselves in this period of war mobilization. But what comes next?

Will labor go forward or will it retreat? Last week, Walter Reuther, for the UAW, called for the resignation of labor representatives from all advisory boards where they serve as "mere window dressing" for big business control. That points in exactly the right direction.

This week brings the ironic report that Walter Reuther is being groomed to serve as labor's representative on the Defense Mobilization Board. For many weeks, top ranking labor leaders have been demanding that labor get "recognition" by the appointment of one of its men to such a position. The New York Post, in an editorial entitled "Reuther in the Name," nominates him as its candidate. And now, James Carey, president of the IUE-CIO, plugs for greater representation for "the public and labor" on a revamped wage board.

It would seem a difficult exercise in tactical manipulation to reconcile a desire for more "labor representation" with the fact that these representatives serve as "window dressing."

NO RETREAT!

Can labor men on these government boards be anything more than "mere window dressing"? If we recall why the union officials left the Wage Board, the answer to such a question should be unmistakable. They resigned not simply in opposition to the wage decree but in protest against the whole political policy of the Truman administration.

All their threats and complaints were addressed to the White House. They hit away at Truman's policy on prices; they exposed his inaction on rents; they told the truth about his line on taxation; they warned against forced labor controls; they hit

out against the domination of government, the Truman government, by big business.

What would change now, if labor went back as willing partners? Very little. After some momentary concessions, some vague promises, some kind but worthless praise of "labor's spirit of cooperation," the wheels of government policy would roll on essentially as before. With this difference: union leaders would once more become "window dressing"; the program of big business would once again be garnished by sprinklings of labor representation.

The administration is now panting with desire to get the union leaders back on the board. For only one reason: it needs a cover of "impartiality" for its old program; it wants to disarm the labor movement.

Not back onto the boards, but further away! That has to become labor policy. By getting off the board, labor stopped the enforcement of the wage order. It won its first important political victory in many, many months. The pressing problem now is to stop the whole anti-labor political trend in national life.

That was the warning of the United Labor Policy Committee. To follow its course of action through to a real lasting political victory, the unions must get off Truman's boards and get out of Truman's Democratic Party!

Who appointed Wilson? Who staffed government agencies with the tools of big business? Who sits in the White House? Who directs the trend of administration policy?

To crawl back now would make a farce out of everything that has been done and said for three weeks. Who can dare to say now that Truman is really labor's "friend"? The big lesson of the fight against the wage freeze recalls the long postponed task of American labor: to form its own independent labor party!

India Aid Keyed --

(Continued from page 1)

reactionary public pressures released by the committees.

Two other questions which have received wide attention in the press as a means of attacking the Nehru foreign policy seemed also to be of interest to the committee members.

KNIFE OUT FOR INDIA

First they wanted to know why India did not buy what it needed from Pakistan. There is a subtly vicious business here. There has long been a suspicion that Washington viewed Pakistan with greater favor, and also as an instrument with which to beat India into line. The U. S. attitude toward the Kashmir dispute, in which it has generally favored the Pakistan cause, is one of the more glaring indications. The rather effusive speech by Ambassador Jessup last year in Karachi is another.

Few of those who are seeking this question have taken the trouble to get the facts. What are they?

When the sterling-bloc nations devalued their currencies in September of 1949, Pakistan alone failed to do so and thereby achieved an automatic rise in its prices of jute and other raw materials of some 40 per cent in terms of Indian rupees. Since India was the natural recipient for almost all of these products the Pakistan decision was tantamount to a declaration of commercial warfare against her neighbor. Trade between these two completely interdependent sections of the subcontinent dried up, causing havoc to both economies, with possibly the worse effect on India's industries, which

were dependent on Pakistan for raw materials. In order to alleviate the mass unemployment in cities like Calcutta, the government spurred the growing of native jute, and with some success. Thus autarchy is one of the by-products of the disastrous division of India.

However, there is still another aspect to this. The truth is that Pakistan is credited with offering more wheat to India than it actually has. Pakistan is a very poor nation and its people are extremely undernourished and it has very little food surplus to export.

At most it has available for immediate shipment 16,000 tons, which is barely significant to India's need for 2 million tons. What is more, the asking price for this wheat is considerably higher than that on the world market, and the quality is, at best, varying. Pakistan cannot be India's bread basket. The very raising of this issue must be viewed with suspicion.

NEHRU'S END OF GUILT

The second question relates to the first: Why has the Indian government been pushing the growing of jute instead of wheat? Part of the answer has been given above. More important is the reality that New Delhi has had an extensive "grow more food" program for some time now, involving the broad distribution of seed and fertilizer as well as development of small irrigation works.

Some 34 million cultivators are directly involved in these various schemes, covering some 170 million acres of land. A vast reclamation project is under way to make some 90 million additional acres available for cultivation.

Some results have already been obtained and food production has increased, but nowhere to what is needed and not even remotely sufficient to meet the deficit resulting from natural catastrophes; and it is these latter that are immediately responsible for the impending famine.

There are very definite criticisms which need to be leveled at Nehru's regime. All production plans, for instance, no matter how noble their intent, founder on the reality of the system of production itself.

So long as the Zamindari rule, and absentee landlordism and land rents of up to 70 per cent of the yield continue to be the primary features of agriculture, there will be few incentives and even fewer means for the peasant to increase his production. So long as holdings are concentrated in a few hands of non-producing landlords, while tens of millions of landless workers live in squalid conditions, chronically underfed and subject to the ruthless irresponsible rule of the landlords—that is to say, while social relations in the villages remain Asiatic-feudal—no real solution to India's hunger will be found. And the New Delhi government of Nehru is guilty of not fulfilling the pre-independence promises for such social change.

But these are not the kind of accusations in which Washington is interested. These are problems which the people of India themselves must take into their own hands. They in no way affect the real, immediate need for food for India now. The maximum popular pressure is still needed if such a program is to get through Congress on time and without strings.