

LABOR ACTION

Independent Socialist Weekly

JUNE 11, 1951

FIVE CENTS

NATALIA TROTSKY BREAKS WITH FOURTH INTERNATIONAL

... pages 1 and 3

Does Washington Want to 'Foment Revolution' in Stalinland?

... page 6

The Dilemmas of Israeli Economy

... page 5

NATALIA TROTSKY Breaks with the Fourth International

Following is the text of the letter sent by Natalia Sedova Trotsky to the leadership of the Fourth International (self-styled "official Trotskyists") and of the Socialist Workers Party, breaking off all political connection with these groups. For comment on Comrade Natalia's important step and on the reaction of the SWP to it, see page 3.

Executive Committee of the Fourth International Political Committee of the Socialist Workers Party Comrades:

You know quite well that I have not been in political agreement with you for the past five or six years, since the end of the war and even earlier. The position you have taken on the important events of recent times shows me that, instead of correcting your earlier errors, you are persisting in them and deepening them. On the road you have taken, you have reached a point where it is no longer possible for me to remain silent or to confine myself to private protests. I must now express my opinions publicly.

The step which I feel obliged to take has been a grave and difficult one for me, and I can only regret it sincerely. But there is no other way. After a great deal of reflections and hesitations over a problem which pained me deeply, I find that I must tell you that I see no other way than to say openly that our disagreements make it impossible for me to remain any longer in your ranks.

The reasons for this final action on my part are known to most of you. I repeat them here briefly only for those to whom they are not familiar, touching only on our fundamentally important differences and not on the differences over matters of daily policy which are related to them or which follow from them.

Obsessed by old and outlived formulas, you continue to regard the Stalinists state as a workers' state. I cannot and will not follow you in this.

"COMPLETELY DESTROYED BY STALINISM"
Virtually every year after the beginning of the fight against the usurping Stalinist bureaucracy, L. D. Trotsky repeated that the regime was moving to the right, under conditions of a lagging world revolution and the seizure of all political positions in Russia by the bureaucracy. Time and again, he pointed out how the consolidation of Stalinism in Russia led to the worsening of the economic, political and social positions of the working class, and the triumph of a tyrannical and privileged aristocracy. If this trend continues, he said, the revolution will be at an end and the restoration of capitalism will be achieved.

That, unfortunately, is what has happened even in new and unexpected forms. There is hardly a country in the world where the authentic ideas and bearers of socialism are so barbarously hounded. It should be clear to everyone that the revolution has been completely destroyed by Stalinism. Yet you continue to say that under this unspeakable regime, Russia is still a workers' state. I consider this a blow at socialism. Stalinism and the Stalinist state have nothing whatever in common with a workers' state or with socialism. They are the worst and the most dangerous enemies of socialism and the working class.

You now hold that the states of Eastern Europe over which Stalinism established its domination during and after the war, are likewise workers' states. This is equivalent to saying that Stalinism has carried out a revolutionary socialist role. I cannot and will not follow you in this.

After the war and even before it ended, there was a rising revolutionary movement of the masses in these Eastern countries. But it was not these masses that won power and it was not a workers' state that was established by their struggle. It was the Stalinist counterrevolution that won power, reducing these lands to vassals of the Kremlin by strangling the working masses, their revolutionary struggles and their revolutionary aspirations.

By considering that the Stalinist bureaucracy established workers' states in these countries, you assign to it a progressive and even revolutionary role. By propagating this monstrous falsehood to the workers' vanguard, you deny to the Fourth

(Continued on page 3)

A BLACK DAY FOR DEMOCRACY—

High Court OKs Smith Act, Using Stalinist Reasoning

By PHILIP COBEN

In the most decisive civil-liberties test of the post-war witchhunting era, the Truman-appointed Supreme Court majority doffed their robes, donned the uniform, got their gun, and shot the First Amendment of the Bill of Rights full of holes. It upheld the constitutionality of the Smith (Gag) Act, the test case being on the 11 CP leaders convicted in Foley Square.

The First Amendment happens to be the one which says that Congress shall make no law abridging the right of free speech. It has been dented before, to be sure.

In a tortuous document decked out with references to "325 U. S. 91, 101-105 (1945)" and such, the Vinson majority of 6 (Black and Douglas dissenting) explained it away as a misunderstanding, with a knowing wink about the present cold-war crisis in one place, and in another some mumbo-jumbo about "no absolutes" and "semantic straitjackets."

The "semantic straitjacket," of course, is the language of the Bill of Rights, which says that "Congress shall make no law . . . and forgets to add . . . unless it feels it's necessary."

Unskillfully pretending that it was merely a question of outlawing "advocacy" of the "overthrow of the government by force and violence" — a formula often enough misused itself, to justify crude repressions of free speech

unmarked by such advocacy—Vinson's funeral eulogy over the body of the First Amendment never even considers the fact that the Smith Act's language goes far beyond even this.

Both Douglas and Black pointed out this shyster trick of the politician who was placed at the head of the high court by Truman. Wrote Black:

"These petitioners were not charged with an attempt to overthrow the government. They were not charged with non-verbal acts of any kind designed to overthrow the government. They were not even charged with saying anything designed to overthrow the government. The charge was that they agreed to assemble and to talk and publish certain ideas at a later date . . ." and so on, in a smashing exposure, on the legal plane, of the majority's reasoning.

(Continued on page 2)

"Public opinion being what it now is, few will protest the conviction of these Communist petitioners," said Justice Black.

It is probably unfortunately true that "few will protest," even many of those who wish to be liberals and who are dismayed by the Supreme Court's decision. They will fail to raise their voice partly in fear and, perhaps worse still, partly because of an insidious feeling that any stick is good enough if it is used to beat such a monstrous totalitarian movement as the CP.

We Independent Socialists hate Stalinism and have indeed fought it more consistently than anyone else. But the issue in the Supreme Court decision is NOT Stalinism.

Let it be remembered that the Smith Act, upheld by the court, was first used against socialists and unionists in the notorious Minneapolis case of 1940. Let it be remembered that if the First Amendment of the Bill of Rights and its free speech is scuttled in order to scuttle the Stalinists, there have been two casualties.

Protest the Truman court's decision—work for the repeal of the infamous Smith Act—to defeat Stalinism by defending democracy, and not to feed Stalinism by helping the Washington witch-hunters whittle democracy away.

Acheson Edges Over to GOP Line Under MacArthur-Repub Squeeze

By GORDON HASKELL

The political boxing match continues in Washington at the hearings of the Senate Armed Services and Foreign Relations Committees. Every conceivable aspect of the policy of the U. S. government as it relates to the firing of General MacArthur, or to the Korean war, or to relations past and present with the Chiang and Stalinist governments, has been raked over long ago. The sessions continue only in the interest of seeking to make the record for the next elections.

One of the chief targets of Republican wrath has been Secretary of State Dean Acheson. From the start of the hearings it was known that the Republican hatchmen, like Knowland of California, had the knife out for Acheson. They have repeatedly tried to get the secretary to admit that U. S. policy toward China was somehow influenced by Stalinist agents in or around the

Department of State, or that the American government sought to sell China down the river to the Russian or Chinese Stalinists for some obscure reason.

THEY AGREE

Acheson has been able to dodge their crudely constructed traps. They have not been able to corner him into making any new or sensational admissions, or into embarrassed silence as a result of being forced to the threshold of such admissions.

And this is due to the fact, reconfirmed by the whole course of the hearings, that on the broad questions of foreign policy the administration and the Republicans stand on a common foundation.

The Republicans, it should be added, can be said to be united in their foreign policy by only one factor: their utter demagoguery.

The Republicans have tried to make a big issue of the fact that at the Yalta conference vital Chi-

nese interests (the Manchurian railroad) and territories (Dairen and Port Arthur) were given to Russia without the consent or even knowledge of the Chinese government. Acheson pointed out that the Russians had the same claim to these interests as the Chinese government had to Formosa: the Russians had lost theirs to the Japanese in 1904, and the Chinese had lost Formosa to the Japanese in the war of 1895.

This is the kind of argument which stumps imperialists. After all, the reasoning seems to go, if an imperialist power has lost some territory or economic interest by a war, it is quite legitimate that these should be rewon by another war. None of them even raise the question of the rights of the peoples involved, THEIR right to decide who will rule over them!

It is quite clear that neither the American government nor

(Turn to last page)

Stellato-Reuther Conflict Heats Up in Auto Union

By WALTER JASON

DETROIT, June 3—Failure of the Wage Stabilization Board to approve automatically the 4-cent yearly improvement raise of nearly a million auto workers has created considerable resentment in the shops here, and has been a very embarrassing development for the United Automobile Workers (CIO) top leadership.

Nor was this embarrassment alleviated any by the actions of Ford Local 600, which threatened a strike unless the wage raise was forthcoming. Walter P. Reuther, UAW president, wired Carl Stellato, president of Ford Local 600, that such action would not be tolerated by the international union executive board. Reuther said that all UAW locals should act together, but failed to specify what action they were to take except sit and patiently wait for the WSB results.

Fortunately for Reuther, both the General Motors and Ford companies announced they would make retroactive payments on the 4 cents. This has quieted things down. Only Chrysler, at this writing, has not made any such commitment. But all major companies must pay a 3-cent-per-hour raise beginning tomorrow under the escalator clause of the contracts, which payments were okayed by the WSB.

Ford Local 600 did something

else which has kept the political atmosphere at boiling point between itself and the UAW top leaders. John L. Lewis, coal miners' union president, was invited—and accepted the invitation—to speak at the local union's tenth anniversary celebration on June 23. One Detroit newspaper labor editor described Reuther as "hopping mad" at the news of this invitation. Lewis is said to have laughed when he heard of Reuther's discomfiture.

One of the Reuther hatchetmen at Ford Local 600, who resigned as chairman of the celebration committee, made the newspapers with a blast at the invitation as part of a "red plot."

FIGHT GETTING BITTER

And there were rumors being spread throughout Detroit that Stellato was trying to lead Ford Local 600 out of the UAW, which would be a virtual impossibility, and which Stellato has not shown the slightest inclination of doing. If only Stellato would make such a blunder, then the task of eliminating him from the UAW and regaining control of Ford Local 600 would be facilitated for the Reuther forces.

In the past week, the UAW executive board ordered the trial committee of Ford Local 600, in the matter of the charges against five local union officials for being

"Communists," to bring in findings. This action came in spite of that fact that the trial board was disbanded by legal action of the General Council of Ford Local 600, after it failed to report within the original 90 days called for in its setup. Of course, this is part of the campaign by Reuther against Stellato, the charge now being that Stellato is covering up for the Stalinists.

Some of this factional bitterness may flare up at the Michigan CIO convention held here this week. But the main purpose of this convention is to wed solidly the CIO and the Democratic Party "regulars" into an organization committed for 1952 to the Democratic Party candidates, both national and state. In Michigan it signifies the UAW backing Governor Williams and Senator Blair Moody in the 1952 race.

OKs Smith Act —

(Continued from page 1)

"No matter how it is worded, this is a virulent form of prior censorship of speech and press," he charged.

The majority's decision, said Douglas, is "to make freedom of speech turn not on what is said, but on the intent with which it is said. Once we start down that road we enter territory dangerous to the liberties of every citizen."

ANOTHER BAR DOWN

Douglas pointed out that the case based on the Smith Act was founded on the charge that the defendants organized to teach "the Marxist-Leninist doctrine contained chiefly in four books," and that "the court does not outlaw these texts nor condemn them to the fire, as the Communists do literature offensive to their creed." Clearly, however, it can be added, the court did just that in effect, or at least permitted a court to do it whenever it felt like it.

Naturally, it must be understood, one need not believe that the full implications and consequences of the court's reasoning will be immediately carried out in practice by the government. The judges-in-uniform have

merely let another—and important—bar down. "I have always believed," wrote Black, that the First Amendment is the keynote of our government, that the freedoms it guarantees provide the best insurance against destruction of all freedom. . . . So long as this court exercises the power of judicial review of legislation, I cannot agree that the First Amendment permits us to sustain laws suppressing freedom of speech and press on the basis of Congress' or our own notions of mere 'reasonableness' . . ."

VISHINSKY'S LINE

Douglas ended his dissent with a sharp thrust at the hypocrisy of those (which means the administration in the first place) who forge totalitarian weapons to fight totalitarians: "Wishinsky wrote in 1948 in the *Law of the Soviet State*: 'In our state, naturally there can be no place for freedom of speech, press, and so on for the foes of socialism.' Our concern should be that we accept no such standard for the United States."

What the Supreme Court majority accepted was basically the Vishinsky-Stalinist rationale. One has only to read Vinson's document as the words of a Moscow judge arguing against the right of a "bourgeois deviationist" to express opposition to the regime . . . Let anyone who defends it try that experiment!

Above all, let the Truman apologists in the labor movement try that experiment. When Justice Black opined that "few will protest the conviction" because of the state of "anti-red" hysteria in the country, it must be noted with a sense of shame that his words will in all likelihood apply most to so many leaders of labor in this country who pose as defenders of democracy.

Here, more than on any another day, silence by Murray or Reuther or Green or Dubinsky et al. will be a striking confession of cowardice and "doublethinking" on that task—the defense of democratic rights—which is peculiarly the job of the labor movement. But the men who do the labor in the shops need not follow them down this road.

Indian Socialists Mobilize 75,000 In Demonstration Against Nehru

Growing opposition to the policies of the Nehru government in India was expressed in spectacular form on June 3. According to press dispatches, 75,000 peasants and workers demonstrated for eight hours in the capital of India, New Delhi, shouting slogans such as "Nehru has become the agent of the capitalists" and "We have come to Delhi to change the present government."

A six-point "People's Charter" was presented to the government, a series of demands which, in reality, are nothing more than the legislative promises Nehru has so often made but never begun to fulfill (abolition of feudal estates, redistribution of land on an economic basis, nationalization of key industries, creation of a national food army, etc.). According to the Socialists these failures are to some extent responsible for the fact that the Nehru government cannot provide the people with the barest minimum of food, clothing and housing.

Seventy-five thousand people of India in New Delhi have shown their full agreement with this analysis, and they are marching.

Ohio Stalinists Come Out for New Version of Jim-Crow-in-Reverse

By JOE HAUSER

CLEVELAND, June 2—The Stalinists have started putting forward a new and demagogic racist line in a union local here, a line which amounts to Jim-Crow-in-reverse.

The Communist Party has been for many years the dominant force in Cleveland's Fisher Body Local 45 of the United Automobile Workers (CIO). It has run the local for the maximum advantage to itself, and yet it has had a real base among the workers in the plant. Important factors were the terrible working conditions, which made the workers more susceptible to the pseudo-radical line of the Stalinists, and the large proportion of minority groups present. The CP made considerable headway among the Slavic and Negro workers. Titoism has hurt them among those with Slovenian ties, and the recent boners of the local CP has aroused the anger of many colored workers.

Just previous to the local union elections held this spring, the Stalinists put out a shop paper, the Spark Plug, advertised on its front page as issued by the Ohio Communist Party. This issue contained articles on the conditions in various GM plants in Cleveland. The story devoted to Fisher Body complained that some of the union leaders were no longer fighting for Negroes, and it put forward the line that all grievances of Negro workers should be treated essentially as discrimination cases, that is, in a separate category.

THEY REPEAT IT

The Freedom Slate, the group which rallied the anti-CP forces in the union, promptly took up this issue in the first of a series of leaflets.

The Freedom leaflet defended the record of the union in regard to fighting discrimination, and argued that Negroes had problems in the shop which were basically similar to those of all workers. When discrimination occurs, said the leaflet, it had to be fought as such, but it would be wrong to claim discrimination in all cases artificially.

Because of their election strategy, the Stalinists did not put out another leaflet until this month. In the meantime the Freedom Slate had captured a majority of the union's executive board, but had not succeeded in getting much of the local union apparatus away from the tight grip of the CP.

Now the three-months-late issue of Spark Plug contains an answer to the Freedom Slate

which reaffirms the earlier line in very specific terms. The CP says, and we quote:

"The treatment of the Negro workers in the shop is therefore at all times [their emphasis] based on discrimination, and every grievance of a Negro worker basically involves discrimination."

NO SPLINTERING

Once again the Freedom Slate answered the Stalinists, exposing their phony line aimed at gaining influence among the Negroes.

Freedom repeated its argument of several months back: "Basically all workers, regardless of race, color, creed or national origin, have similar problems. THAT IS WHY WE HAVE ONE UNION IN THE PLANT! Speedup, working conditions, etc., affect all workers alike. When discrimination occurs, as it surely does, then it should be fought as discrimination."

As an example of the stupidity of the CP argument, the Freedom leaflet gave an example of a wheelhouse line in the press room, which had a speedup grievance. The union processed one grievance for the whole line, as was natural.

Freedom pointed out that if a Stalinist line were followed, the union would have to fight two separate grievances, one for the white workers on that line charging speedup, and one for the colored workers charging discrimination. They followed up to show how such tactics would only serve to splinter the union into all sorts of different groups divided by color, sex, religion, nationality, etc.

The Stalinists have issued leaflets on all sorts of subjects over the years. Previously no one answered them, and undoubtedly many workers accepted their side of the issues. By exposing this argument of the CP, Freedom did much to show the union members how reactionary the Stalinists were. Many Negro workers were incensed at the attempt to play them for suckers, and expressed their appreciation for the work being done by the Freedom Slate.

The Stalinists were set back by the spring elections, but by no means were they wiped out. It will take consistent fighting on a progressive level to eliminate this anti-union force from the local. Only the first steps have been begun; there is a lot to do yet.

Comrade Natalia's Indictment

By M. S.

The letter of Natalia Sedova Trotsky, in which she breaks off relations with the Fourth International and with the Socialist Workers Party, is a document of outstanding political importance.

Natalia Trotsky is not only the comrade who was the life-long companion of Leon Trotsky in the revolutionary movement and the one who followed most closely the development of his ideas. She is the last of the living representatives of the greatest revolutionary generation of our time and in particular of that deathless band, the Trotskyist Opposition, which launched its war more than a quarter of a century ago against the Stalinist bureaucracy and its strangulation of the Russian Revolution.

Because she is one of the founders of the Russian Opposition and later of the Fourth International, her repudiation of the organizations which presume to speak in the name of Leon Trotsky is all the more significant. Her decision to break from the movement with which she was so eminently associated for many years was, as she writes in the letter, a difficult one to make. It is as much to her merit that she has made this decision as it is to the discredit of those whose policies forced her action.

We cannot but welcome her letter which, with all its dignity and restraint, is a forthright and forceful rebuke to those who are making the stainless name of Leon Trotsky a synonym for arch-confusion at best and apologetics and defense of Stalinist reaction at worst.

Natalia Trotsky's differences with the Fourth International, as her letter indicates, did not begin yesterday. They have been developing, ever sharper and more irreconcilable, for several years.

Time and again, in private letters and documents, she addressed urgent appeals for a change in the course that was driving this movement deeper into the mire of pro-Stalinism. Ignored and even ridiculed, never loyally or seriously discussed, these appeals proved vain.

After everything that has happened in the last decade, the spokesmen of the "official Trotskyist movement" persist in repeating the long-outlived dogma that the barbarous police state in Stalinist Russia is working-class in character, that they will rush to its defense in wartime. Now they have added the new and no less monstrous dogma that the police states in the countries which Stalinism has conquered and whose peoples they have reduced to a new and hideous slavery are likewise working-class in character and deserving of their defense.

To cap it all and as a logical outcome of their course, the head of the Fourth International, which was founded in struggle against Stalinism as the incarnation of counter-revolution, is now advocating openly and formally that this same Stalinism is also a revolutionary force for socialism and must be supported in country after country by the "Trotskyist" movement.

Who Can Remain Silent Now?

Natalia Trotsky's refusal to lend a revolutionary name to such abominations will, we trust, help awaken the socialist and Marxist militants in the Fourth International to the need of a radical reconsideration of the course to disaster their movement has taken. It should help arouse out of inexcusable silence and passivity especially those who change their own party with defending a fascist state but nevertheless follow it submissively.

Readers of our press who are familiar with our own analysis of the Stalinist state know that while we agree unreservedly with Comrade Natalia's conclusion that Stalinism has brought the great Russian Revolution to a complete end, we do not see eye to eye with her when she adds that Stalinism has restored capitalism, even if she modifies it with the term "in new and unexpected forms." In the context of the position she takes on the whole, the disagreement is of minor consequence and belongs in the realm of valuable theoretical discussion. At any rate, we have nothing in common with the "criticism" of her which is made by the paper of the SWP, the *Militant*, which prints the text of her letter along with an answer by the Political Committee of the SWP.

The answer is interesting above all because of the pitiable political and theoretical level and the pro-Stalinist arguments which distinguish the "official Trotskyist movement" in general, but not least of all because of the sly venomousness, low insinuations and disloyalty which distinguish the polemics of the Cannonists in particular. We shall take the occasion to return to their statement in an early issue of LABOR ACTION. Here we will refer to but one sentence, which is so typical of their smirking smugness:

"Strict adherence to his [Trotsky's] teachings and to his method has enabled the world movement he founded to survive and to grow against blows and difficulties unparalleled in history."

That the Fourth International has labored under tremendous blows and difficulties is certainly true. The biggest and cruelest blows were and still are delivered against it by the force it supports more and more slavishly—Stalinism. But not the least of the blows have been delivered by its own leadership and the policies it has followed. The "survival"—let alone the growth—of the Fourth International is a myth of self-satisfied bureaucrats. Everywhere, without exception, their policy has resulted in or contributed to the stagnation, the splitting-up or the destruction of the Trotskyist movement.

With the departure of Natalia Trotsky, they have lost the last representative of the Russian Trotskyist movement.

With their sabotage of the unity negotiations with the then Workers Party, they deliberately scuttled the last chance of uniting the movement in the United States.

The Trotskyist movement in Britain they callously split in two, one aftermath being the resignation of the leader of the British movement from the Fourth International, another being the increase of those who repudiate the theory that Stalinist barbarism represents a workers' state, and the third being that the "official group" follows a public course which prompts the British Stalinists to praise it in their press and to distribute its paper in their shops.

In France, they have irretrievably split the Trotskyist movement and have left as the "official group" a stagnating fragment which urges the French working class to vote the Stalinists into power.

The Italian movement they expelled because it did not believe Russia is a workers' state.

Natalia Trotsky

(Continued from page 1)



NATALIA TROTSKY

The Spanish movement, in its majority, quit it for the same reason.

The Belgian movement has simply disappeared without a trace. As for the German Trotskyists, we do not know of a single one who considers Russia a workers' state or is prepared to defend that totalitarian penitentiary in peacetime or in wartime.

The Chinese Trotskyist movement has been reduced by the savage terror of Chiang Kai-shek and the no less savage terror of Mao Tse-tung. But so far as we know, not a single Chinese Trotskyist who has survived those ordeals supports the theory and policies on Stalinism of the Fourth International and the SWP. The same holds true for the group in Indo-China.

In other lands the story is not significantly different.

Much of this gloomy record would have had to be written even if the Fourth International had the best leadership imaginable. There are unfavorable social and political forces at work which cannot be overcome in a day or a month or a year. But insofar as the leadership of the Fourth International was able to control its own existence, it has done its maximum to cripple and disgrace its movement.

No matter what else it does, it will go from bad to worse until it burns out of its political system the poisonous theory that the Stalinist states are workers' states, which it is a socialist and working class duty to defend. For, as Natalia Trotsky writes: "Whoever defends this regime of barbarous oppression, regardless of the motives, abandons the principles of socialism and internationalism."

International all the basic reason for existence as the world party of the socialist revolution. In the past, we always considered Stalinism to be a counterrevolutionary force in every sense of the term. You no longer do so. But I continue to do so.

In 1932 and 1933, the Stalinists, in order to justify their shameful capitulation to Hitlerism, declared that it would matter little if the Fascists came to power because socialism would come after and through the rule of Fascism. Only dehumanized brutes without a shred of socialist thought or spirit could have argued this way. Now, notwithstanding the revolutionary aims which animate you, you maintain that the despotic Stalinist reaction which has triumphed in Eastern Europe is one of the roads through which socialism will eventually come. This view marks an irremediable break with the profoundest convictions always held by our movement and which I continue to share.

TITO: "A REPLICIA IN A NEW FORM . . ."

I find it impossible to follow you in the question of the Tito regime in Yugoslavia. All the sympathy and support of revolutionists and even of all democrats, should go to the Yugoslav people in their determined resistance to the efforts of Moscow to reduce them and their country to vassalage. Every advantage should be taken of the concessions which the Yugoslav regime now finds itself obliged to make to the people. But your entire press is now devoted to an inexcusable idealization of the Titoist bureaucracy, for which no ground exists in the traditions and principles of our movement.

This bureaucracy is only a replica, in a new form, of the old Stalinist bureaucracy. It was trained in the ideas, the politics and morals of the G.P.U. Its regime differs from Stalin's in no fundamental regard. It is absurd to believe or to teach that the revolutionary leadership of the Yugoslav people will develop out of this bureaucracy or in any way other than in the course of struggle against it.

WAR: "I CANNOT AND WILL NOT FOLLOW YOU . . ."

Most inopportune of all is the position on the war to which you have committed yourselves. The third world war which threatens humanity confronts the revolutionary movement with the most difficult problems, the most complex situations, the gravest decisions. Our position can be taken only after the most earnest and freest discussions. But in the face of all the events of recent years, you continue to advocate, and to pledge the entire movement, to the defense of the Stalinist state. You are even now supporting the armies of Stalinism in the war which is being endured by the anguished Korean people. I cannot and will not follow you in this.

As far back as 1927, Trotsky, in reply to a disloyal question put to him in the Political Bureau by Stalin, stated his views as follows: *For the socialist fatherland, yes! For the Stalinist regime, no!* That was in 1927! Now, twenty-three years later Stalin has left nothing of the Socialist fatherland. It has been replaced by the enslavement and degradation of the people by the Stalinist autocracy. This is the state you propose to defend in the war, which you are already defending in Korea.

I know very well how often you repeat that you are criticizing Stalinism and fighting it. But the fact is that your criticism and your fight lose their value and can yield no results because they are determined by and subordinated to your position of defense of the Stalinist state. Whoever defends this regime of barbarous oppression, regardless of the motives, abandons the principles of socialism and internationalism.

In the message sent me from the recent convention of the SWP you write that Trotsky's ideas continue to be your guide. I must tell you that I read these words with great bitterness. As you observe you who that I have written above, I do not see his ideas in your politics. I have confidence in these ideas. I remain convinced that the only way out of the present situation is the social revolution, the self-emancipation of the proletariat of the world.

Natalia Sedova TROTSKY

Mexico, D. F.
May 9, 1951

CP Holds Voting Strength in Italy

Socialists Get 10%; DeGasperi Loses Strength to Neo-Fascists

By PAUL ROBERTS

The dominant political fact to be seen in last week's municipal elections in Northern and Central Italy is that the various Stalinist and socialist parties between them polled approximately 47 per cent of the vote. Thus, despite three years of American Marshall Plan aid being poured into Italy, that country is still the scene of widespread misery and dissatisfaction. In fact the combined vote of the Stalinists and their own puppet "Nenni Socialists" even showed a slight increase over their previous totals.

Strictly from the politicians' point of view, however, the elections were a setback for Stalinist influence in the municipal governments. Thanks to a tailor-made election law, the various non-Stalinist parties were able to pool their votes and thus take over a number of cities in which the Stalinists were still the largest single party.

Of the 28 provincial capitals in which elections took place, 16 had been in Stalinist hands. Now 11 of those 16 have been won by the Christian Democrats and their allies, thus giving them 23 out of the 28. Among the cities whose municipalities will no longer be under Stalinist con-

trol are Venice and the port of Genoa.

The church-run Christian-Democratic Party is still the largest party in Italy, but its 41 per cent is less satisfactory than the absolute majority it won in 1948. The Christian-Democrats lost votes in several directions.

SOCIALIST VOTE

To the extreme right, the neo-fascist MSI (Italian Social Movement) got over a third of a million votes, many from disgruntled former Christian-Democrats. Within the pro-government coalition, the Liberal Party, a conservative but not church-run group, also increased at C-D expense.

And to the left, the newly-formed Socialist Party (uniting the old right-wing and centrist PSI and PSU) seems to have won some votes away from the Christian-Democrats while at the same time losing votes in some localities to the Stalinist-puppet Nenni group. The SP on the whole got slightly over 10 per cent of the votes and thus just about held its own, while the Nenni group got about 13 per cent.

The Stalinists on their own got about 22 per cent, but picked up some more by running under various front names such as (in

Milan) the Taxpayers Defense List.

IN BOLOGNA

The one important city administration to remain in Stalinist hands is that of Bologna. There the CP and its allies just managed to beat out the Christian-Democrats and their allies by 1137 votes out of a quarter of a million. The neo-fascist MSI saved the day for the Stalinists by getting some seven thousand votes, most of which would have gone to the Christian-Democrats, but since the latter would not take the MSI into the pro-government coalition these votes were lost and the Stalinist were able to hold on.

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!

The ISL Program in Brief

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

INTERESTED?

Get acquainted with the Independent Socialist League—

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. _____

BOLIVIA: MILITARY JUNTA TAKES OVER; EX-CHIEF TAKES A POWDER

By JUAN REY

The recent success of the Nationalists (MNR) in the Bolivian elections has brought about a political crisis in internal policy.

The pro-Peronist MNR—the initials stand for Revolutionary Nationalist Movement—won a plurality of the votes but not the absolute majority which is required by the constitution to elect the president of the republic. But the semi-feudal bourgeoisie of Bolivia could not give up power to the pro-Peronists of the MNR, in spite of its own bankruptcy as proved in the election, because the MNR's mine-nationalization demagoguery could be too dangerous to the interests of the mine owners and imperialism.

The deposed president Urriolagoitia declared that he was ready to turn over power to a president who was backed by a majority, in accordance with the constitution, but that meanwhile he would turn it over to a military junta. Overnight the Bolivians found themselves with a different government, and the president escaped to Chilean territory. It was a "cold" coup d'état.

Urriolagoitia voluntarily made way for the generals to "save" the bourgeoisie from "communism." His flight from the country was shameful but perfectly in accordance with the tradition of Creole (native-bourgeois) policy.

U. S. FINGER

Thus political developments here have taken forms different from Argentina, Peru, Brazil and Venezuela; and the nationalist pro-Peronist party was prevented from assuming governmental power. The military junta of General Ballivian is a continuation of the Urriolagoitia-type "democracy," that is, of the power of the semi-feudal bourgeoisie. To be sure, it is an atypical form of military dictatorship, as a consequence of the bankruptcy of the political machine of the bourgeois right.

It was the intervention of U. S. influence that played the most important role in the coup d'état. The U. S. could not permit that it lose political influence in the country—that is, that it lose con-

trol-over Bolivian tin, a strategic metal.

General Quiroga, executioner of the Bolivian workers, as well as Pedro Zilveti, ex-minister of foreign affairs, had made a visit to Washington and had received detailed guidance for the eventuality of Nationalist victory in the election. The U. S. bourgeoisie cannot lose its cheap tin; and in Bolivia cheap tin means the poverty of the country and the massacre of the mine workers.

The State Department could not permit its loss of influence in Bolivia, because the victory of Peronist influence would endanger its war policies. And so now Bolivia has been brought nearer to the status of a U. S. colony like Puerto Rico, but without entailing any official responsibility on Washington's part. What a comfortable setup that is!

NEW COUP COMING?

The MNR has declared that it will reply with armed insurrection. There was some shooting several nights, but the workers did not go out on strike. The Nationalist leader of the mine workers' union, Lechin, was arrested, but nobody went out on strike for him.

The workers' support to the MNR turned out to be purely electoral; they would not spill their blood for this party. It seems that Bolivia will remain Washington's satellite, not Peron's.

Of course, the military junta is a rightist reactionary government. It will sell the country and its interests to U. S. capital and it will make Bolivian youth available for the Yankee war policy. But the Nationalist pro-Peronist government could not realize its "reforms" and "nationalization," because it is a bourgeois current; it cannot let loose a "nationalist revolution."

But the Nationalist party cannot renounce its political role, either. It is likely to answer by a new coup d'état, perhaps executed by the younger officers and supported by the masses of the middle class and the workers. Bolivia is a country of great surprises and U. S. policy will not be able to celebrate an easy victory.

May 27, Santiago

SOCIALIST YOUTH LEAGUE
114 W. 14th St.
New York 11, N. Y.

I want more information about the Socialist Youth League.

I want to join the Socialist Youth League.

NAME _____
ADDRESS _____
CITY _____ ZONE _____ STATE _____
SCHOOL (IF STUDENT) _____

LABOR ACTION

Independent Socialist Weekly

Vol. 15, No. 24 June 11, 1951

Published weekly by the Labor Action Publishing Company, 114 West 14th 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

SUR LE "FRONT DE BATAILLE" DE LA MUSIQUE SOVIETIQUE, by Nicholas Nabokov.—Preuves, April 1951.

Nabokov reviews the latest developments in the "battle front" of Russian Stalinist music. Two items may be especially interesting:

"The most outstanding fact about this 'new line' in Soviet musical historiography is the condemnation, not only of almost everything produced in the last 20, or better 30, years in Western Europe, but also of the Soviet musical upsurge in the first 10 years of the Revolution. 'This is the worst period in all musical history,' exclaims one musical critic, and another joins the chorus of censors: 'The Soviet composers of this period (1920-1930) did not understand the immensity of their task; their music was not in harmony with the glorious epoch in which they lived. They were infused with the most harmful forms of the bourgeois decline in Western Eu-

rope.'"

Secondly, he gives the Kremlin's Index Expurgatorius for the works of Prokofiev and Shostakovich:

PROKOFIEV:
Not in Russian repertoires: 4th and 6th Symphonies; *Sythyian Suite*; all the operas; 3rd, 4th and 8th Sonatas; the following ballets: *The Clown*, *The Steel Step*, *The Prodigal Son*; and the greatest part of his music written before 1930 (including his famous compositions for piano like *Sarcasms*, *Fugitive Visions*, and *Tales of My Grandmother*).

SHOSTAKOVICH:
Not in the Russian repertoires: 4th and 9th Symphonies; all the operas (*The Nose*, *Lady Macbeth of Mzensk*); the ballets *The Limpid Stream*, *The Age of Gold*; other shorter works of the beginning of 1930.

Readers Take the Floor . . .

Cease-Fire?

TO THE EDITOR:

While war is the pursuit of political objectives through violence, in recent times it has become questionable whether war and political aims are not antithetical. So redoubtable a warrior as MacArthur has pontificated to the effect that the destruction caused by war is such as to eliminate it as a means of resolving disputes between nations. More often it eliminates the nations themselves. Seldom has this been so clearly valid as in Korea.

There is another characteristic of the Korean conflict which has a direct bearing on the proposal that follows. While in a total war such as the last world war it may be difficult to see anything less than a "total" outcome, via the exhaustion or defeat of one or both forces, in Korea both sides have been fighting a limited war—which has reached a stalemate that can only be resolved by the extension of both purposes and means. There was one previous occasion when such a situation existed, viz., last winter when Allied troops had marched back from Pusan to the 38th parallel.

The stalemate is now both political and military on both sides. Neither North nor South Koreans are real factors in the situation. Foreign invaders rule the roost. By their recent offensive the Chinese have shown that they can hold a line across the waist of the peninsula and launch an attack at will, which requires the full power of all the Allied armies to frustrate. They can only do this at very great loss to themselves. But the recent offensive of the Chinese obviously had two political intents—it did not pose the goal of total victory—(1) in case of a cease-fire to develop the most advantageous positions, and (2) more significantly, the Chinese directed their attack toward the ROK lines with the result that all four ROK divisions in the line were destroyed and the rest of the ROK army rendered useless for the future. If then any cease-fire develops and any kind of peace eventuates the Rhee regime would find itself for a very long time without an army of its own. This was a great political victory for the Stalinists. However, it is clear that the Chinese cannot achieve their ultimate goal of driving out the Americans—unless they resort to (1) full use of air and armor and (2) in order to maintain such an all-out effort Russia would have to intervene more directly.

The same holds for the U. S., as the witnesses before the Senate committee have emphasized. In order to "unify" Korea and drive out the Pyongyang government and the Chinese it would be necessary to do two things: (1) take off the "wraps" and engage in total war, including

atomic weapons, and (2) extend the war to include Manchuria and China, at the very least.

Short of these, the American objective of driving the Chinese out of all Korea cannot be advanced by continuation of the present war and this is on the authority of every leading U. S. general from MacArthur to Ridgway to Van Fleet: Korea cannot be "unified" under U. S. or Rhee rule. An extension of the war would, of course, alter the aims as well. War with China could not then have as its purpose simply a decision in Korea. We have it on no less an authority than Trygve Lie that the UN is satisfied that it has already achieved its original goal since it has "repelled aggression and thrown the aggressors back across the 38th parallel."

The Chinese for their part, sought not only to secure all of Korea for themselves and the Stalinist world bloc but also the following: (1) Formosa, (2) a seat in the UN, (3) a decisive voice in a Japanese treaty. It is highly doubtful that any, and certainly not all, of these could be achieved by continuation or extension of the war. The war itself has made some of these impossible for Peking, at the present time—Formosa, for example.

Given the political developments in the post-war years the West had forfeited its ability to determine or defend Korea's independence. The Truman intervention was an effort to overcome the political and military betrayals of the previous five years through violent means. Washington's war was doomed from the beginning to stalemate and political defeat. It could not possibly beat the invaders, short of all-out war, after all the years of confusion, stupidity and support to reaction. Under these circumstances the present stalemate is the best that could be expected. *go no si waox go unu sy aq lqssod we s spuuq tsutstigs held—though probably not for very long without a democratic political solution, if that is still a reality. Peace at this time and at this point is the maximum that can be achieved and is the minimum hope that any alternative will still be possible in the future.*

Independent Socialists have, from the beginning, rejected a military solution to the terrible plight of Korea. While this approach has been vindicated it must also be acknowledged that there has not been a democratic or socialist program possible for Korea, at least since 1948, and certainly no alternative for the war which could advance socialist or democratic objectives. A democratic approach to the Korean crisis must have two basic considerations: (1) the people of Korea and (2) to halt Stalinism, stop its expansion and de-

Avel BAKER

Subscribe to
LABOR ACTION

The Crisis in Israel—3 The Dilemmas of the Israeli Economy

By AL FINDLEY

The success of the General Zionist (conservative) campaign against economic controls and for free trade in the recent municipal elections, plus the fact that Israeli economic difficulties continue and show no sign of quick solution, makes the economic question the central one in the coming balloting for the Knesset, to be held July 30.

The Israeli economy continues to suffer from a shortage of all kinds of goods; a strict program of austerity rules in the country; inflation has not been stopped; imports exceed exports by a 9 to 1 ratio; and the Israeli pound, worth \$2.80 officially, sells at 80 cents to \$1 on the free market. In addition a new and serious economic problem has been added to the overburdened economy.

With the world divided into two imperialist war camps engaged in a huge armament race, Israel finds it difficult to obtain the goods it needs even when it possesses the necessary foreign exchange. The Stalinist bloc of states has given Israel few or no credits, and trade between Israel and the East is on a modest scale. Despite the fact that Israel has a relatively large dollar income (contributions from American Jews, etc.) it is meeting increasing difficulties in obtaining allocations for the materials and machinery that it needs to buy in the West.

Aneurin Bevan, in his resignation from the British cabinet, showed how even such a powerful country as England—which is closely allied with the U. S., which is of vital importance in American foreign policy, and which has greater resources from which to draw—is experiencing difficulties in this regard. The small state of Israel finds it much more difficult to grapple with this problem.

The causes of Israel's economic difficulties are not hard to find. They are:

(1) *The poverty of the country.* Israel is poor in natural resources. Palestine was always an economic-deficit country, which had to import even a large portion of its food. The partition of Palestine left Israel in an even weaker position since a large proportion of its food production came from the Arab sections of the country.

(2) *The disruption of normal trade channels of trade with Arab Palestine and the other Arab countries.* The sections of Palestine that are now incorporated in the state of Israel received a large proportion of its food and imports from the Arab countries, in exchange for manufactured goods. The Arab boycott has resulted in the expenditure of large sums of "hard money" for the purchase of food and the bare necessities of life and has hampered the sale of Israeli industrial production, forcing Israel to seek new markets—a process that takes time and effort.

The boycott has undoubtedly also hurt the surrounding countries. All the Arab countries had a favorable balance of trade with the Jewish economy and as a result the boycott probably hurts them as much as it does Israel.

(3) *The tremendous immigration into Israel.* The small and poor state of Israel is now receiving immigrants at the rate of 200,000 a year. These immigrants bring in no capital to speak of and become an immediate economic burden.

While it is true that the cost of bringing them and settling them is borne mostly by foreign philanthropy, yet Israel itself supplies about one fourth of the cost. The land must support and feed them from its own production while the foreign funds have to be used for capital investments such as housing, agricultural implements, etc., necessary to make them able to support themselves in the future.

(4) *The overwhelming burden of armaments.* The figures of the Israeli government's arms budget are a closely guarded secret. However, its tremendous importance and the terrific burden which it places on the economy of a small and poor country can be gauged by the statement of high officials that Israel spends more on armaments alone than it does on both its normal civil budget and its extraordinary development budget for immigration and capital investment combined.

For the next three years the government of Israel has planned an expenditure of \$1½ billion for immigration and capital development. This sum is to be raised as follows: (1) \$500 million from the Israeli government budget; (2) the same amount from charitable donations; (3) the same from private capital investment and loans and credits from other governments. The largest single credit is, of course, to come from the U. S. The Israeli government expects about \$150 million from Washington.

In order to encourage foreign private capital, Mapai (Ben Gurion's Labor Party) has pursued a moderate economic policy that includes tax and exchange concessions to foreign investments and the maintenance of the economic status quo as a "mixed economy." Both the capitalist and collective sectors of the economy are experiencing growth and expansion. As near as one can gather, the ratio between the two has remained about the same.

Basically a Capitalist Economy

Thus Israel remains basically a capitalist economy though the state is governed by a working-class party and a significant portion of the economy of the country is in the hands of the working class.

The approximate figures are as follows: About 17 per cent of agriculture is organized on collectivist lines (Kibbutzim) where the land and all tools are held in common and where no private ownership exists even in houses and small plots. Daily living is also organized on a communal basis.

Another 35 per cent is organized into some sort of cooperatives. These vary from those that pool productive machinery to those that engage in individual production but joint marketing.

The most profitable section of agriculture, orange and lemon growing, etc., is predominantly in the hands of private capital, though here the Histadrut (labor federation) has made inroads in the past few years, primarily through acquiring the deserted Arab section of citrus culture.

In agriculture the Mapai is now putting greater emphasis on the cooperatives, rather than on the Kibbutzim. Ben Gurion has also demanded that the collectives dilute their principled opposition to the use of hired labor. This demand that they temporarily employ people who do not share equally in the products of labor has been rejected by all groups in the Kibbutzim, including those of the Mapai.

In industry, about 5 to 7 per cent is run by cooperatives organ-

ized for the most part in the Histadrut. In many cases, these cooperatives occupy an important position in the economy of the country and have a greater importance than the figure indicates.

In their general approach to the "building of socialism," the labor groups in Israel, especially Mapai, are not so much concerned with the question of nationalization or even with the taking over of existing industries. Their main emphasis is rather on establishing cooperatives and collectives, and now on establishing some new state-owned industries. Socialism is somehow conceived of as a flower growing amid the weeds of capitalism.

Since the victory of the General Zionists in the municipal elections, the leaders of the Mapai feel that it is impossible for them to compete with the General Zionists for the vote of the middle classes and have invoked a slightly more leftist course to rally the vote of the working class to their candidates.

Mapai has refused further concessions to the religious bloc, as we have pointed out in previous articles. It has laid great stress on the struggle against the black market; it has pointed out that rationing and price controls protect the workers' share of the limited supply of scarce goods and foods, in opposition to the capitalist position of "free trade" which, in a country short of goods, must result in rationing by the pocketbook. Above all, the Mapai, for the first time in years, is leading a struggle for higher wages.

The most dramatic instance of the last was the lockout and strike of the metal workers, which was supported by a demonstrative general strike and which won the workers a 14 per cent increase in wages.

Bourgeois Party Gaining Strength

The General Zionists are riding a swell of popular support among the middle classes. Having won 25 per cent of the vote in the municipal elections, as against only 7 per cent in the previous election, they have emerged as the second largest party in Israel and are attracting sections of other bourgeois parties.

In addition they are becoming the rallying center upon which other bourgeois parties will focus in an attempt to create a right-wing bloc and a new government. The Progressive Party of the liberals is split over the question of merging with the General Zionists. Whatever happens on the merger question, the Progressive Party, as well as all other capitalist parties, is bound to lose votes and personnel to the General Zionists.

The General Zionists are playing on the resentment of sections of the population against austerity and rationing. They raise all the classical arguments used by the capitalists: the world over against controls that hamper their freedom to make profits. It is not scarcity that produces rationing and controls, they say, but the controls that produce the scarcity. They accuse the government of "favoritism" to the "socialist" sectors of the economy, discrimination against the capitalist sector in the allocation of materials, inefficiency, etc. They claim that a free-trade economy would attract capital, would establish an equilibrium between supply and demand, and, of course, eliminate the black market and inflation.

Free trade in Israel, under the present conditions of shortages as a result of armaments, immigration and the unfavorable balance of trade, can indeed abolish the black market—by legalizing it. It can abolish rationing through points systems and such, by introducing rationing in accordance with the amount of cash one has.

An indication of the attitude of the General Zionists toward the black market was given recently by the General Zionist mayor of Tel-Aviv. He publicly announced that he was buying the necessary materials for the construction of a hospital on the black market.

Curiously enough, the General Zionists have nationalization as an important part of their program. They demand the nationalization of transportation, labor exchanges (employment bureaus), Kupat Cholim (the labor network of social security and services). The reason is not difficult to see. These are cooperatives run by the trade-union movement. The free enterprisers are willing to put them under state ownership so as to impair and possibly seriously reduce the strength and influence of the labor movement.

Dependent on Foreign Capital

Then there is the position of the Mapam, the Stalinoid party. Its economic program is a little difficult to follow, and it is sometimes hard to separate it from its foreign policy, which of course is pro-Russian.

What is clear is Mapam's stress on agriculture, and above all its emphasis on the collectives as the primary mode of settling the land. In addition, it calls for the nationalization of some industries such as the chemical works of the Dead Sea. The concession for the Dead Sea development is held by an Anglo-Jewish corporation and it is probable that the Mapam's demand for nationalization stems from anti-British motives rather than economic considerations.

Mapam's program also calls for the attraction of private capital. However, in its daily press, it counterposes the mobilization of internal capital and a planned economy to the Mapai's program of attracting foreign capital. While a planned economy is needed and would utilize the existing capital to better advantage, it is hard to see how it can be counterposed to and be a substitute for increasing the total capital of the country by the importation of capital.

Mapam is also opposed to accepting any loans from the U. S. government. While it abstained on the first \$100 million loan from the U. S., it voted against accepting the \$35 million credit from the Export-Import Bank.

The propaganda of the Mapam against such loans is sure to fall on deaf ears, since Israel desperately needs new capital. Its agitation against accepting aid from the U. S. also suffers from internal contradictions. On the one hand, it claims that all such loans must necessarily enslave the country to American imperialism. On the other hand, its organ claims that the U. S. is not interested in giving aid to Israel and that the loans are nothing more than a means used by the Democratic and Republican politicians to catch American-Jewish votes.

Israel needs capital and economic aid from all and any sources from which they can be obtained. The only sensible program is not to oppose acceptance of such aid from anyone but to fight against the attachment of any strings.

The job of seeing to it that economic aid is free from political and military entanglements is, of course, first and foremost that of the Israeli labor movement. While the importance of the Jewish vote in the U. S. has been overestimated, it too can play a part. And it is certainly the duty of the American labor movement to see to it that economic aid abroad (whether to Israel, India or Europe) is really economic aid, and not a down payment on economic domination or militarization.

What's Behind the Talk about 'Fomenting Revolution Behind the Iron Curtain'?

Washington and the New Russian Revolution

By HAL DRAPER

Roughly in the last couple of years, there has been taking place a turn in sentiment among the ruling circles in the U. S., both in and out of the administration, toward paying attention to "political warfare" against Moscow. The Voice of America's propaganda broadcasts, of course, have been going on for a longer time; it is a question not merely of propaganda broadcasts but—the term has been widely flung around—"fomenting revolution behind the Iron Curtain."

The talk of this sort has come from two or three different sources. One has been refugees from Russia and Eastern Europe, of course, and American liberals and officials who have tentatively echoed their recommendations. As we shall see, what these people mean by "revolution behind the Iron Curtain" is as various as the political lines which exist among the émigrés from Stalinland.

Another source, however, has been elements of the extreme Republican right in this country. Their motivation is not far to seek.

To a large extent, this type of "foment revolution" talk has come from circles which also sympathize with Herbert Hoover's line that the U. S. cannot rely on its European and world allies and who especially seek a "cheap" road to stopping Stalinism—or one which they think could be achieved at bargain prices instead of by an expensive course of rearming the U. S. and its part of the world.

It is not that they have any political objections to arming to the teeth. Their myopic eyes, in many cases, are fixed on the boggy of resulting high taxes; and they have neither the intelligence nor broader vision (strictly from the capitalist point of view) to see the role of the cold-war economy in keeping U. S. capitalism going at all, or to appreciate the capitalist-"internationalist" needs of U. S. imperialism.

A Slight Difficulty

Above all, they have not the slightest conception of what "fomenting revolution" behind the Iron Curtain means or takes. They have seized upon the idea in large part as something which at least sounds like a plausible alternative positive program which can be counterposed to the program of the "internationalists"—that is, to the Truman-Acheson program, which is supported essentially by the main body of Republicans also, of "containing Communism" through building a far-flung and costly international alliance and war bloc.

From both sides, this swell of talk about "fomenting revolution" has been drawing the attention of the White House and State Department, also. Even if the administration went for it, however, it would be a very delicate matter for it to talk about publicly.

The U. S. has always pretended to raise its hands in sanctimonious horror at the "amoral" and insidious practices of the Russian regime in building its fifth columns within other countries to "overthrow the government." It was for a long time the official reason for this country's refusal to recognize Russia; and when the Roosevelt administration finally did so, it insisted on exacting a paper pledge from Moscow that it would cut it out.

Before and since then, of course, the charge that Moscow wants to "foment revolution" in the United States has been a standard "proof" of the inability of the "free world" to live with such people. If any responsible representatives of the U. S. were now to speak openly of doing that which has been so condemned, their hypocrisy would be too, too evident.

"Project Subversion"?

But that is a minor consideration, or at most a consideration which might affect the government's tactics and public statements. Does the administration want to go in for anything like such "revolution-fomenting"?

The only thing that is plain is that the administration, too, has been playing with the idea—kind of on-the-side, much as it might set up a project on the side to develop a new type of weapon which might possibly work out.

But there the analogy, if there is any, has to

end. A crew of scientists and a general can be given a hunk of money and told to see what they can do about developing a particular weapon. The work can be carried on completely separately from anything else going on. The idea that a bureau or agency can be so set aside to "foment revolution" in Stalinland is completely fantastic.

LABOR ACTION has many times made clear that we Independent Socialists most certainly believe that blowing up the Stalinist power from within politically is the "secret weapon" which can stop Stalinism and Stalinist expansion in the world. It is a weapon, however, which is a function of a country's total foreign and domestic policy, and not some auxiliary objective which can be pursued while capitalism and imperialism still dictate the main lines of those policies.

The Gas-Bag School

The fact is that much of the "foment revolution" talk, especially from the right, seems to be based on actually taking seriously the notion that revolutions are "fomented"—by outside agitators and such.

We know, of course, that the bourgeoisie has always talked in such terms about revolution. It would appear that many of them actually believe their own stupidity! Their idea of a revolution—and in particular of this revolution which is to be "fomented" behind the Iron Curtain—is that it is something to be brought about by insidious operatives and agitators who use the grievances of the masses to stir up that many-headed beast and pull off a coup. They "make" a revolution, to order.

Many of these ignoramuses have been sold on the picture of the Russian Revolution of 1917 which has been painted by other ignoramuses and liars—that it was a secret conspiracy engineered by Lenin and a roomful of "professional revolutionists" who seized the key telephone exchanges and buildings, etc., and then terrorized everybody else. Actually believing this nonsense, they imagine perhaps that they can pull it off in reverse. I am well-nigh convinced that this is what "foment revolution in Stalinland" literally means to a great many of those who gas about it. Above all, for them the masses of people are precisely the mere puppets and pawns which (in their fantasy) they were for Lenin and the Bolsheviks.

But all that refers to the more stupid and ignorant sections of the new-fledged "revolution-fomenters," who are, however, not without numbers and influence in both parties in Washington. It goes without saying that it is of interest mainly as a highlight on the troglodyte thinking of influential sections of the U. S. bourgeoisie, and not because this kind of talk will ever be of any serious import. It is hot air, and will remain hot air.

Truman Gives It a Nod

The more serious and informed liberals who have taken up the idea do, of course, appreciate that it is not a matter of secret operatives à la E. Phillips Oppenheim, but of a world policy by the U. S. which can stimulate and encourage disintegrative tendencies in the Stalinist empire. This is one of the reasons why so many of them rightly lament the actual course of U. S. policy, which in fact convinces the peoples under Moscow, as it convinces the other peoples in the world, that much as they hate the Stalinist tyranny they cannot look to Western capitalism to offer an alternative capable of inspiring revolts.

This was the central idea, indeed, of the letter (disclosed in LABOR ACTION two weeks ago) by a leader of the Ukrainian resistance underground of the UPA to the Voice of America. Politava rather naively was advising the State Department to quit boosting capitalism because the peoples behind the Iron Curtain will have none of it. . . . The very existence of the UPA, and similar movements reported in other parts of Russia, shows that in actual life resistance movements of revolt against the Kremlin can appeal to the people and live only on the basis of an anti-capitalist as well as anti-Stalinist program.

And what of the administration itself?

What was perhaps the first public nod by Truman in the direction of this line of talk occurred in the speech which he made in answer to MacArthur, on May 7.

One motivation of this speech was pointed out by LABOR ACTION at the time. MacArthur's line had put the administration on a spot, in one very specific way. The cheery general had presented his case as a way to end the war in Korea, and nothing else could appeal as strongly to the fervent desires of the American people. MacArthur, to be sure, as we said, was demagogically proposing to "end the war in Korea" by extending it to China! It was easy enough for Truman to blast it and in this way to try to stamp the Republican-MacArthur forces as the "pro-war party" while he himself posed in the mantle of peace.

"Struggle Without End"?

But yet—but yet—this could hardly satisfy the people's desires which had been utilized by MacArthur. For, whatever Truman could say about MacArthur and with whatever justice, he (the people felt) and his administration were committed to and carrying on a deadly war which seemed to have no prospect of coming to a definitive ending. What perspective could Truman hold out on this score? The actual policy of the administration was to hope for a conclusion as the result of sufficient bloodletting and slaughter.

It was in this speech, therefore, that Truman for the first time gave considerable emphasis to the perspective of ending the cold war through bringing about an overturn inside the Russian regime.

"We are not engaged in a struggle without end," he said. Where then was the end? It was this:

"Some people do not understand how the free world can ever win this long struggle without fighting a third world war. These people overlook the inner weaknesses of the Soviet dictatorship. . . . The Kremlin's system of terror, which appears to be its main strength, is one of its greatest weaknesses. . . . the futility of the whole Communist program is becoming more and more apparent to the people under Soviet control. . . ."

Then he referred to disaffection in China under Mao, to the Yugoslav split, and to the stream of refugees from the Iron Curtain countries. He continued:

"There are growing signs of internal tension and unrest behind the Iron Curtain. We must remember that the peoples under the Soviet rule of terror are not only our friends, but our silent allies. . . ." etc.

For a Palace Revolution

What then did Truman point to as the "end" of the struggle? Revolution in Russia? Not at all. What he actually pointed to—what the administration, it seems, has actually adopted out of the fomenting talk—should be clearly understood. Here is the key paragraph from Truman's speech:

"As the free nations build their strength and unity, this fact will compel a change in the Soviet drive for power and conquest. The Soviet rulers are faced with the growing strength of the free world, the increasing cost of aggression, and the increasing difficulty of driving their people to greater and greater hardships. They will be forced by these pressures from within and without to give up aggression. It will then be possible to make progress with a program for international control and reduction of armaments and for the peaceful settlement of disputes." [My emphasis.]

If the thought is not yet clear, one should turn to a recent article in the magazine *Foreign Affairs* by George Kennan. Kennan, long a close State Department adviser, is regarded by the State Department as an outstanding "expert" on Russia. He is the "Mr. X" who authored the article in the same magazine which is considered to have been the first flyer of the "contain Communism" policy soon after enunciated by the administration. His new article is therefore of more than passing significance.

Kennan took up precisely the question we are discussing. His article among other things warned against the notion that capitalism could be reintroduced in a defeated Russia. This, as far as it goes, sounds like the

(Continued bottom of next page)

A Draft Resolution for the ISL Convention— ON INDEPENDENT FEDERATION IN ASIA

One of the biggest changes of world-historic importance that have occurred since the ending of the Second World War has been the attainment of national independence by a series of Asian countries—India, Burma, Indonesia, etc.—formerly under the political control of Western imperialist powers, and the overweening strength of national-independence aspirations and movements in virtually every other section still in their control.

While in all countries (except the U. S.) capitalism at home was mortally wounded by the Second World War and its consequences, the "Asian revolution" (which furthermore is still going on in various forms) has been the greatest concrete blow to capitalist imperialism.

These victories for national independence were not achieved because the imperialist leopards had changed their spots or because they were willing to give up anything they were still able to hold and exploit. They were won because the colonial peoples were able to take advantage of the weakness and exhaustion of the imperialists and tear themselves loose from the Western empires.

The Marxist socialists hail these victories, while recognizing that national independence does not itself solve the basic problems of the colonial peoples (the agrarian revolution, for example) but makes possible their solution and gives the continuing fight for their solution a new framework and new forms.

THIRD-CAMP ELEMENTS IN ASIA

But the present cold war, "little" Korean war and menace of the big third world war are threatening to drive the newly created independent states of Asia into an historic blind alley. With the decay of British and West European capitalism and imperialism, they have been able to win effective national independence—but at a time when national independence, however important a prerequisite for further development, has ceased to mean all that it once did.

More and more, ALL the independent states of the world (European included) are being forced to choose between the overlordship and domination of one or the other would-be imperialist master of the globe, the United States or Russia, or else to strike out on a third road, not only politically independent of an immediate oppressor but genuinely independent of the domination of either war bloc, the independent road of the Third Camp.

While all the countries of the world, not only in Asia, face this situation, in Asia there are special forces impelling the peoples to fight against lining up with either of the war blocs:

- These newly independent countries are the products of powerful national-revolutionary and anti-imperialist upsurges which are of modern and even recent origin.
- The ties which formerly bound them to the imperialists have only been freshly broken.
- They have acquired a tremendous amount of self-confidence and trust in the liberating forces which are unleashed by a mass people's movement, and are not weighed down by a past of defeat such as has filled sections of the European proletarian vanguard with apathy and pessimism.

"FORUM"

is the political discussion and information bulletin of the Independent Socialist League. The current issue contains the main draft resolutions before the ISL in the present pre-convention discussion. It is a public bulletin—the ISL does not believe in "internal" bulletins for political discussion.

The price is 15 cents a copy. Please enclose payment in ordering from: the Independent Socialist League, 114 West 14 Street, New York 11, N. Y.

Washington and the New Russian Revolution —

(Continued from page 6)

beginning of understanding, and in truth it does represent an advance in realistic thinking on the part of the guardians of U. S. imperialism. But as one reads him further, one gets the direction in which this bit of wisdom is angled.

For Kennan is putting forward the perspective that the objective of the U. S. in fighting Stalinist expansionism should not be to overthrow the Russian system or anything of that sort; but, through its "pressures from within and without" (to use Truman's words), to bring about a change in the leadership at the head of the Moscow regime, from those who are following the present path of aggression to those who are willing to live in peace with the capitalist world.

The postulate here, of course, is that there are such elements, or such a faction, in the Politburo or in the bureaucracy more generally. The reader should remember the famous words of Truman, some time ago, about Stalin's being a "prisoner of the Politburo." It is part of the same conception.

What Kennan is talking about is a "palace revolution," a changing of the guard.

What he is hoping for is not a new Russian revolution which will overthrow the Stalinist regime and system and give the power back to the hands of the people and their democratic institutions, but that the "contain Communism" policy and cold war will either convince the present lead-

This is a draft resolution adopted by the Political Committee of the Independent Socialist League, for discussion in the League, looking toward the coming national convention. The main draft resolutions for the convention have already been published in FORUM, the ISL's discussion bulletin. The present document is being published in LABOR ACTION in order to get it to the League membership as quickly as possible, in view of the amount of time remaining for pre-convention discussion.

The pre-convention discussion issue of FORUM has already explained the form in which the draft International Resolution for the convention (of which this document is a part) is being presented. It is presented as four separate supplements to the inclusive International Resolution adopted by the last convention. The first two supplements—(1) on war, and (2) on the meaning of the British Labor government—were printed in FORUM. The present document, ON INDEPENDENT FEDERATION FOR ASIA, is the third of these.

It should be clear to readers, then, as to ISL members, that this document is not presented as a self-sufficient statement but as a supplement to the basic documents before the League.—Ed.

• Their governments are new and relatively inexperienced in the arts of repression and deception (though, it must be added, they are learning fast).

For these reasons, the socialist and people's movements of Asia represent today one of the largest reservoirs and organizing grounds for the elements of the Third Camp of the people against the looming third world war and against the two imperialist power blocs which are leading to it.

For masses of the Asian people, as elsewhere, this sentiment takes the form of an amorphous and ill-defined "neutrality" without clear political demarcation; but the "neutrality" of the masses, unlike some of the programs which are put forward under that term, is not only essentially progressive but is indeed their way of expressing their Third Camp aspirations.

As elsewhere, the program of the Third Camp encounters in Asia the problem of how the new states can effectively maintain their independence as against the threat of Stalinist expansion and aggression on the one hand and of U. S. domination on the other; of what are the first steps that would have to be taken by governments which were truly determined and able to assert their independence from the war blocs.

The specific aim of this resolution is to propose such a first step, not as a finished program in itself but as a part of and in the context of a genuinely socialist policy against the war and against both capitalism and Stalinism. This is the orientation toward INDEPENDENT FEDERATION in Asia.

I.

The Permanent Revolution And Asian "Neutrality"

The road through which the countries of Asia attained their independence in this period of history is of vital importance in understanding the problem they now face in the cold war.

Prognoses previously made by the Marxist movement and based on the theory of permanent revolution expected that the national independence of such peoples would be gained under the leadership of the working class in a social revolution; that the native bourgeoisie and petty-bourgeoisie leaders could not lead the struggle for independence to victory.

But these prognoses were primarily based on the assumption of the continued existence of viable imperialist powers in the West capable of maintaining their control over the backward countries.

Today the era of capitalist disintegration and decay in which we live, which has become especially plain precisely at the periphery of capitalist imperialism, in the colonies, shows us a world capitalism in catastrophic dissolution everywhere but in the United States (which emerges as the sole capitalism-as-a-going concern). Following the Second World War, the new Asian states were able to seize their independence not because of any unforeseen or new qualities displayed by the native-bourgeoisie forces but because the imperialist grip on them weakened at home.

These countries have therefore come to political independence, with all the responsibility and problems of this status, under the continuing leadership of the native-bourgeoisie forces, represented in India for example by Nehru and the Congress Party. These social elements seek no conflict with the capitalist world but rather wish to integrate themselves with it (on the basis of political independence, to be sure).

In the previous period of imperialism, it was such elements which were capable of only a compromising, half-hearted, timid and capitulatory fight even for the national independence which they coveted. But now they are faced by a different problem: they wish for what they call "neutrality" but cannot achieve it in any real form.

They fervently wish for a "neutralist" position partly for the same reasons that animate even large sections of the European bourgeoisies: because they recognize that whichever of the two main antagonists wins the present imperialist tug-of-war, they have nothing to gain, while they risk the devastation and impoverishment of their own lands. If this is true even in Europe, it is even more true of the new rulers of the Asian states.

For them, one of the most important meanings of the Korean war—where they see what may be the prelude to the third world war taking place on their own continent and not in Europe—is precisely that, in the most concrete sense, victory or defeat ceases to have decisive significance for them when it can be gained only at the cost of devastation of the land and the people. In Korea, they see, the U. S. can win or the Stalinists can win but the Korean people have already lost; the third world war threatens them with the same fate.

In addition to the world-wide impulsion to "neutrality" in some form as a general sentiment, in Asia the new independent states have only just recently broken away from the very imperialism which they are now being wooed to support. Behind each of the new governments is a mass pressure for non-involvement in the affairs of the late oppressors (termed "suspicion of the West" in the euphemisms of the press) which is undoubtedly even greater and more violent than anywhere else.

NATIVE BOURGEOISIE AND COLD WAR

But just as in the previous period of imperialism, these elements could follow only a compromising and capitulatory course in the fight for independence, so today, under the new conditions, they are equally capable of only a compromising, half-hearted, and in the end capitulatory effort for the "neutrality" which they desire.

Without derogating to any degree the importance of the political independence which they have gained and enjoy, it is still important to understand that the problem of independence faces them still in its new form—a form similar to that in which it faces all of the U. S.'s other junior partners in the capitalist world.

In the face of this need for independence, the present social strata and political leaders at the head of India et al. find themselves in much the same position as was true for them in the pre-war era when it was a question of political independence.

(Turn to last page)

ership to give up aggression (the implication in Truman's speech especially), or that it will convince and move a section of the Stalinist bureaucracy—perhaps even headed by the "prisoner of the Politburo"—to reshuffle the leadership among those who wish a "peaceful coexistence" with the West.

Our guess is that this represents the present perspective of the administration, insofar as it has any far-reaching perspective at all.

Playing with Fire

As a matter of fact, those who glibly talk about "fomenting revolution" (real revolution) in the Stalinist empire—even if they don't know what they're talking about—are irresponsible from the capitalist point of view. (They are in actual fact saved from this accusation only by the thought that they are simply mouthing words.) For even if the U. S. were to go seriously into the business of stirring up mass revolt behind the Iron Curtain, somehow or other, and insofar as their efforts (even if done with the limited objective of bringing about a "palace revolution") actually furthered this eventually, it is not they who could control the whirlwind thus created.

The day when mass revolt—before, during or after a third world war—sweeps over the Stalinist empire, that day will not be celebrated by capitalism. For there

is no force which will be able to limit the people to a change in the guard, much as that is certainly possible as a first phase, and above all there is no force which will be able to push the people back to capitalism once they have settled with their present masters.

The new Russian Revolution will have to be a socialist revolution, by virtue of the fact that it is a democratic revolution in a collectivized system. The state now owns all the means of production; the new Russian Revolution will give the state power back to the "ownership" of the people. The clock cannot be turned back to the old capitalist system which is decaying everywhere in the world.

And such a democratic-socialist revolution in Russia would spell the final end of capitalism everywhere in the world—as the Russian Revolution of 1917 almost did. That is the basic reason why responsible and intelligent capitalist policy, in today's world, finds it dangerous to play with the fire of revolution behind the Iron Curtain. They may do so nevertheless—the mistake has been made by rulers before. But we have seen the actual objective.

It is this objective which accounts for the kind of steps which have been taken by the State Department and other U. S. agencies in playing around with "revolution-fomenters." This story, which especially concerns the maneuvers of the U. S. with various groups of Russian émigrés, will be taken up in a second article next week.

Resolution: Independent Federation in Asia—

(Continued from page 7)

Equally important, and as a corollary, the same is true for the new socialist and workers' movements of these countries, particularly India. Real independence from the domination of the war blocs—the independence of the Third Camp road—depends upon the forces of the social revolution, the forces struggling for the agrarian revolution which is essential to the peasantry and for the proletarian revolution which is the objective of the socialist movement.

In the last analysis, when the chips are down, such independence will be impossible for the Nehrus. It can be gained only through the bold and militant leadership of the awakening and growing socialist movements of the Asian countries.

This is one of the most important concrete and contemporary meanings of the theory of the permanent revolution in Asia today.

II.

No Hope for Asia From the Two War Blocs

A consistently progressive solution for Asia in the present world crisis can come from no other source than from the social-revolutionary aspirations of the masses headed by the socialist working class.

While, in most sincere if naive fashion, American liberalism has been laying great stress on the need for Washington to recognize and foster the "Asian revolution," the actual policy of the U. S. has been just the reverse. Most plainly in Asia, the U. S. has swung its weight to prop up the most discredited and reactionary elements in the Asian countries (Rhee, Chiang, Bao Dai) and has irretrievably shown its hand to the Indian people by its cynical and brutal stalling of wheat aid in the face of famine.

The capitalist rulers of the U. S. are incapable of "fostering the Asian revolution" even when and where such a policy could be used to foster its own power against Russia. They support the reactionaries because there is no other social force or political movement which they can rely on to follow U. S. policies. They do not find it possible to appeal to the mass movement of the people, which is essential to the democratic revolution in these countries, because the upsurge of such a movement, no matter by whom awakened, would threaten to tear these countries away from the U. S. bloc.

The vaunted "Point Four" program proposed to raise the standards of living in backward countries, and which is especially the white hope of pro-war liberalism in this country as a specific means to "foster the Asian revolution," is, first of all, still mostly paper and talk.

Secondly, there is virtually no prospect that the U. S. rulers will consider carrying it out on the scale (such as is proposed by Walter Reuther) as could mean something even in the minds of its liberal enthusiasts.

And finally, even a fairly large-scale Point Four program misses the main point of what is necessary in order to raise the Asian standard of living. The Asian economies, to be sure, need technical aid and "know-how" as well as capital investment, but no amount of these contributions can mean much in the long run as long as the social structure of their countries remains what it is. Even more than Marshall Plan aid has filtered into the pockets of the West European ruling classes, would Point Four aid be channelized into the pockets of the native ruling strata, be squandered by them, or simply prove ineffective to bring about any long-lasting change.

If the U. S. and the Western bloc cannot bring a progressive solution for Asia, it is even clearer that Russian power and Stalinism in general cannot and will

not. Illusions on this score are especially dangerous in Asia, where the people's hatred for centuries has been turned against those imperialist powers which are now in the U. S. bloc and not so much against Russia—for the simple reason that Russian imperialism (both tsarist and Stalinist) has never until recently been able to get a hold on that continent.

The coming to power of Stalinism in China, under Mao Tse-tung, has placed the millions of Chinese people under a new tyranny, and a totalitarian one.

It is true that, just as in Europe Stalinism holds out the lure of destroying the old capitalist exploitation and does indeed fulfill this promise on coming to power, in order to substitute its own exploitive system, so in Asia Stalinism attracts on the basis of truthfully promising to destroy the old landlord exploitive power and effecting an "agrarian revolution." The "agrarian revolution" which it brings in its wake is, however, not one which gives the land to the peasants (except in form only and temporarily, until it sufficiently consolidates its power) but one in which the totalitarian state bureaucracy substitutes its own exploitation and terror for that of the landlords and old exploiters.

The Stalinist regime which it imposes is, in Asia as in Europe, not only the deadly enemy of capitalism and the feudal elements—it is also the deadly enemy of all democracy, of socialism and of every interest of the workers and peasants.

While Stalinist China's relations with Moscow are of obvious importance from many angles, the character of such a regime does not depend upon whether it is or is not, or the degree to which it is, a puppet satellite of Moscow. The possibilities of some kind of "Titoism" (that is, more properly, national-Stalinism) in China, for example, are of the highest importance not only in the cold war but also in the tactics and strategy of socialism, but do not negate the socialist position on any type of Stalinist regime as the alternative to the present ones. It is impossible for a genuine socialist to be a supporter, critical or otherwise, of the Mao government in Peking.

III.

A Road to the Third Camp: Independent Federation

If a social-revolutionary movement of the Asian masses headed by a socialist working class is to be built, against both American and Russian imperialism and against any compromise by the native bourgeoisie with either, it can only be through seeking the forms through which such real independence can be achieved and maintained.

Not even in Europe can such real independence be achieved and maintained by any one country alone. (See the ISL resolution on an Independent Western Union in Europe.) Still more is this true for the relatively backward countries of Asia.

It is for this reason that socialists had cause to hail the tendency which showed itself in Asia simultaneously with the upsurge of independence following the Second World War—the tendency toward strengthening the ties and relations of the free countries of Asia in some form of federation.

These tendencies were given most official form by the two all-Asian conferences sponsored by Nehru; but in addition the idea of a South Asian Federation was a popular and widely supported idea. If the federation idea was eventually virtually scuttled by Nehru himself, in fear of the international responsibilities which it entailed in the face of U. S. power, it was for reasons such as are sketched in Part I.

For these very reasons too, this idea, this orientation, deserves to be taken up most enthusiastically precisely by the socialist forces in Asia and by all those who wish

to turn in the direction of a Third Camp road out of the war crisis.

A voluntary federation of the free nations of Asia banded together independently of either the U. S. bloc or Russia cannot itself solve Asia's problems, but it is an indispensable prerequisite for solving them.

Most immediately, it would and could set up a center of attraction for all those elements who are now drawn to the power of one or the other war bloc—to those elements in the Philippines who are caught between the U. S.-supported government of Quirino and the appeal of the Hukbalahaps, to those elements in Indo-China who wish to throw in neither with the French puppet Bao Dai nor with the increasingly Stalinized movement of Ho; etc.

It would and could immeasurably increase the ability of the Asian countries to resist the pressure, blackmail and simple bludgeoning of either the U. S. or Russia, designed to force them into line.

We are not here concerned with many specific questions of the form and constituency of such an independent federation as would necessarily have to be solved before it could become a reality or its propagation be effectively carried on. We have neither the wish nor sufficient information to prescribe such details as can be determined only by the revolutionary socialists of Asia.

One such aspect is the question of the inclusion of Japan in such an independent Asian federation, in addition to the free countries of South Asia. It can only be noted that this question is sharply posed before the Asian countries above all because of the close economic ties between Japan and the rest of Asia, and because the economic basis of an Asian federation may very well stand in dire need of a Japan which is not an airfield and military base of the Atlantic Pact bloc nor a puppet of the U. S. or Russia. At the same time, in order themselves to achieve independence, the Japanese people equally need the support of the rest of Asia such as a federation could contribute.

The basic and general orientation toward independent Asian federation, however, whatever its specific forms, is vital to the development of a socialist movement based upon a Third Camp perspective in the war. It is the socialists of Asia who can do what Nehru cannot do.

IV.

With the Socialists of Asia

Everything said above points to India as the key to Asia, and to the mass Socialist Party of India in particular.

For this reason, the Independent Socialist League believes that it is of the highest importance to build and strengthen the most fraternal and friendliest ties with the Socialist Party of India, and above all to educate itself and its own members to a more adequate understanding and appreciation of the problems of the Indian socialists and their situation.

It goes without saying that we believe it is the duty of all revolutionary socialists in India to join and build, loyally and actively, the Socialist Party of India and to strengthen all elements within the party looking toward an independent socialist and revolutionary course.

For the same reason, we greet the coming conference of the South Asian socialist parties to be held in Rangoon, and hail this evidence of growing cooperation and fraternal relations among the socialists of the continent.

On the basis of ever closer ties as well as ever greater political clarification, the relatively new and vigorous socialist movements of Asia can indeed take the leadership of socialism in the world in showing the path to that which is of first and decisive importance: an independent course against both capitalism and Stalinism and for the winning of a socialist world.

Acheson Edges Over to Republican China Line —

(Continued from page 1)

any of the other governments who met at Yalta were in the least concerned with the question of the rights of the peoples in Asia to determine their own destinies. The powerful men at Yalta and at their other conferences traded boundaries, and the peoples who live between them, back and forth like so many pieces of cloth over a counter.

SHIFT ON CHINA

The considerations were simply: What do we get in exchange for this deal? Formosa was given to Chiang, lower Sakhalin to Stalin, Korea was split at the 38th parallel. The only serious questions was whether or not the various parties would stick to their bargains. And all this was plotted under the slogans of the four freedoms and the Atlantic Charter!

Aside from this "revelation" that imperialists act like imperialists, the testimony has been a convenient platform from which to explain the fact that the policy of the administration with regard

to China is almost indistinguishable from the policy of the Republicans.

The administration is still opposed to expanding the military operations into China at the present time. But with each passing week it becomes clearer that they are committed to support Chiang Kai-shek's government in Formosa, to defend it, and when the time is ripe, to back its reinvasion of the continent.

This is a considerable reversal from the time when the White Paper on China was published in 1949. That paper proved to the hilt that the Chiang government lacked any popular support in China. Yet such is the nature of the present American government that it can find no alternative to supporting Chiang, that is, to committing itself to help his gang of grafters and oppressors back into power over their people.

In a certain sense, the administration is not alone responsible for this reversal of policy. No one who understands the basic character of the American government, the nature of its imperial-

ism, can be surprised by this turn. But the speed with which it has been accomplished under the pressure of the Republicans is a result of the lack of any serious counter-pressure from the labor movement.

"PRACTICAL" LIBERAL

The labor leaders, it appears, backed Truman solidly in his ouster of MacArthur. On the broader questions of policy they have supported the administration, almost without qualification. And the American Federation of Labor came out recently with an issue of its *Monthly Survey* in which its chief contribution was to warn against the danger of "appeasement" in settling the war in Korea!

The fact that Acheson and the administration have edged over to the Republicans on China policy has, of course, not assuaged the wrath of the Knowlands, who see their talking-point weakening—especially when the secretary of state blandly pretends that there has been no change at all. It also has not saved him from

being stabbed in the back by none other than that "liberal" ADA senator from Illinois, Paul Douglas, who has announced that he too thinks "Acheson must go."

There have been few more cynical demonstrations of unprincipled politics than this one by Douglas. For, as he makes clear, he doesn't think there is a "political liability" for the administration; that is, because the Republicans have succeeded in their demagoguery, Acheson must be thrown to the wolves.

Thus the Senate hearings grind wearily along. The politicians seek to score debater's points which they will try to blow up out of all proportion during the elections. But once the military had disposed of MacArthur's irresponsible proposal to expand the war here and now, it becomes clearer day by day that nothing basic separates the participants in the "great debate," beyond the desire of each of them to beat the other come election day.

The FIGHT for SOCIALISM

by Max Shachtman

A basic primer in the principles and program of Independent Socialism

\$1.00

Cloth-bound \$2.00

INDEPENDENT SOCIALIST PRESS

114 W. 14th St.

New York 11, N. Y.