

LABOR ACTION

Independent Socialist Weekly

AUGUST 13, 1951

FIVE CENTS

BUREAUCRATISM RULES AT DETROIT AREA CIO CONVENTION

... page 2

Bevan's Pamphlet on Foreign Policy: 'More for Socialism, Less for War'

... page 6

Indian Socialist Leader on 3rd Camp

... page 3

The Strange Case of the New York Post

AN OPEN LETTER TO EDITOR
JAMES A. WECHSLER

Dear Sir:

This is about the *Post* and civil liberties, and so we had better make one thing clear first.

We think the *Post* has an outstanding editorial record on civil liberties, the best in fact among the metropolitan newspapers in the country. We have no hesitation in saying that, in these times, your editorials blasting the arrests of the Stalinist leaders, the Supreme Court's blessing of the Smith Act and the loyalty-oath witchhunts have been notable for their courage. Within the limits of your political point of view—and we are not discussing that in this letter—your argumentation behind your defense of democratic procedures has not only been bold but also cogent and intelligent. That is not said grudgingly or as a prelude to damning with faint praise.

Quite the contrary. It is because that is clearly true that the following has to be said. If the *Post* were less forthright in its stand on such specific civil-liberties issues as we have noted, it would be quite pointless to go further.

Going further means taking up your editorial of July 31 and its rather spectacular manifestation of the point beyond which the *Post's* boldness, forthrightness and intelligence fail it, not to speak of its willingness to tell the truth and the whole truth about what is happening to democracy in this country.

Your editorial of July 31 dealt with the "poll of fear" conducted by the *Madison Capital-Times*, duplicated in *New York* by the *Post*, and used by President Truman in his Detroit speech to take a fall out of McCarthyism.

You interpreted the immediate meaning of the results of the two polls:

"Distrust and anxiety are abroad in the land. Too many Americans view one another with cold and fishy eyes. Too many Americans wonder if their neighbors are dangerous characters; too many Americans are afraid to invoke their most precious freedoms for fear they will be identified as troublemakers. . . .

"If we do not reclaim [our brightest banners of freedom], the average American may be transformed into a full-time non-participant, shunning all public activity, refusing to sign anything, looking the other way whenever anybody asks him to stand up and fight for the things we believe in."

That is all true, expressed mildly enough. It could be put a bit more strongly: the people were afraid to make use of the right of petition guaranteed by the Constitution because they feared reprisal by authorities against their expression of opinion.

That, of course, is what was behind such answers as were given to the *Post* reporters:

● "You wouldn't be trying to make me lose my job, would you, mister? You put your name on something these days and it's no telling where it might show up later."

● "I'm afraid to sign anything."

● "Please, sir, don't make me sign. Only six months I'm here. I don't want trouble. Please."

● "I signed something once and my kids gave me such heck I had to promise them never to do it again."

● "... This is safe, boys; just what they taught us in school. Let's sign."

Of whom and of what were these people afraid?

That's the question, isn't it?

Anyone can deplore the fact that a pall of fear hangs over the people, the same type of fear that becomes the very warp and woof of existence in the totalitarian countries, particularly the Stalinist states.

Too few liberal voices have gone further to condemn the acts and government measures which have instilled this fear in the people's minds.

(Turn to last page)

HONOR SYSTEM: Cadets Are Expelled, Generals Exported

Ninety cadets have been kicked out of West Point for cutting corners with the honor system of exams. That's because the army is so jealous of its honor, it says.

Brig. Gen. D. J. Crawford, on the other hand, admitted under investigation that, as head of the Detroit Tank Arsenal, he accepted favors from contractors with whom he did business. He breached no honor system but only the law and the taxpayers' pocket-book.

The general has not been kicked out of the army, which is so jealous of its honor. Didn't even lose a star.

Instead he was merely transferred in duty from Detroit to one of the places where the army is teaching democracy to the benighted Europeans—Heidelberg, Germany.

One congressman, a member of the investigating committee, opined that his misconduct was mostly a matter of stupidity. A qualification?

War Budget Plus Decontrol Bill Equals Inflation

Spending for war at the rate of over \$50 billion a year was achieved as the House Appropriations Committee voted a record sum for the peacetime military budget, fountainhead of the current inflation.

More than \$1½ billion was lopped from President Truman's request. Yet the \$56,062,405,890 remainder does not include public works or the bill for the fighting in Korea since June 30.

Later a \$4½ billion measure for public works will be considered. Compare this sum with the domestic war budget and consider the small role which housing, roads, flood reclamation, and all the needs of human welfare play in this era of permanent war economy.

Over half of the total peacetime war bill is for what is termed military "hardware"—weapons and other supplies which are the instruments of death and destruction.

The dry officialese of the committee deplored "the practice of improper relations between procurement officials and representatives

of firms from whom they procure millions of dollars worth of equipment, and so forth." So much for the scandals of bribery and corruption that have been frequently publicized since the beginning of

(Turn to last page)

Berkeley Tenants Fight Rent Steal by Landlords

By S. BEILAS

BERKELEY, Calif., Aug. 4—The free market has returned to the city of Berkeley. So say the representatives of four thousand jubilant landlords. They babble on about the law of supply and demand, laissez faire and constitutional guarantees for proprietary rights.

The simple fact is that rent decontrol has been enacted. The glee of the real estate interests foretells rent gouging, evictions and a soaring of living costs for the tenants of Berkeley. Disguised in terms of "the free market," the jungle rule of capitalist private enterprise has prevailed—despite the protest of thousands of renters.

Within thirty to sixty days this decontrol will affect almost 40,000 rental units in the city. Particularly for the returning students at the University of California a severe rental hardship will be imposed with the opening of the fall semester.

Even greater privations confront 10,000 residents of Cordonces Village, an interracial Federal Housing Project straddling the cities of Berkeley and Albany, where almost 8,000 Negroes have lived for years in amicable relations with the families of white workers and students.

Not only does decontrol bear down directly on Cordonces Village through the raising of project rentals when a mounting rent level affects the entire community, but also because the dismantling of the village itself was confirmed in the decontrol hearings.

TENANTS UNORGANIZED

Neither the city of Berkeley nor Albany showed any willingness to take over from the Federal Housing Authority. The latter therefore is proceeding to disband the project. August 1 saw the discontinuance of additional occupancy in the village. The closing down will actually start by next January, and by August 1952 the whole project will be torn down.

How 2,500 families can squeeze into the presently available 650 rental units apparently does not concern the city councilmen or the federal authorities. The realty board of course is interested in the problem; their members rub their hands in delight.

The story of decontrol in Berkeley reads like the usual account of the short fall of vested interest wagging the larger body politic. Tenants outnumber and can outvote landlords almost ten to one. However, the landlords are united in the Berkeley Real Estate Board and the Apartment House Associ-

ation of Alameda County, while tenants remained organizationally disarmed.

When the real-estate lobby in Washington demanded and secured local option in rent control, the Berkeley city council retained controls but permitted the lifting of rentals 25 per cent. Still dissatisfied, the local real-estate interests entered the April 1951 councilmanic elections with an anti-control slate. They smeared the idea of rent control with the word socialism; they labeled their opponents subversive. The venality of landlordism succeeded, and the entire council chamber was stacked with "free marketeers."

PACKED HEARING

Pursuing their advantage, the realty interests then petitioned their councilmanic henchmen to conduct a survey on the availability of rentals in Berkeley. The council obliged by authorizing the local housing expeditor to investigate rentals during the period June 27 to July 3—two weeks after the ending of the spring term at the university. Even though twelve thousand students had left school, the survey revealed a bare 650 available units for rent. Less than 2 per cent was the margin of availability in rental housing!

(Continued on page 6)

Burocratism Rules Detroit Area CIO Meet, UAW Leadership Alienates Negro Militants

By WALTER JASON

DETROIT, Aug. 5—Take away the finesse of Walter P. Reuther from the United Auto Workers' union leadership in handing opposition at conventions, and the results are a display of crude burocratism usually associated with such hardened CIO unions as the Steel Workers.

The day-and-a-half convention of the Wayne County CIO, with over 500 delegates, represented something of a fantasy, to put it politely. Not since the Communist Party bloc was riding roughshod over all opposition in the Wayne County CIO did anyone see such a disgusting spectacle as part of this convention.

The convention began with a few remarks by Emil Mazey, secretary-treasurer of the UAW-CIO. His blasts at the Ford Local 600 delegation had as its theme: "agents of the Soviet Union." This provocative speech provoked the Ford delegates and whipped up the pro-administration forces, who had a four-to-one majority. From then on it was a nasty, embittered and uneasy convention.

Two minor but significant incidents revealed the salient character of this convention.

The first incident centered around the Credentials Committee report. Its chairman was asked: "Did you and the other delegates from your local get elected, or did you appoint the delegation?" The point was raised by a Ford 600 delegate.

In reply, the chairman blandly said: "We were elected, and if you don't think so, let the delegates from my local speak for themselves." His report was accepted overwhelmingly by the convention. There was just one little thing wrong. Every UAW leader at the convention knew that the chairman had appointed himself and his delegation. His own delegates had admitted to other delegates before the debate.

Now it happens that this business of appointing delegates and packing conventions was one of the important accusations against the CP bloc when it was in control of the Wayne County CIO. And the constitution was specifically changed to eliminate this burocratic practice.

Unquestionably, the Stellato forces of the Ford local will make quite a point of this incident in their post-convention discussions.

CRUDE STUFF

At 10 o'clock Friday night the rules committee made its report. It said, among other things, that all resolutions to appear before the convention had to be submitted before 9:30 Friday night.

James Watson, former Reutherite who is now in the Stellato camp, took the floor to object, pointing out that such a rule excluded the submission of any resolutions to the convention, since the deadline time was already past before anyone had been informed about it. He also objected to a limitation of three minutes' discussion from the floor, while the officers could speak at length on any question. Although even the CP would have been a little careful in presenting such a brazen report, this one was voted overwhelmingly.

After this convention, it was explained to this reporter that the sole purpose of the convention was supposed to be to raise officers' salaries and to get a per-capita increase, which undoubtedly was true from the viewpoint of the administration, but hardly answers the questions confronting the CIO workers in the Wayne County area who are represented by the council.

The highlight of Friday night's opening session was the very smooth act of Michigan's glamor boys in politics, Senator Blair Moody and Governor G. Mennen Williams. They went over big.

In speaking about the Defense Production Act, and his fight against inflation, Senator Moody emphasized that "The mobilization effort will be hurt by lack of controls and by inflation." The

delegates saw only that he was fighting against inflation, and he was applauded vigorously.

Then Soapy Williams took the floor and with malice aforethought—Emily Mazey was sitting on the platform—asked the delegates, "What do you think NOW of my choice for senator?" He received an enthusiastic response. Since Mazey and Reuther had publicly regretted Moody's appointment in place of their own candidate, George Edwards, it is safe to assume that Mazey got the point. This is the second time recently that Williams has appealed over the heads of the UAW leaders, so to speak, to get a direct endorsement of his own policies as against UAW leaders' wishes. The significance of this will be revealed further when we discuss the mayoralty problem.

The major speech on Saturday was Walter P. Reuther's report. His sharp criticism of the 82nd Congress—"so lousy it makes the do-nothing 80th Congress look like a New Deal Congress" was very well received. He denounced the blindness of the steel industry, and he informed the delegates that C. E. Wilson, the mobilization czar, whom the CIO recently demanded be ousted, was doing a good job in trying to

make industry see the light on mobilization problems.

Reuther's blasts at the National Association of Manufacturers' tax program—its sales-tax idea would give each auto worker a 27-cent per hour wage cut—also were warmly welcomed.

ABOUT HUDSON

The sad mess at Hudson received brief mention from Reuther: "We forced this company to take a war contract which it was trying to refuse," Reuther declared. This proposal was defended as alleviating unemployment at Hudson in the long run. The fact that Hudson now is guaranteed a profit for the next few years, no matter what it does in auto production, was not mentioned by Reuther. It also seemed to escape his attention that such a guarantee of future war profits strengthens the company in its present bitter fight against the union.

Reuther did not mention the action of the Hudson local in demanding that the government seize Hudson... something put out by the UAW as a publicity stunt.

Reuther also told the delegates that real progress was being made in the field of getting an FEPC law in Detroit. And this brings up the hotly disputed point of the convention.

In recent months a so-called Greater Detroit Negro labor council, with strong backing from Ford Local 600, has been circulating petitions to put the question of an FEPC law on the books, by a referendum vote of the people in the November election.

This idea has been attacked by the Detroit Council of Churches and other organizations, which charged it was a Communist Party device to divide the community, etc.

BITTER DEBATE

The UAW leaders' position was contained in a resolution presented to the convention. It said: "Because the CIO believes that the basic needs of minority groups have not yet been met

with respect to job opportunity in our country, we will continue to fight for legislative enactment of fair-practices legislation at every legislative level.

"Groups purporting to represent the labor movement in Wayne County apparently do not agree with this procedure, and as a result have initiated petition campaigns seeking to place this matter before the citizens of Detroit on the ballot this fall.

"This procedure can only result in opening fair-practices legislation to distortion, misrepresentation and misunderstanding in this community and will destroy the possibilities of getting fair-practices legislation in Detroit or Michigan for years to come.

"This petition campaign has been condemned by every thinking and representative organization in the Detroit area which has fought alongside the CIO in the struggle for FEPC legislation, this, of course, with the exception of the Communist Party and its front organizations!

"Be it therefore resolved that this convention go on record for continuing the fight for legislative enactment of FEPC legislation at every legislative level and that we inform our membership that CIO opposes the procedure to place this matter on the ballot this fall."

Surely, here is a complex, difficult problem that needs the fullest discussion, exchange of ideas and objective approach. Instead, a bitter, vehement and ugly debate took place, which was cut off far too quickly by the administration, which left many questions unanswered, and which clearly antagonized most of the Negro delegates present.

NO REPLY

One speaker against the resolution pointed out that the CIO said that Congress was Dixiecrat-and Republican-controlled, so that nothing would happen there; furthermore Truman wouldn't sign an executive order. He pointed out the same condition existed in Lansing, Mich., and in the Detroit City Council. He charged that the

resolution was dumping the problem in a wastepaper basket.

There was no real reply to this. Instead, the whole thing was reduced exclusively to a "Communist Party plot."

One pro-administration speaker charged, for example: "This referendum proposal will tear the city apart"—to which a Negro shouted bitterly in reply, "It deserves to be torn apart."

"Another argued that a referendum will fail—something which is very true today, considering the lack of any serious program on the shop level by the UAW on the subject of FEPC. This blunt fact, factionally stated, just irritated the Negro delegates more. To be sure, Alex Fuller, Negro vice-president of the Wayne County CIO, and a Negro delegate from the shops spoke against the referendum as no real solution, but their voices got little hearing, except among the administration forces.

It was something to watch qualified Negro speakers like Bill Hood and James Watts of Ford Local 600 get so furious at the tone of the discussion that they couldn't even speak adequately. Hood just shouted out, "You can't stop us. The Negro people are on the march. We're going to get the petition signed no matter what you do." And Watts yelled, "The CIO is betraying us. They won't fight for FEPC any more." This, from unionists with years of experience in the labor movement, shows how embittered the feelings have become.

The cynical character of the discussion and the refusal of the chairman to permit full discussion did not add to the atmosphere. After the debate, many white delegates said, "After all we've done for them, look at them. None of them are worth a damn." This is sufficient commentary on the kind of feelings whipped up by the floor speeches!

Among the Negroes whom we interviewed, the feeling was just as bitter. For nobody explained why in Detroit, the heart of the UAW, with the Reuther leadership in control for five years, the majority of the UAW rank and file today would vote AGAINST an FEPC. What had happened to Reuther's vaunted FEPC program? How was the FEPC department functioning? What was it doing?

There are many aspects to this problem which the delegates know about but which didn't come out. What happened to the motions passed time and again at UAW FEPC conferences to carry on a vigorous campaign in Detroit on an FEPC? on discrimination in restaurants? Weren't many white delegates sore because even discussing this issue would "lose votes for CIO-endorsed candidates as George Edwards lost"? This line of reasoning justifiably appeals to no Negroes in the UAW.

This convention revealed that the Reuther leadership was losing its grip on more and more of the Negro auto workers. The Stalinists will have a field day if the present shortsighted policies continue. The auto workers just won't take attacks on the CP as an all-inclusive answer. It is significant that the middle-class Negroes and the middle-class organizations in Detroit agree with Reuther's present approach. But not the Negroes in the shop. Many of these Negroes who voted against the resolution are ordinarily "right-wingers."

At least this issue was discussed. The same cannot be said for PAC and the coming mayoralty elections. If the FEPC issue was a hot potato, the mayoralty campaign is a very embarrassing one for the UAW leadership. And this whole question was referred to the CIO-PAC committee. Why? We'll report the PAC mess in next week's article.

However, the plans for the party in San Francisco are going ahead full speed. The pact is being printed up in handsome form for the elaborate ceremony, complete with dotted lines where the "minor" powers may affix their signatures of approval for Washington's bastion in Japan.

But apparently few were prone to this logic. The Indian government announced recently that it would sign the pact only if it was radically altered. The clause permitting the reconstruction of Japanese military forces worried them, as it did everyone else. In addition, they wanted it definitely stated that Formosa belonged to China.

From Australia, Herbert Evatt, an architect of anti-Russian strategy in the UN several years ago, spoke up in sharp criticism of the pact. The reception in Rangoon, Burma, was not any better. One newspaper characterized it as a "bilateral pact between the United States and Japan." And a few days later even the South Korean government—which no one could label "Communist"—

Indian Socialist Leader in New York Address Presents Need for Third-Camp Anti-War Fight

By STEWART PITT

NEW YORK, Aug. 2—Speaking to an audience of over 300 yesterday evening at the Community Church in this city, Dr. Rommanohar Lohia, a leading spokesman of the Socialist Party of India now touring the United States, made clear the unswerving opposition of his party to the war policies of both the United States and Russia and forcefully stated the need for the further development of a Third Camp as the road to peace in the world.

Wearing his Gandhi cap, the symbol of the Gandhian Socialism he espouses, Comrade Lohia declared: "Communism is as great a menace as capitalism is" to India. Answering a question on his attitude toward Stalinist

Indian Socialist leadership, including Nehru and Gandhi. The Indian Socialists were among the most active and forceful in this great struggle.

In the ensuing period, when Gandhi stood almost alone against both Nehru and Patel on the question of supporting the British war effort, it was the Socialists and men like Lohia who supported Gandhi and independence. It is because of their long years of proven devotion to freedom and to Indian freedom that these men, like Lohia, are listened to today, and have been able to build their party into the only popular alternative to the increasingly rightist and conservative Congress.

While the Indian SP "cannot take part in the UN system" it does favor a different kind of UN, a world government in which all peoples are equally represented, whose leaders truly represent the peoples of the world, having been elected by them, and which is governed by a world parliament.

Elaborating, Comrade Lohia declared that if the Indian Socialists were in power they would assume the task of providing an integrating ideology for these nations, of freedom from either imperialism, and of mutual area cooperation in foreign policy, commerce and mutual defense. If any nation of South Asia were attacked by any aggressor India would consider such an act a *casus belli*, and defend the free peoples in every way.

However, such a system of equal and democratic cooperation was quite different from the so-called collective-security policy the U. S. was forcing upon the United Nations. Lohia saw this program as the organization of "world politics into an international caste system," with a Big Two or Big Three dominating everything.

In this respect he saw no basic difference between the UN and the ill-fated League of Nations.

In 1940 Lohia was jailed by the British together with Jai Prakash Narain, and it was at this time that Gandhi declared "I cannot sit still when I see Rommanohar Lohia and Jai Prakash Narain in jail, than whom I do not know braver or straighter men." It was at this time that Gandhi launched his "Quit India" movement, which culminated in August 1942 with the arrest of practically the entire In-

RR Strike Was Anti-Peron Revolt

[The following dispatch was, of course, written before the steps taken by Peron to crush the railroad workers' strike by brutal force.—Ed.]

By JUAN REY

SANTIAGO, Aug. 2—There was, of course, method behind Peron's suppression of the free press in Argentina, in the course of which the most important newspaper of the Spanish-speaking world, *La Prensa*, was taken over by the government. Behind this affair was the fact that the Argentine dictator finds himself in serious difficulties and every trace of oppositionist activity is a danger for his bonapartist-totalitarian regime.

Peron represents his own fight against the bourgeois opposition as the struggle of the "shirtless ones" (*descamisados*) backed by the organized working class and the "General Confederation of Labor" which claims 5 million members. But the outbreak of the railroad strike this morning reveals the true reality in Argentina.

Eighteen bombs exploded this morning, blowing gaps in various railroad lines of the country. The bombs did not cause great damage; their aim was only to immobilize the lines and impede the strikebreaking activities of the government.

The extraordinary violence of the strike is only proof of the grave situation in Argentina and the crisis of the Peronist regime. It is no accident that the strike takes place after the suppression of *La Prensa* and before the coming general election for the presidency, which, as everyone knows, is due to "re-elect" Peron.

The government denounces the strike movement as a "plot" instigated by "foreign elements," "agents of Wall Street" and of "Montevideo" [capital of Uruguay] who are "hostile to Argentina." The use of bombs, it says, is evident proof of the existence of such "plots" and "sabotage."

But the bombings are only the workers' answer to a regime which has broken all the promises it has made to the working class. The extraordinary violence of the strike is only proof of the grave situation in Argentina and the crisis of the Peronist regime. It is no accident that the strike takes place after the suppression of *La Prensa* and before the coming general election for the presidency, which, as everyone knows, is due to "re-elect" Peron.

the national Janvani Divas Committee, the special organization for the rallying of India's millions around the charter. In this capacity he has toured his country, leading thousands of demonstrations to present the peoples' grievances to the authorities.

Lohia comes here, then, not only as a spokesman of the second party of a great free nation of Asia, but also because in his own person he is a man of courage and intellectual stature whose merits are known and respected by millions of his people. His observations will, therefore, be of very special interest to American Socialists. Comrade Lohia's visit provides an opportunity for a deeper understanding of Indian Socialism.

SPONSORED CHARTER

Last year Lohia was arrested in connection with the bitter textile strike in Bombay. Later when the Hind Kisan Panchayat movement was launched to organize the struggle of the peasantry, Lohia was elected its first chairman. On May Day of this year the Indian SP launched its Peoples Charter, for which Lohia is largely responsible.

The charter expresses the deepest needs of the Indian people and is at the same time a program of struggle for transforming the new nation. It calls for the redistribution of the land to the peasantry and landless; nationalization of key industries; a program of volunteer labor to build canals, irrigation ditches and roads; re-establishment of the village communes (*panchayats*) with authority and responsibility for local problems; price control as a step toward providing food equally for all and controlling inflation; government encouragement and aid to cottage industries so that the energies of the population can be made more productive and so that the whole nation can participate in the production of those essential goods which the countries' industries cannot take care of.

The charter has received almost no mention in the American press. In India, however, it has inspired millions to social action. Comrade Lohia was appointed chairman of

the national Janvani Divas Committee, the special organization for the rallying of India's millions around the charter. In this capacity he has toured his country, leading thousands of demonstrations to present the peoples' grievances to the authorities.

Lohia comes here, then, not only as a spokesman of the second party of a great free nation of Asia, but also because in his own person he is a man of courage and intellectual stature whose merits are known and respected by millions of his people. His observations will, therefore, be of very special interest to American Socialists. Comrade Lohia's visit provides an opportunity for a deeper understanding of Indian Socialism.

Lohia is probably the outstanding representative of what is known as "Gandhian Socialism." Certainly he is its most original and articulate spokesman. A large part of his speech at the Community Church was devoted to his presentation of the idea of revolution through non-violence. However one evaluates this idea in itself, in terms of Indian politics it represents part of what has been termed the "struggle for the image of Gandhi."

Aside from non-violence, Lohia has taken up Gandhi's program of "charkas"—that is, cottage production—giving to this notion a new rationale. With the help of "small unit machines" requiring very small outlays of capital, Lohia stated his hope of inspiring the development all over India of small-scale production capable of making much of the essential consumers' goods. At the same time such local economic units are looked upon as a safeguard against the disastrous degeneration of the Indian socialist revolution. This program was given great emphasis by Lohia as his key to decentralization of power in all spheres of life.

It is difficult to say to what degree these ideas are shared by Lohia's comrades. The Gandhian impact remains very powerful in Indian intellectual circles.

Certainly to American and Western socialists the schemes presented by Lohia are new, at once giving insights into Asian problems of socialist construction and challenging the notions of super-centralization, nationally centralized planning, and emphasis on heavy industries. For his part Lohia made clear his complete distrust of mass-production techniques as irrelevant to India, alien to its national genius and undesirable in terms of consequent values.

In place of Western capitalist technology Lohia called for a new technology, one "not yet invented" but to be inspired by the special needs of the Asiatic revolution, with its enormous population density and infinitesimal per-capita wealth. Lohia emphasized repeatedly that he could not see how anything else than widespread "small unit production" involving the bulk of the population could raise this per-capita level of production. Yet there remains something difficult to grasp in his hope to "thus eliminate the erosive drive to constantly increase the standard of living."

On the other hand, Lohia foresaw the probable breakup of the Pakistan state, if left to normal historic development. He saw the eventual separation of East and West Pakistan as a strong possibility, or the colonization of the East by West Pakistan, the two parts being artificially separated by a thousand miles of India.

The far-ranging character of Lohia's presentation is indicative of the seriousness of his politics and its level of responsibility. The audience was accordingly very appreciative.

More and more married women are working in industry.

That fact emerges from statistics which have a bearing on two interesting points: how the standard of living of the American worker's family is being maintained, and that stock problem of magazine articles, "What Is Happening to the American Home?"

In 1940, 17 per cent of all married women were in the labor force. In 1950, this had gone up to 25 per cent. And in April 1951, as compared with April 1950, there were nearly 800,000 more women in non-agricultural employment; it can be assumed that the number of married women among this number will swell the percentage.

world in confusion as to India's true intentions.

After an acid attack on Nehru's domestic failures, Lohia cited as India's immediate needs the abolition of landlordism, division of the land, fixing of maximum holdings. Only then, he declared, will the peasant willingly and dynamically become involved in progressive tasks. Instead Nehru engages in much moralizing, attacking the people for slothfulness but offering no incentives.

To what extent will Asian reconstruction require American capital? Lohia's opinion of Point Four was that it was "niggardly" and by this it only exacerbated tempers without solving anything. "The challenge of communism will be faced by us on the basis of our ideology, not on the basis of outside assistance," though such help would be welcomed.

One of the most interesting parts of Lohia's presentation was his discussion of the Kashmir issue. The roots of this problem were, in his opinion, inherent in the "disaster of partition." Therefore the issue of Kashmir is part of the fundamental issue of whether the new states of Asia shall be formed on communal and theocratic grounds. This tendency, which exists in both India and Pakistan, as well as in much of the rest of the continent, is one of "Asia's greatest dangers." Hindus and Moslems are in reality one nation.

KASHMIR PROBLEM

As to a plebiscite in Kashmir, such a simplistic solution requires certain essential preconditions which the two states have been unable to agree upon. Before there can be a plebiscite the Pakistan army must be withdrawn. But the same cannot apply to the armies of India. The latter are the only defense force of Kashmir and its democratic government have against new incursions of violence and destruction inspired Moslems, such as occurred in 1948. For that reason simultaneous withdrawal would not provide the conditions of freedom essential to a true plebiscite, he said.

In no circumstances must Kashmir be permitted to fall to Pakistan, however, because of the larger implications that such a result would be a victory for religious fanaticism and a disaster for all Asia.

On the other hand, Lohia foresaw the probable breakup of the Pakistan state, if left to normal historic development. He saw the eventual separation of East and West Pakistan as a strong possibility, or the colonization of the East by West Pakistan, the two parts being artificially separated by a thousand miles of India.

The far-ranging character of Lohia's presentation is indicative of the seriousness of his politics and its level of responsibility. The audience was accordingly very appreciative.

Turning to the present regime which rules in Delhi, he charged that the ruling powers have repudiated the promise of the revolutionary class back up this criticism. Only the Argentine and Latin American petty bourgeoisie can support any such theory, which renounces an independent role for the working class. But the working class does not renounce this role and it is showing all—including Peron—that it is marching to achieve its own emancipation, regardless of the immediate outcome of the present strike.

Sharp criticism was directed at the former's garrulous but vacillating course of swinging from apparent pro-Western to apparent pro-Stalinist policies.

Whither Marriage?

More and more married women are working in industry.

That fact emerges from statistics which have a bearing on two interesting points: how the standard of living of the American worker's family is being maintained, and that stock problem of magazine articles, "What Is Happening to the American Home?"

In 1940, 17 per cent of all married women were in the labor force. In 1950, this had gone up to 25 per cent. And in April 1951, as compared with April 1950, there were nearly 800,000 more women in non-agricultural employment; it can be assumed that the number of married women among this number will swell the percentage.

world in confusion as to India's true intentions.

After an acid attack on Nehru's domestic failures, Lohia cited as India's immediate needs the abolition of landlordism, division of the land, fixing of maximum holdings. Only then, he declared, will the peasant willingly and dynamically become involved in progressive tasks. Instead Nehru engages in much moralizing, attacking the people for slothfulness but offering no incentives.

To what extent will Asian reconstruction require American capital? Lohia's opinion of Point Four was that it was "niggardly" and by this it only exacerbated tempers without solving anything. "The challenge of communism will be faced by us on the basis of our ideology, not on the basis of outside assistance," though such help would be welcomed.

One of the most interesting parts of Lohia's presentation was his discussion of the Kashmir issue. The roots of this problem were, in his opinion, inherent in the "disaster of partition." Therefore the issue of Kashmir is part of the fundamental issue of whether the new states of Asia shall be formed on communal and theocratic grounds. This tendency, which exists in both India and Pakistan, as well as in much of the rest of the continent, is one of "Asia's greatest dangers." Hindus and Moslems are in reality one nation.

KASHMIR PROBLEM

As to a plebiscite in Kashmir, such a simplistic solution requires certain essential preconditions which the two states have been unable to agree upon. Before there can be a plebiscite the Pakistan army must be withdrawn. But the same cannot apply to the armies of India. The latter are the only defense force of Kashmir and its democratic government have against new incursions of violence and destruction inspired Moslems, such as occurred in 1948. For that reason simultaneous withdrawal would not provide the conditions of freedom essential to a true plebiscite, he said.

In no circumstances must Kashmir be permitted to fall to Pakistan, however, because of the larger implications that such a result would be a victory for religious fanaticism and a disaster for all Asia.

On the other hand, Lohia foresaw the probable breakup of the Pakistan state, if left to normal historic development. He saw the eventual separation of East and West Pakistan as a strong possibility, or the colonization of the East by West Pakistan, the two parts being artificially separated by a thousand miles of India.

The far-ranging character of Lohia's presentation is indicative of the seriousness of his politics and its level of responsibility. The audience was accordingly very appreciative.

Turning to the present regime which rules in Delhi, he charged that the ruling powers have repudiated the promise of the revolutionary class back up this criticism. Only the Argentine and Latin American petty bourgeoisie can support any such theory, which renounces an independent role for the working class. But the working class does not renounce this role and it is showing all—including Peron—that it is marching to achieve its own emancipation, regardless of the immediate outcome of the present strike.

Sharp criticism was directed at the former's garrulous but vacillating course of swinging from apparent pro-Western to apparent pro-Stalinist policies.

Subscribe to
LABOR ACTION

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.

Point Four ILLUSIONS DWINDLE AS IT FAILS TO GET UNDER WAY

By CARL DARTON

Presidential inaugural addresses have been noted for their quick relegation to oblivion. However the so-called Point 4 of Harry Truman's January 20th, 1949 address, despite its origin, has captured the imagination of scientists and humanitarians everywhere. That it has survived this long is a tribute to the significance of the idea.

Truman stated the program as follows: "We must embark on a bold new program of making the benefits of our scientific advances and industrial progress available for the improvement of underdeveloped areas; [and] to help them through their own effort to produce more food, more clothing, more materials for housing and more mechanical power to lighten their burden. . . . It must be a world-wide effort for the achievement of peace, plenty and freedom."

The real import of these words, other than their demagogic appeal, is that such areas as Latin America, Africa, the Middle East, South and Southeast Asia produce 100 per cent of the United States' consumption of natural rubber, 83 per cent of chrome, 74 per cent of tin, 77 per cent of manganese, 70 per cent of aluminum ore, 19 per cent of lead and 24 per cent of copper. Anything which would increase the economic level of these lands would increase the production of these vital war materials. Besides, this program in early 1949 was part of the long-range, slow, "soft" plan for the Americanization of the world.

As later pointed out in Fortune, it had the following economic arguments from the capitalist viewpoint:

- (1) That the export of capital will help assure full employment in the U. S. (2) That developed countries are better markets for U. S. exports. (3) That development of such countries will help cure their "dollar" shortage.

Despite this selfish motivation such a program could not help but appeal to all scientists and right thinking people when it is realized that these undeveloped countries include 51 per cent of the world area and 46 per cent of the world's people, most of whom are in a constant state of starvation. It is considerably easier to share and to exchange inventions and scientific knowledge than it is to contain them within national boundaries by security measures.

Mouthing Phrases, Exporting Hate

However, this program "to present to the peoples of the world that know-how and technical knowledge . . . for the welfare and benefit of the inhabitants and not their exploitation" is utter illusion in the present world's political setup. Accordingly, the program which envisioned mainly agricultural, health, sanitary, and public works aid has, relatively speaking, never really got under way.

Thus in the current year the budget for technical aid (Point 4) is \$34,500,000 compared to \$8,500,000,000 for military and economic aid mainly to the "developed countries" of Europe and Asia to build up their huge war machine. And compared with the gigantic manpower output for military purposes the State Department in its May 1951 progress report listed a meager "350 Point 4 technicians at work on 108 technical cooperative projects in 27 countries."

It has been estimated that even a partially effective program of economic aid to the underdeveloped regions would cost about 3 billion dollars per year. Compared to the present cost of the war effort this amount could be readily available from the U. S. with no effect on the standard of living of our people. That no significant amount will actually be expended is certain in the political atmosphere of today. Such is our crazy world that while billions are spent for the eventual destruction of our own people the government cannot afford to spend millions to help others to help themselves.

It is small wonder that the U. S., while mouthing phrases of help and aid to the starving Asians, succeeds only in exporting hate. That all illusions as to the purpose of Point 4 is soon to end is indicated in Washington by the expected transfer of Point 4's Technical Cooperation Agency to the Economic Cooperation Administration, whose avowed purpose is economic and military aid to the members of the North Atlantic pact and other U. S. allies. As it has been put by one scientist publication: "The U. S. cannot simultaneously be armorer and big brother to the world."

The Standard Biographical Work—"KARL MARX" by Franz Mehring British-edition, cloth-bound—\$3.00—while they last LABOR ACTION BOOK SERVICE 114 West 14 Street New York 11, N. Y.

LABOR ACTION Independent Socialist Weekly Vol. 15, No. 33 August 13, 1951 Published weekly by the Labor Action Publishing Company, 114 West 14 Street, New York City 11, N. Y. Send all communications to general editorial and business offices of LABOR ACTION at that address. Telephone: WATKINS 4-4222. Subscription rate: \$2.00 a year; \$1.00 for six months. (\$2.25 and \$1.15 for Canada and Foreign.) Re-entered as second-class matter May 24, 1940, at the Post Office at New York, N. Y., under the act of March 3, 1879. Editor: HAL DRAPER Assistant Editors: MARY BELL and L. G. SMITH Business Manager: L. G. SMITH Opinions and policies expressed in the course of signed articles by contributors do not necessarily represent the views of Labor Action, which are given in editorial statements.

READING from LEFT to RIGHT

PRIESTS VS. PARISHIONERS, by Dick Bruner—The Nation, July 28.

Here's an interesting case history which reminds one that the relative separation of church and state which exists in the cities should not be taken for granted in the villages and rural areas of the country.

It concerns Pierz, Minn., a little village of 851 souls, with 95 per cent of them resting peacefully in the bosom of the Roman Catholic Church—peacefully, that is, until a little while ago when Henry Gau was excommunicated. The story in brief:

Pierz has a parochial school operated by St. Joseph's parish which has a unique arrangement with the public educational system. The latter rents one or two classrooms of the parochial school in which non-Catholic students are taught by two Catholic lay teachers (the other classes are taught by nuns). Then at the end of 1939, twenty-eight rural districts around the village decided to consolidate and bring a public high school into being through a bond issue.

The priests' spoke against it at every meeting; Catholics who favored the bond issue were denounced as "anti-Catholic" and—of course—"Communist." They explicitly demanded church

control of education on principle (in the U. S. in the 20th century). When the school board even proposed to compromise by allowing priests to teach religion in the public school, they rejected the overture: "This is not enough. Every idea and every subject has to be presented from a Christian point of view."

The bond issue was defeated, and the parish proposed to build a parochial high school. Villagers formed an Independent School Committee, with Henry Gau as chairman, to take a straw vote on the project; the vote in Pierz was against the clergy. Thereupon, on Sunday the priest read out a letter from the bishop excommunicating Gau.

In subsequent elections for the school board, the church went into the vote with its own candidates. Sermons were preached on how to vote; one priest told his parishioners they would be committing a mortal sin if they voted for any of the men opposed by the church; etc.

While, in the U. S., the Catholic hierarchy claims by and large no desire to control all education, critics like Paul Blanshard have been viciously attacked for pointing out that this is simply a matter of expediency in this country: wherever they have the requisite power, the hierarchy takes a different attitude.

The Course of True Love . . .

By H. D. We have noted before that the violent love affair between the official-Trotskyists and the Yugoslav Titoists—it was one of those with an ardent wooer and a standoffish lady fair—has cooled down; only embers glow with muted ardor, sending up a lick of passionate flame now and then, to die down repulsed with an angry sizzle.

Ernest Germain sums up the present sorry state of le grand amour in the French official-Trotskyist organ La Verité for July 5-18, in an article unaccountably entitled "First Balance Sheet of the Yugoslav Affair." He names Western imperialism as co-respondent.

The Yugoslav's infidelity, of course, is ascribed to their foreign policy, but he does not (cannot) stop there. Germain lists their gross deviations, which became plain to him with the outbreak of the Korean war, and which comprise the many questions on which the Tito regime has made clear that it is supporting the Western bloc in the cold war. His language is strongly denunciatory and stiff.

"From all the evidence, they have, on an increasing number of questions, espoused the positions of American imperialism. . . .

SCHIZOID DEVELOPMENT

"Last summer [right after the outbreak of the Korean war] one could wonder whether the opportunist declarations, speeches and writings of the Yugoslav leaders were not explainable on the basis of the dramatic situation and famine in Yugoslavia and whether they would have only a passing effect on the international workers' movement. Wasn't it a matter simply of words which, after all, few people would take at their face value? That was an error. . . . The turn to the right in Yugoslav foreign policy . . . rapidly discredited the Yugoslav cause in the eyes of the vacillating Communist militants and tended to give a certain basis to the Stalinist slander that 'Tito has passed over to the imperialist camp' . . .

"Since then, however, actions have succeeded to words. It is no longer only the objective result of the rightist Yugoslav politics which holds back and fetters the regroupment of the revolutionary forces, it is the conscious intervention of the Yugoslav CP, and of the forces it inspires, which is becoming more and more one of the main brakes on this regroupment. In the British Labor Party, it is not the left but the reformist and pro-imperialist leadership which Djilas and Pyade have embraced, declaring that the latter represents the principle socialist force today and passing over in silence the fact that it maintains colonialist exploitation over half of Africa. . . .

The last point, incidentally, is absolutely true and deserved special notice before this. The Yugoslav spokesmen have indeed criticized Bevan for starting a fight, drawing their comments straight from the Labor Herald.

Germain had begun the "balance sheet" with the usual glowing picture (in retrospect) of the 1948-1950 advances toward "socialist democracy" in Yugoslavia. He has to raise the question: "How was it possible for this dual and contradictory evolution of the Yugoslav affair to take place?"—that is, how does he explain that the Tito regime has gone in one direction (toward socialism) in domestic policy and toward imperialism in foreign policy? Given his myths about the internal development of Yugoslav national-Stalinism, the schizoid development is certainly a sticker.

His explanation, naturally, is in terms of imperialist pressure, plus the pressure of "the rich peasantry in the country itself." He notes also that the Tito regime had "no confidence in the forces of the international proletariat and of the colonial

peoples," in spite of the fact that "the revolution is today every year marching on to new countries and new continents" (he means Stalinism).

He does not ask, let alone explain, how a regime which has not an iota of confidence in revolutionary forces which are making revolutions before his eyes yet somehow has such confidence in the revolutionary consciousness of its own people that it has made giant strides in turning over democratic control of the country to them, as he has claimed. The fact is, of course, not only that the latter is a myth, as we have discussed before, but also that it is not true that the Tito leaders began deviating from internationalism only with the Korean war and pressure from the West. There has not been a microscopic speck of socialist internationalism in the Titoists' ideology from the day after the Cominform break, not to speak of before that time.

The Tito regime's attitude of dependence on and glorification of the UN was being shouted by them fully as vigorously two years ago as now. It is the Titoists who clothed themselves in the mantle of "socialism in one country" and, in declaration after declaration from 1948 on, explicitly insisted that they had to rely on only the resources of their own country. They opposed international organization from the beginning. Their views on the war have never been anything else but bounded by the concepts of "aggression," "peaceful coexistence," etc.

ANYTHING CAN HAPPEN

All of these defined their principled views on every international question from 1948. The Korean war, famine, U. S. pressure, etc., merely made it unavoidable for them to make decisions and take overt actions which (while tactically convenient for them in the face of Cominform pressure) were implicit in their ideas.

If they are today supporting the Western camp against Moscow, their road to it, and mode of being in it, is not essentially different from the alliance of Moscow with the West after its attack by Germany. The big difference for them, to be sure, is the fact that their specific weight in such an alliance is far, far less than that of Russia's in 1941-45; this indeed is the reason why they were the British Labor Party leadership (which is a Power) and pooh-pooh Bevan (who is only trying to be a consistent socialist by his own lights).

But Germain finds that "the restoration of capitalism is becoming a real menace for Yugoslavia," citing the regime's loosening up on prices for the peasants and so on. That the Tito regime may founder completely, disintegrate, and give way to a regime which will seek to restore capitalism has naturally always been a possibility and still is. Germain implies, however, that the Tito regime itself is steering toward the restoration of capitalism. This is of a piece with the longer-established official-Trotskyist myth that the Moscow regime of Stalin is also headed in that direction.

Having discovered a couple of years ago a Yugoslav "revolution" which was not made by any revolutionary overthrow by the masses but carried through by the bureaucracy from the top, they now warn that the same bureaucracy is heading toward an equally bureaucratic counter-revolution. What a regime, this Tito's! It makes revolutions and unmakes them, while the masses remain on the sidelines and either cheer or glower! In the world of the pre-Titoists of the left, anything can happen.

Subscribe—\$2 a year LABOR ACTION

Youth and Student Corner

Liberal Student Groups, Democracy and War Issue on the Campus

By MAX MARTIN

Liberalism in the United States today is caught in an ever deepening quandary and finds itself facing problems which mount by the hour. Its basic difficulty lies in the unbridgeable gulf between the support which it gives to American imperialism's preparations for World War III as expressed through Truman's foreign policy, on the one hand, and its traditions of fighting for democracy, civil liberties, rising standards of living and other progressive measures on the other. The solutions which liberals try to apply to these problems are in the nature of compromises, makeshifts and expedient palliatives whose results would frequently be laughable were they not so tragic.

Under the hammer blows of the needs of a society girding itself for an unpopular war, liberals give up one by one their basic tenets of civil liberties with half-cynical, half-uneasy explanations about "security" and "just a temporary emergency measure." Those inroads on democracy which they still find themselves unable to swallow are dealt with by a tortured and tortuous compartmentalization. This or that Republican senator, this or that errant administration official, is responsible. The Truman "Fair Deal" regime, its foreign policy and its domestic policy, is guiltless.

The witchhunt? McCarthyism is to blame and perhaps the attorney general is a bit overzealous in arresting the Stalinist leaders. Washington is propping up Franco just at the moment when the Spanish people are beginning to stir to free themselves from his police-state rule? That's the fault of our ambassador in Madrid, who's no liberal! This approach is illustrated well enough by the liberal New York Post (discussed elsewhere in this issue).

Needless to say, all of the above attitudes are reflected and refracted by liberal students, whether they are unaffiliated or organized in such campus groups as Students for Democratic Action or the Young Liberals. They differ from their parent organizations in that they are generally less cynical and more uneasy over the tightrope they have to walk, and are frequently further to the left and more genuinely eager to struggle for democratic rights. Despite this not-unimportant difference they share with their progenitors confusion and schizoid politics. Having no over-all understanding of the nature of the political world we all live in they have no lines by which to guide themselves.

Against Two Errors

Quite frequently they indulge in long soul-searchings over whether or not it is correct to defend the civil rights of Stalinists when they support Washington's cold war against Russia. Even when they have this problem settled they are phased by what to do about the fact that Stalinists pretend to be for civil liberties, engage in fights to defend their OWN rights, and more frequently initiate united-front movements or try to enter those initiated by others (in order to gain control of them for their reactionary reasons).

The reaction of liberal students to this problem jumps from extreme to extreme; at times they try to show how democratic they are and take the initiative of inviting Stalinist student organizations into their united fronts, at other times they abandon these organizations at the first sign of Stalinist participation in them, giving the Stalinists the opportunity of claiming that they are the only fighters for academic freedom (or whatever was the aim of the united front).

Both of these positions, of course, are incorrect. It then becomes the task of members of the Socialist Youth League and other socialist and anti-war students to explain to the liberals that although Stalinists should not be invited into such campaigns (since they are against

civil liberties for anybody except themselves, as well as for other reasons) it is not at all necessary to give up the fight when the Stalinists appear on the scene. The real anti-democratic nature of Stalinism can be exposed and the Stalinists can in a democratic manner be defeated politically inside the united-front organizations at the same time that the organization carries on the purpose for which it was organized.

In addition to their general educational and propaganda work through meetings, leaflet and press distribution, etc., it is the task of socialist students on campus to engage loyally with liberal and other democratic student groups in all campaigns over democratic and progressive issues. They have to spur the liberals on and demand that the liberals fight for their democratic program and not let it be sacrificed to the needs of Washington's cold war. The fact that liberalism supports Washington's foreign policy and opposes the restrictions on freedom which inevitably flow from them is the contradiction for the liberals. It is our job to try to see to it that this contradiction is not resolved by the liberals' desertion of their democratic viewpoints.

Convincing Liberal Students

During the course of such joint activities the socialist students can teach the liberals that in order to struggle for democracy it is necessary for them to end their alliance with the Fair Deal administration, which is chiefly responsible for the sad state of civil rights in America today, and to work for the formation of an independent labor party. Furthermore, they can be shown that the fight for democracy is indissolubly connected with the struggle against war and for socialism.

Liberal students support the Truman-Acheson foreign policy not because of their links to American imperialism, as is the case with so many of the paid professional spokesmen for liberal organizations, but because they are genuinely anti-Stalinist for democratic reasons. Recognizing Stalinism for the monstrous totalitarian barbarism that it is, and not seeing any other force capable of putting an end to it they turn to Washington. This gives socialists another approach to them.

Washington is not interested in democracy nor does it fight Stalinism from democratic motivations. Its enmity to Russia is dictated by the economic and political interests of its capitalist ruling class. When its interests dictated so during the last war, Russia was "our noble ally" and Roosevelt cynically divided the world up with Stalin at Yalta. America today makes deals with the fascist butcher Franco, this being done, Washington tries to tell the people of the world, because it is fighting for democracy. It is our task to convince the liberal students of these truths.

We must point out to them that most of the peoples of the world are forever through with capitalism and colonial exploitation and that they will not fight for Washington against Russia. Only a democratic policy which genuinely supports the desires for socialism of the European working classes and the colonial peoples' aspirations for national independence and a solution of the agrarian problem can hope to rally these peoples.

To support Washington's reactionary policy, we can teach the liberals, plays into the hands of Stalinism. Only a workers' government could have such a democratic policy. If the liberals on campus wish to see the destruction of Stalinism and its replacement by democracy they must begin to think along these lines.

By this kind of action and propaganda the socialist forces can find the road which leads to bringing ever-increasing numbers of liberal students under the influence of and to the program and banner of the struggle for the Third Camp and socialism.

Natalia Trotsky's Letter in Bolivia

By F. J.

LA PAZ, Aug. 1—Copies of LABOR ACTION have arrived here with Natalia Trotsky's letter breaking with the Fourth International, and the news has made a profound impression on the revolutionary socialists of Bolivia.

(For that matter, also, the second largest newspaper here, El Diario in its August 1 issue, gave its top front-page headline to the event, reproducing Comrade Natalia's letter entire.)

The official section of the Fourth International in this country, the POR (Partido Obrero

Revolucionario), has not yet made its position known. [Other articles inform us, however, that stalwarts of the POR have been saying that after all Natalia's action does not have political significance because she was "only the wife" of the Old Man, etc., etc.—Ed.]

But at a special meeting of the Liga Obrera Socialista (LOS)—the former PSOB—Natalia's letter was read and thoroughly discussed. All members of the league's central committee expressed their views. Although doubts were expressed about the content of the "capitalist restoration" in Russia, the following resolution was adopted unanimously: "The LOS group finds that Comrade Natalia Trotsky's letter confirms, generally speaking, the ideas and viewpoints which were supported and defended by the former PSOB and now by the LOS with respect to the Fourth International, Stalinism and the problems of the proletarian revolution. Consequently, the LOS supports this letter with all its socialist faith and expects that the courageous act of Comrade Natalia will strengthen the international revolutionary movement and will be a starting point for a new regrouping of the revolutionary organizations in the entire world."

The LOS decided to publish Comrade Natalia's letter in thousands of copies and called for a general discussion on such fundamental problems of revolutionary policy. In the discussion, comrades emphasized the historical merit of LABOR ACTION and the Independent Socialist League of the U. S. because of its critical work on the outlived policy of the Fourth International and the American SWP.

[Note: LABOR ACTION thanks these comrades and hopes that they will acquaint themselves, in the course of their consideration of the Russian problem, with our view of the nature of Russian Stalinist society: that no "capitalist restoration" has taken place, but that the system of exploitation there is based on a NEW social order, for which we use the term "bureaucratic collectivism."—Ed.]

NEW YORK Labor Action Forums Thursday at 8:30, August 16 Britain Under the Labor Gov't A Firsthand Report by DAVID ALEXANDER LABOR ACTION HALL, 114 West 14 Street, N.Y.C.

Bevan's Pamphlet on Foreign Policy

'More for Socialism, Less for War' Is Central Message Appealing to Workers

By HAL DRAPER

We discussed in the first part of this article, last week, the underlying reason why the Bevanites' pamphlet-manifesto, *One Way Only*, centers its position around the size of the rearmament budget. To recall that for a moment: we pointed out that at bottom they have no conceptions of foreign policy other than Attlee's and are motivated primarily by their concern for the domestic program of social reform, which would be cut to the quick by the rearmament program, as Attlee's ministers have admitted.

But how attack the size of the rearmament figures without any independent notions on foreign policy? The problem, and the fact that they have no solution for it, accounts for the vague, self-contradictory and ambiguous impression which the pamphlet conveys on this issue.

The London Times' attack—cleverly, I think—confined itself primarily to inserting the dagger and twisting in this spot.

We mentioned that *One Way Only* made a big point of arguing that Russia is weaker than it is supposed. Quite plainly, most of the time, it means: militarily and industrially weaker. Presumably their argument implies that if this is true, then Britain needs a smaller arms budget than its leaders think and have proposed.

The Times thereupon went into a froth of figures and citations about Russian strength. It has authorities to quote. Since it is true that the Bevanites' made this point a pillar of their position, it cannot be denounced as irrelevant or distorting. We ourselves are not interested in a determination of this question as the basis for a political position. It is the Bevanites who are thereby forced to argue on a ground on which they cannot possibly be either convincing or inspiring.

More than that, they cannot turn aside the second lunge of the Times. But it is time to let *One Way Only* speak for itself.

"Once the real strength of the Soviet Union is seen in real perspective, it is possible to make a sane examination of our rearmament program. . . . Is the main purpose of it to withstand an early general attack by the Soviet Union? No, this cannot be so, it points out. 'What, then, is its real purpose?' It considers the argument that it is intended to be a 'deterrent' to Russia. 'That is a legitimate objective,' it admits. 'And if such a plan for preventing aggression is to be made effective, there must be forces available to back it. Facts and armaments designed for this purpose are an essential part of a policy of peace.'"

Uneasy Balancing

What then is left for them to say after this? Arrived at the point, they feebly add that, however, rearmament must be "most carefully limited" in order not to destroy "the other objective . . . to sustain our domestic economy and to launch a liberating policy abroad on a more ambitious scale. . . ." (It has the Point Four idea in mind.) We are for a strong defense but against "break-neck Atlantic rearmament." It was "right to resist aggression in Korea" . . . "but it is no less necessary to resist military demands which would strain our economy to the breaking point and rob us of any chance of playing an effective role in the attack on world poverty." Therefore we must "cut it [the arms budget] to reasonable proportions, and . . . see whether by our example and pressure we can spread the same sanity across the Atlantic before it is too late."

There is nothing more concrete on this aspect. At every point, the military considerations and the "other objective" are balanced against each other in tightrope language. On the logical plane, it is of course the easiest thing in the world for Attlee's men to reply that they too balance the need for arms against Russia with the social needs, and merely come up with a different factual answer: *And what are your facts on this question which YOU raise, Mr. Bevan?* In effect, that is the Times' riposte also:

"They conspicuously refrain from making any attempt to estimate the scale of rearmament required to act as such a deterrent; they merely assert, cloudily and dogmatically, that the scale adopted is too great."

And again: "On page 10 of *One Way Only* the authors talk of the 'latent strength of the Western powers.' Rearmament is intended to turn the latent strength of the West into strength which can be immediately effective." And so on.

No, it is not this kind of argumentation in *One Way Only* which explains why in fact Bevan's supporters are routing the government's spokesmen at many Labor Party meetings before the rank and file.

In its reply to the Times among others, Bevan's organ *The Tribune* remained completely on the same ground that was attacked. In its lead article (July 13-26) entitled "The Crime of *One Way Only*," it weakly counters: "The first sacred truth which we have dared to question is the figure of 4,700 million pounds to be spent on rearmament in the next three years. The indecency we have committed is our refusal to accept this total as immaculate and unchallengeable. . . . Anyone who dares to add up figures about industrial strength or military potential, anyone who is so bold as to wonder why if the Russians are so strong they have not attempted a general attack already, is querulously dismissed as a simpleton, a saboteur or worse." (My italics.) Then it refers to Russia's "poor comparative resources." It could not have more clearly taken a line which substitutes arithmetic and bookkeeping for politics and program. But then it has little of the latter on foreign policy.

Two of Bevan's prominent supporters, R. H. S. Crossman and Ian Mikardo, also went to the defense in a letter to the Times. Thrown into the breach *ad hoc* is an entirely new theory which is not in the pamphlet at all, though it may be the private possession of Crossman and Mikardo. After again starting off with "Russian weakness," they write: "Indeed, there is ground for believing that . . . we shall soon have reached an equilibrium of power between East and West. To transform this equilibrium into a Western ascendancy would not secure peace and might actually threaten to convert the cold war into a hot war." There are more stupidities and anti-socialist ideas in these two sentences than we care to discuss right now.

Now it is necessary to mention that in *One Way Only* there is a rather long passage, entirely unrelated to the sections we have cited, which could have been developed into an entirely different and immensely stronger view of what was meant by "Russian weakness." It begins: "Although the Soviet government has not refrained from using military strength to gain its ends on particular occasions, Soviet policy has relied in the main on other weapons. Their chief attack has been delivered on the social, political and economic fronts. . . . If we spend too large a part of our resources building up military deterrents, we shall by that very act increase the number of Trojan horses upon which Soviet Communism relies for its victories more than upon the sheer weight of its armed forces."

And it cites the situation in France and Italy quite correctly. But nothing is done with this; it remains suspended in the pamphlet like a hanging participle. (Remember that the pamphlet was worked out by a group, and no doubt this section was included to make someone happy.) Above all, it leads to no suggestion of counterposing a political offensive against Stalinism to the building up of arms either in "reasonable" proportions or otherwise. For this would require the elaboration of an entirely different foreign policy—a socialist internationalist one—as against the basic Attlee-Bevan agreement on the Atlantic Pact strategy!

And so, precisely at this point, the pamphlet's discussion of foreign policy peters off into proposals for negotiated deals with Russia, with ambiguous overtones. There is not a word about British imperialism in Africa, the Near East or Asia. Contrary to the impression one would get from almost any American newspaper, there is no attack on U. S. imperialism or foreign policy, with

the exception of an implied criticism on its raw-materials policy as it affects British economy. On the contrary, the pamphlet goes out of its way to applaud Washington's idealistic motives and to polemicize against the conception of the American colossus as a capitalist devil. What caused the U. S. press to split a gut was its warnings that the U. S. might be so carried away by its own strength—under a government other than the present one, it hedges, implying MacArthur—that it may undertake aggressive action.

But even this much constitutes an appeal to the British workers' suspicion and hostility toward U. S. imperialism.

'Carry Out the Program'

No, there is no foreign policy here which either has captured or can possibly capture the imagination and fervent support of the Labor Party rank and file. There is nothing here which even offers any reason to believe that the Bevanite leaders can retain their balance on the tightrope they are treading because there is no straight line upon which they can stand. It is rather the section on domestic policy which is their strength, plus the GENERAL impression conveyed by the pamphlet that they want less subordination to American imperialism, even though there is not much of a meaningful program put forward to achieve this.

It is then especially a pity that there is only a relatively small section which discusses the grievances of the British workers at home.

There is a vigorous attack on the Labor government's failure to enforce "fair shares":

"Before the Budget, the City [financial district] and the business world expected a real attack. . . . When the Budget came, their whoops of joy . . . echoed round every boardroom in the country. Dividends and bonus shares grew so rapidly that even the *Sunday Express* was inspired to complain that excessive profits were forcing prices too high. In four weeks from Budget Day the value of securities quoted on the Stock Exchange rose by a thousand million pounds."

There is an attack on the raw-materials crisis, elaborating the point which Bevan made cogently in his resignation speech.

We do not propose any "new" ideas, the pamphlet concludes; carry out the program in *Let Us Win Together* (the Labor Party's program): further nationalization and social planning, more industrial democracy, implement the program which is on paper. Concretely, (1) make this possible by reducing the arms program; (2) keep the cost of living stable; (3) make a vigorous attack on distribution costs; (4) a general price freeze; (5) ban or tax heavily all dividend increases over the 1947-1948 level.

More for socialism, less for war: this is its message, stripped of its feeble argumentation. And fortunately it is the message, rather than most of the argumentation, which corresponds to the basic interests and needs of the British workers.

One Viscount Portman is quoted (by U. S. News & World Report) as follows—we visualize him dangling a monocle in one hand and balancing a cup of tea with the other, as he addresses his cronies:

"Viscount Portman said that *One Way Only* was a pamphlet of an extremely disgusting nature. To put it mildly, it was almost treasonable, and one could hardly realize yet the effect it would have on the minds of the workers in the factories and the various branches of armament production. . . ."

Whatever happens at the coming conferences of the Trade Union Congress and the Labor Party with regard to the relationship of forces among the delegates there, it is certain that it will not adequately reflect the effect of that message in "the minds of the workers in the factories" and above all its dynamic potentialities for the development of a genuinely socialist and clear left wing in Britain. Such a left wing does not yet exist in significantly organized form. But its development can change the course of our history.

Berkeley Tenants Fight Rent Steal by Gouging Landlords —

(Continued from page 1)

Next came the demand for a council hearing on decontrol with the Chamber of Commerce backing the landlords. Although the hearing was to be open to the public at large, the Apartment House Association called a banquet for the realty people and deliberately instructed them to pack the Berkeley Little Theater a full hour in advance of the meeting. When a thousand clamoring tenants showed up at meeting time, they found themselves locked out of the hearing. Fortunately a last-minute effort compelled the council to change the place of meeting.

The Daily Californian, the university publication, reported the episode. "Led by Robert Martinson," who is organizer of the Berkeley Socialist Youth League, "the seatless citizens sent a delegation to the City Hall a block away,

where the city council was meeting prior to adjourning to the theater for the hearing. The council listened to Martinson and several others who asked that the meeting be moved to the Community Theater. . . . After much discussion . . . the council first adjourned to the Little Theater and then to the larger Community Theater. . . ."

As the hearing finally got under way, the council demagogically offered equal time to both the realty interests and the tenants. Thus eleven organizations representing renters were allotted the same total time as three spokesmen for the landlords.

EXPOSE GOUGERS

After an hour of hammy, demagogic appeals by the Apartment House Association, the Real Estate Board and the Committee for Rent Decontrol, a battery of tenant speakers took the floor and outlined the hardships and diffi-

culties decontrol would impose on most of Berkeley's residents. The speakers included representatives from the Young Democratic Club, the CIO Council, Americans for Democratic Action, the Independent Progressive Party, the First Unitarian Church and the Auto Mechanics Union.

Robert Ash of the AFL Central Labor Council pointedly held up the expeditor's survey as proof that the rental situation still remained "tight." He added that with the increased population through anticipated defense production, overcrowding and an actual excess of tenants over available units could be expected in a few months.

Martinson ridiculed the realty plea that decontrol meant lower rentals. He cited recent Labor Department statistics showing that rents had increased nineteen percent in decontrolled cities, whereas in controlled cities they had

gone up only 3.3 per cent.

Durward DuRant, the Socialist Party candidate for councilman, reaffirmed his stand for rent control and public housing. He called the real-estate interests "exploiters of the worst kind."

Then followed about fifty individual residents of Berkeley, most of them tenants and students, each using two minutes to present his personal and family problems arising from the continued rental shortage. This display of opposition to decontrol kept the council in session until about two o'clock in the morning.

TEST CASE

But the protest had no effect. Both the city council and the landlords had made up their minds long in advance. At the next council meeting on the morning of July 31, all eight councilmen voted for decontrol. Mayor Lawrence Cross alone supported

the majority of his constituents, saying he preferred "to leave the matter in the hands of the federal government."

That Berkeley serves as a test case of real-estate domination in the Bay Area is best illustrated by the example of Albany. There the same pattern unfolded, and almost simultaneously the Albany city council enacted decontrol—with only one abstention. Moreover, in the next few weeks decontrol will come up in Oakland, San Francisco and Alameda.

In all instances the realty interests have played the same unctuous role, maneuvering through lobbies and elections—supported by the Chambers of Commerce—in their plot against tenant residents. To them the principle of "the free market" must be reaffirmed. Human misery be damned—private profit is at stake.

Readers of Labor Action Take the Floor . . .

BLP Discussion Supports Bevan

London, July 14

To The Editor:

Undoubtedly the most important of the three Fabian Society's meetings to discuss Labor's foreign-and domestic policy in relation to the rearmament drive and the resignation of Mr. Bevan took place yesterday. The title of this conference was "Arms and Foreign Policy." It was held at Caxton Hall, Westminster, and was the last of a series of public discussions of the Bevan resignation.

It estimated there were about three or four hundred people present at this conference. Mr. John Freeman spoke for the Bevan group, and Mr. Dennis Healy spoke for the government.

The government took a serious view of the proceedings was shown by the presence of Mr. Hugh Dalton, who is now rated as Labor's No. 3 man in order of importance in the hierarchy. The publication of *One Way Only* made the conference interesting from every point of view, for we heard for the first time the official reaction to this most important pamphlet.

Mr. John Freeman suggested that every person at the conference should buy a copy of the pamphlet to see whether or not Mr. Healy's accusations as to its confused character were based on a careful reading of the document in question. It was pointed out by someone in the hall that all the copies on the literature stalls had been bought up! This caused a minor stir in the conference, as it was clear evidence that the pamphlet was going to sell at an unprecedented rate throughout the length and breadth of the Labor movement.

Mr. Healy in his reply to Mr. Freeman's exposition and elaboration upon *One Way Only* pointed out that Mr. Bevan had not resigned because he opposed rearmament as such, but because he opposed the scale of rearmament. This Freeman was willing to concede, for he said that rearmament on such a colossal scale was impossible of fulfillment and would undermine the economic base upon which it was founded and therefore would in the long run break up the rearmament program itself.

The discussion revealed an almost unanimous support for Mr. Freeman. One comrade asked what military value was the \$750,000,000 rearmament of Chiang Kai-shek to America's plan for defense of the "Western" world? Mr. Healy replied that America had in fact acted as the arsenal of Communism!

Another comrade denied Mr. Healy's contention that the immediate or even long-term danger came from Russia's military potential. He pointed out that all the evidence indicated that it was Russia's anti-capitalist appeal to millions throughout Europe and Asia that enabled her to seize power without direct military intervention in Yugoslavia, Albania, Czechoslovakia and China. The question was not whether we supported rearmament or not in the abstract, but whether we supported rearmament of Chiang Kai-shek, Syngman Rhee and Franco in the concrete. The question was what was the character of Russian strength—was it military or ideological and social? If

the former was the case then a military solution was called for; if the latter, a social and ideological alternative was necessary. . . .

It was significant that nearly all other speakers from the floor tackled on to the theme that the social revolution in Asia, Africa and the Middle East is the dominant fact of the twentieth century, to quote *One Way Only*, and it was this that made nonsense of the idea that rearmament and defense should be given.

A. V.

Coleman Explains His Resolution

The following letter refers to the resolution on war policy, the text of which was printed in our July 23 issue, which was put before the recent ISL convention by Coleman and unanimously rejected by the convention. It should be explained, perhaps, that after adopting its own resolution, the convention decided to take a record vote on the above-mentioned resolution (in spite of the fact that no delegate sponsored it) in order to underline the League's views—Ed.

To The Editor:

. . . This resolution represents a final effort in the attempt begun over two years ago by myself and other members of the ISL to get the organization's position on the war stated in more concrete terms than in the cloudy generalities and windy slogans which the Political Committee favors. My resolution was not and is not, however, a summation of my own position on the question. As I made clear in the discussion article to which the resolution was appended, the resolution has a somewhat different purpose. As far as I am concerned, the three factors mentioned in the resolution are in full effect today, and have been in effect at least since the present discussion began. I believe there has been no misunderstanding on this point; my position is now and all along has been one of critical support of military resistance to Stalinist aggression, and of unqualified opposition to all currents in the socialist movement that compromise on the question of Stalinism, as well as to all tendencies to place democratic capitalism and Stalinist totalitarianism on the same plane.

The purpose of the above resolution was to bring to a test, once and for all, whether the ISL was actually, as spokesmen for the Political Committee have sometimes claimed, examining and weighing in a serious and rational manner all the possible lines along which the war crisis might develop; or whether the ISL was merely reciting an article of Leninist faith in a purely automatic way and deliberately closing its eyes to everything that might disturb that faith. Spokesmen for the Political Committee have repeatedly stated that, of course, if only two

"camps" in fact existed in the war, the ISL could do nothing else than support the camp of democratic capitalism. (See Larry O'Connor in LABOR ACTION of March 12). My resolution merely states that such a situation, in which the choice can be only between two 'camps,' must be considered a real possibility—one of the possible lines of development of the war crisis. To be obliged to state this obvious fact in a resolution strikes me as somewhat absurd. Yet the convention of the ISL rejected this resolution, and did so, I understand, by what only barely missed being a unanimous vote!

What does this mean? It means that the ISL rules out, dogmatically and absolutely, any possibility that an effective "Third Camp" may fail to develop. The permanent existence of an effective "Third Camp" is guaranteed by—the convention of the ISL! It is now clear that the "Third Camp" is outside the processes of history, and that it is, as some have suspected, a metaphysical rather than a political entity.

To my mind, this absolute ruling-out of all possible lines of development except the single one that happens to fit Leninist specifications is political obscurantism pure and simple—it is saying good-bye to rational politics. I did not attend the convention and have not yet been able to obtain official confirmation that my resolution was rejected. When I have received such confirmation, I intend to resign from the ISL.

H. D. COLEMAN
(St. Louis)

(1) We find Coleman's letter—which we print post-mortem, so to speak, at his request—not very illuminating as to the form in which his pro-war resolution was cast. By form, of course, we do not mean the fact that Coleman thinks socialists should support the war by the West against Russia—though that is the heart of the matter and the real basis for the ISL's decisive action on his resolution.

But Coleman did not think fit to present his views in this form, which would at least have the merit of being unambiguous. Instead he formulated a resolution which called for support to the third world war IF three factors enumerated being carefully selected ones which are indubitably present now: Stalinist military pressure, weakness of the Third Camp, and "a significant degree of democracy" in the West as compared with Russia.

Coleman, above, explains that this way of putting it was a "test." We are informed that it was supposed to test whether we are "examining and weighing in a serious and rational manner all the possible lines along which the war crisis might develop. . . ."

It is no doubt necessary always to weigh all possible future developments, insofar as one can foresee them, and even to do so "in a serious and rational manner." But (a) Coleman makes perfectly clear that he was describing the

present state of affairs, in his opinion; (b) it was obvious to us that he was describing the present, not the possible future; and (c) we make bold to believe that most of the headline-skimming readers of even the N. Y. Daily News would also be aware of the present existence of the three "ifs" on which he based his pro-war stand.

The question, then, is obviously not anyone's willingness to be as serious and rational as Coleman in weighing "all the possible lines along which the war crisis might develop," but rather this: Do in fact his three "ifs" mandate socialist support to the third imperialist world war?

This is what our voluminous discussions of the war question have been about. It would take us outside the bounds of politics to examine and weigh the question: Why is it that converts to these pro-war views insist on insinuating that anyone who disagrees with them cannot be "serious and rational" about the problem? At any rate, we'll stick to politics, ourselves.

For the question itself, we need only refer here to said voluminous discussions on the war question and our resolution, plus the following comment relevant to the above letter.

(2) Coleman misquotes (or mis-paraphrases) the article by Comrade O'Connor to which he refers, and we are convinced that he does so in all honesty because he simply does not understand the first thing about the socialist anti-war position.

He ascribes to us the view (without quotation marks) that support of the war would be indicated "if only two 'camps' in fact existed in the war." Before pointing out how absurd this is, let us quote what Comrade O'Connor actually wrote, noting the capitalized portion:

"We have made clear before this—in the 1949 ISL resolution, for example—that bourgeois democracy is preferable to Stalinism (or fascism), that it is indeed the 'lesser evil' IF THE QUESTION IS LIMITED TO A CHOICE BETWEEN THESE TWO ALONE. The whole point of our anti-war position is precisely that it is suicidal to base our politics on this lesser evil."—

To point up the difference: When the First World War broke out, "only two 'camps' in fact existed in the war." There was no Third Camp in existence "in fact" except the few scattered left socialists. The task which the anti-war socialists set themselves was to help to bring the Third Camp mass movement into existence "in fact." They did. Those social democrats for whom "the question is limited to a choice between [the two imperialists] alone" followed their well-known lesser-evil course and brought the socialist movement to the brink of destruction.

Naturally, we refer to this only to clarify the exceedingly elementary idea: A socialist has a right to base his politics on the lesser-evil choice only if he first decides that there is no possibility of intervention by the aroused masses of the world against both imperialists; only if he first discounts the Third Camp (that is childish) but as the legitimate goal and reason for existence of the socialist anti-war struggle.

As Comrade O'Connor wrote: "It is true that there is no organized force with a clear ideology which shows a practical effect in organizing the masses or giving them 'something tangible.' But what contribution can be made toward bringing such a force into being by politicians who start out by committing themselves to the military and political support of American capitalism?"

In all seriousness and rationality, Coleman's profundity may be

summed up as: There is no organized Third Camp movement against the war now, and therefore the socialist movement should take that course which makes impossible any contribution on its part toward ever building such a movement.

If, however, there were an organized Third Camp movement struggling against both imperialisms in existence "in fact" in the world, Coleman would be willing to oppose the war. In other words—that's what it means—if the world revolution were around the corner and already walking up to him with outstretched arms. That's mighty decent and manifests his no-doubt fundamentally progressive aspirations. . . . Since that is not the case, however, he cannot live in the ISL, which exists in order to work toward that goal. . . .

It would be entirely hypocritical of us if we intimated that we are amazed by Coleman's decision to take himself and his pro-war views out of our movement. We have a point of view on these matters; we do not expel anyone for pro-war views; he can even advocate them within his democratic rights; but when he finds, as he does, that he can convince next to no one in the movement, he must himself decide whether his views are compatible with loyal participation in the movement.—Ed.

(3) Coleman misquotes (or mis-paraphrases) the article by Comrade O'Connor to which he refers, and we are convinced that he does so in all honesty because he simply does not understand the first thing about the socialist anti-war position.

He ascribes to us the view (without quotation marks) that support of the war would be indicated "if only two 'camps' in fact existed in the war." Before pointing out how absurd this is, let us quote what Comrade O'Connor actually wrote, noting the capitalized portion:

"We have made clear before this—in the 1949 ISL resolution, for example—that bourgeois democracy is preferable to Stalinism (or fascism), that it is indeed the 'lesser evil' IF THE QUESTION IS LIMITED TO A CHOICE BETWEEN THESE TWO ALONE. The whole point of our anti-war position is precisely that it is suicidal to base our politics on this lesser evil."—

To the Editor:
Oslo, July 21, 1951

According to a front-page story in the London Daily Herald of July 19, 1951, Admiral Forrest P. Sherman, United States Chief of Naval Operations, did more than just negotiate with Generalissimo Franco for military bases in Spain.

The Herald states that Admiral Sherman and his wife were "guests at Franco's garden party in Madrid yesterday (Wednesday), to celebrate the 15th anniversary of the civil war."

As private American citizens in Norway we should like to let the people of Norway know through their newspapers that not all Americans endorse such morally degenerate and politically disastrous behavior on the part of a government representative. Available evidence from the anti-Communist underground in Spain indicates that Franco would not only be an ideological liability to the West, but also a worthless military "ally." After a decade of hunger and totalitarianism it is extremely doubtful if the Spanish people, now in a rebellious mood, would fight for Franco.

What nauseates us most, however, is to see a high American official fraternize with Franco in a "celebration" of the outbreak of the Spanish civil war. That was historically a prelude to the worldwide holocaust from 1939 to 1945, and both Hitler and Mussolini derived considerable military experience by actively supporting the Franco revolt against the Republican government of Spain.

Frankly we are ashamed for our country. We are ashamed that reactionary and militaristic groups are so confident of their growing power at home that an American admiral would dare to sit down and drink toasts to the Spanish butcher—the symbol of political corruption and filth, the unreconstructed fascist and dictator who would soon collapse if only America withheld economic and military aid.

NEW YORK CLASS

Sponsored by the Socialist Youth League at Labor Action Hall, 114 West 14 Street, N. Y. C.

WORLD POLITICS: 1930-1950

(Tuesdays, 7:30-9 p.m.)

The remaining sessions are:

Aug. 14—The National Question and

Modern WarHal Draper

Aug. 21—The Role of Stalinism in the

Chinese RevolutionJack Brad

You're Invited

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

To the New York Post — — War Budget Plus — —

(Continued from page 1)

And even the *Post* draws the line at telling the truth about one further thing: *the men and leaders* whose acts and government measures have created this state of fear.

We have particular reference to the last paragraph of your above-quoted editorial:

"We liked President Truman's attack on the timid souls and their creators. We think he senses that American democracy is strong enough to withstand totalitarian attack without silencing dissenters and hounding non-conformists. We wonder when he will find an attorney general who shares his faith in freedom."

We can imagine several possible reasons for your writing this paragraph, but the hardest one for us to accept as the explanation is that you believe it yourself.

Is it really worth while wondering whether you think the trouble is that Truman can't find an attorney general who believes in civil liberties? Frankly, we feel kind of childish even raising the question.

What exactly is it you want to convey by this assumption of wide-eyed innocence? Is it a "diplomatic" suggestion to Truman that he change his attorney general? Why do you feel the need to be so deviously and darkly diplomatic on this?

AN EXPLANATION IS NEEDED

But let that go. The more important point is that you assert that Attorney General McGrath and his policies and actions which you condemn do not represent Truman himself, but are in conflict with Truman's "faith in freedom."

Perhaps then you have some private and altogether mysterious explanation for Truman's failure to can his unfaithful servant. Perhaps you have a similar explanation for his failure to take a much less drastic step: exert his power as McGrath's boss to stay his hand.

Perhaps you can expound the reason why this McGrath was preceded as attorney general by Tom Clark, who started what McGrath is finishing.

Perhaps you know why this president, whose faith in freedom is not shared by his attorneys general, rewarded the said Tom Clark with a place on that tribunal which is supposed to be the watchdog of our freedoms, the Supreme Court—which is supposed, indeed, to check on unfaithful attorneys general.

Obviously you must have such an explanation: otherwise what can one think of your editorial morality in telling your readers that Truman really and truly does not agree with . . . what his appointed officials are doing?

It would be interesting to be let in on the secret, if we may.

But let that go too. A still more important point claims attention.

You realize, of course, that you are accusing Attorney General McGrath of being disloyal to his president's desires on civil liberty.

That, to be sure, is not a criminal offense, nor is it even as heinous as being accused of "subversiveness" by one of McGrath's employees or McCarthy. But it is nevertheless a serious charge against the man's integrity as a leading figure in the Fair Deal administration.

We know your detestation of McCarthyism—that is, mudslinging charges unbacked by evidence. Do you have any evidence that McGrath's activities are not fully supported by his president? We are not asking for legal evidence that would hold up in court—any kind of evidence.

WHY PICK ON McGRATH?

If we defend McGrath against your accusation, you will understand it is out of no love for him.

For wasn't it Truman who issued the executive order directing the attorney general to set up a "subversive list"? Do you have a moral right to cast aspersions on the latter's integrity as a Fair Deal official because he is acting under Truman's written order?

Is it not Truman who is directly and personally responsible for the fact that the "subversive list" procedure, under which all agencies of his government are ordered to operate, was set up in such way that hearings and trials are excluded? Is it moral of you to blame McGrath for the conditions which you have so vigorously and justly attacked?

Is it not Truman's administration—not McCarthy, not the Republicans, not the Dixiecrats, not McGrath, not even J. Edgar Hoover—which ordered and established the "loyalty oath" reign of terror among government employees? Is it ethical of you to impugn McGrath's loyalty on this ground?

Do you really believe that Truman is, privately or otherwise, distressed by his own government's action—the one about which you wrote an excellent editorial—in meeting the danger of "Communist revolution" by throwing the leaders of a legal party in jail on the sole ground that they are the leaders of said legal (if detestable) party? More to the point: are you accusing McGrath of doing this on his own responsibility, without clearance with the White House?

Anyone who believes that you are not merely interested in whitewashing the Fair Deal president—at the expense of a loyal subordinate's character—will await your evidence with interest. Surely it is worth while putting it before your readers.

But let that go as well, in order to get even closer to the main question raised by the "poll of fear." We asked: Of whom and of what were these people afraid?

Exactly what has given the people the idea that it is dangerous to sign a petition?

Your editorial ascribed the pervasive fear to the pernicious consequences of McCarthyism. We do not have to protest too much about our views on McCarthyism and McGrath, who is in quite another class even from McGrath and Truman, and we do not fear them.

But are people afraid to sign petitions because they fear their signatures will fall into the hands of the Wisconsin senator—or into the hands of the FBI?

WHOSE STOOLPIGEONS?

In the words of your editorial, do "too many Americans view one another with fishy eyes" because they are afraid of stoolpigeons hired by McCarthy (who no doubt has as many as he and his slimy backers

can afford)—or because they have read columns of news reports (and seen movies) about FBI stoolpigeons, paid by Truman's administration?

Do "too many Americans wonder if their neighbors are dangerous characters" because of speeches by McCarthy—or do you remember that Truman himself appealed to the public to report "subversive" suspects to the FBI?

Are workers fired from plants, or blacklisted, by McCarthy—or by the agencies of the Defense Department under Truman's orders, and on the basis of Truman's "subversive list"?

For every public figure who has been monstrously smeared by McCarthy, how many government employees and industrial workers—plus scientists and professional men—have been smeared, fired and ruined for careers or jobs by the finger of Truman's "loyalty" agencies?

And didn't all this get under way before ever McCarthy hove on the scene? Wasn't it in the growing atmosphere of "everything goes" against "subversives" that McCarthyism took its inspiration?

Let's get away for a moment from the McGraths and Clarks and even McCarthys, to take a look at an attorney general who presumably shared his president's faith in freedom. For in tracing the heads of the Justice Department only as far back as Clark, we unjustifiably ignored ex-Attorney General Francis Biddle.

Biddle is the present head of Americans for Democratic Action, and, it goes without saying, a liberal. His president was Franklin D. Roosevelt himself, the very grandfather of the Fair Deal.

It was under this combination of Roosevelt and Biddle that the first government witchhunt trial based on the Smith Act took place, against the Trotskyists in the Minneapolis trial.

CF. FDR AND BIDDLE

You condemn the prosecutions and arrests of the *Stalinists* under the Smith Act, in spite of the pressure against them as sympathizers of a foreign totalitarian government. You appreciate the difference in the Minneapolis case. There was not yet any such atmosphere of witchhunting as prevails now: Roosevelt and Biddle went into it "cold." Do you think Harry Truman's faith in freedom is greater than theirs?

Among the differences between McCarthy and Truman is also this: McCarthy's poisoned arrows have been aimed chiefly against public figures and especially prominent government officials; the Truman-created poll of fear has fallen on the little people.

This is not to McCarthy's credit in any way—that's quite irrelevant. He is gunning for the Fair Deal itself, in reality, and he picked up the witchhunt system created by Truman to turn it against the administration. We are thinking of the consequences of this difference.

It is not McCarthyism but the Truman-subversive list-loyalty oath system which is primarily behind the words: "I'm afraid to sign anything." It is the Truman administration which is responsible in the first place for the cloud of fear which hangs over the country.

If we "pick on" the *Post* with regard to all this, it is, as we explained, because the *Post* is one of the best representatives of liberalism on the question of civil liberties. Perhaps if you can explain these things which we . . . do not understand, let us say . . . then you will also have explained what has happened to liberalism in this country.

CAN LIBERALISM TELL THE TRUTH?

The way it looks to us is this:

For one thing, liberalism itself has been poisoned by the same atmosphere that is poisoning the entire country's political life. Otherwise, how explain that you take the same type of attitude toward Truman that is inculcated toward the Leader in the totalitarian states?

Don't let the comparison shock you out of the capacity to think about it. It is typical of totalitarianism that it fosters the habit of looking on the Leader as the general Rectifier of Errors if only he knew about it . . . if only the real facts are forcibly brought to the attention of the busy man . . . if only enough pressure is brought upon him by influential quarters so that he remembers his fundamental love for the people and tears himself loose from evil advisers. . . . Meanwhile the bad things are being done by unscrupulous and unfaithful servants behind his back. . . .

So it was in Tsarist Russia when the muzhiks went to the Winter Palace with ikons to tell the father of the peoples about the wrongs being done them. Such is the idea systematically fostered in Stalinland today, as Stalin time and again intervenes with plenty of publicity to punish excesses of zeal by underlings, who thereupon get purged to confirm their master's zeal for justice. . . .

Meanwhile the Leader himself is not to be blamed for the calamities that exist under his rule, but is to be applauded and cheered at every step he takes to correct them, even if it is only a speech. *This, you see, encourages him to do the right thing. . . .*

You repudiate this comparison with horror and indignation? Then tell the truth about Truman and the Fair Deal administration and their role in strangling democracy in our country! Tell the truth which you know!

We will not permit ourselves the insinuation that you refuse to tell the truth—and in fact write untruths—because the truth will get in the way of your political support to other policies of Truman and the Fair Deal, or to Truman and the Fair Deal as a political movement, for which you want to win your readers' vote.

Is that not the reason why so many Stalinoids—who know the truth about democracy in Russia and are distressed by it but who think Russia is "progressive" for all that—cover up the crimes of the Kremlin and become apologists for it? Don't you despise them as traitors to their professed ideals and traitors to themselves, for whom their treason becomes a poison that eventually saps the vitals of their integrity, honesty and idealism?

If the truth about Truman and the Fair Deal gets in the way of the "practical" considerations which motivate the cowardice and hypocrisy of so many liberals, then perhaps it is necessary to reconsider the grounds upon which you present the Fair Deal as the political road toward a better world. . . . But we have promised not to discuss your politics in this letter, nor is it written to convert you to socialism, certainly.

The truth about Fair Deal democracy would be enough to begin with. It is yet to be demonstrated that liberalism—what liberalism has become in this country today—can afford to tell that truth.

The EDITORS

(Continued from page 1)

the bonanza war boom — from mink coats to defective navy silver-plated oyster forks.

As the government tries to maintain the permanent war economy the pincers movement of short supply of civilian goods and increasing demand closes in on the consumer. As always, the working-class consumer and the low-salaried white collars are the hardest hit.

WORKING BOTH SIDES

The new controls bill signed by Truman "is a law that will push prices up" in the president's own words. Rollbacks are restricted; ceilings are punctured to take care of all cost increases, including advertising and sales expenses; wholesalers and retailers are allowed their "customary percentage margins."

While wage controls have been relaxed to conform to relaxed price controls, wages still, as always, lag behind the cost-of-living increases.

When the administration attempted to defeat the price-control bill before Congress, it charged that the enactment of the bill "would cost the average consumer \$1 a day through the higher prices it would sanction."

Now the administration is trying to soft-peddle the effects of the bill made law by the president's signature. If the administration can introduce some amendments which will hold the line sufficiently to quell outspoken public discontent, it can claim its wisdom in the 1952 election oratory. If not, it can shout, "I told you so!"

Meanwhile, prices on virtually all consumer items are going up—clothing, textiles, automobiles, fuel and that major item in the low-income budget, food.

The fundamental fact that makes inflation inevitable is the war-gear economy operating on the basis of private profit.

PEACE JITTERS

In this type of peacetime war economy, everything is geared to war production. At present, there is judged to be a depressive phase, a kind of deflationary curve in the inflationary cycle. There is a resistance to buying at inflated prices and there is a reduction in purchasing power as high prices and taxes eat up income. According to N. Y. Times writer A. H. Raskin, the government remedy will probably be to step up the pace of military deliveries, with more money finding its way into trade channels and fewer goods being available for purchase.

"All of these things," he concludes, "would contribute to a speedier turn from the present deflationary situation into the kind of inflation that always plagues a war program."

The big doubt that besets the war mobilizers is: What would happen if the killing stopped in Korea and peace broke out? There might be little public support for the continuation of the war effort on an all-out scale.

This is the worst outcome to be feared from the standpoint of an economy so completely geared to war and which has so far shown that it operates best in terms of full production and employment in time of war.

This fear is aptly summed up as "peace jitters." It is a term which vividly expresses the "abnormal" in the now "normal" state of war expectancy, a state which is both economic and psychological.

Interested? For information about the

INDEPENDENT SOCIALIST LEAGUE

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