

# LABOR ACTION

Independent Socialist Weekly

SEPTEMBER 4, 1950

FIVE CENTS

**SOCIALIST POLICY IN THE WAR**  
By Max Shachtman ... page 7

**Economic Crisis in East Germany**  
... page 3

**Titoism vs. Socialist Democracy**  
... page 5

**Pope Denounces Liberal Thought**  
... page 3

## AFL Teachers Hit Gag On Rival CP-Run Union

By GORDON HASKELL

The American Federation of Teachers (AFL) passed a resolution at its national convention in Detroit on August 26, condemning the New York City Board of Education for withdrawing recognition from the Teachers Union, Local 555 of the United Public Workers.

The 600 delegates at the convention, representing some 65,000 professional teachers, took a courageous stand on this matter which might well serve as a model for the rest of the labor movement.

This resolution was a particularly dramatic expression of a keen desire to safeguard the rights of all teachers to join and be represented by any organization of their choice because of the whole history of Local 555 and its relation to the AFT.

Nine years ago the AFT expelled the Teachers Union on the ground that it was dominated by the Communist Party. The Teachers Union then joined the United Public Workers (CIO). And earlier this year the UPW was in turn expelled from the CIO on the ground that the whole international is dominated by the Stalinists.

For years the New York Teachers Guild of the AFL has been competing with the Teachers Union for the support of the teachers in the city. Yet the Guild was one of the locals which introduced resolutions at the convention to protect its old rival from discrimination by the Board of Education.

### "A Need for Greater Vigilance Than Ever"

Eight members of the Teachers Union, including its president, have been suspended without pay because they refused to say whether or not they are members of the Communist Party. One of them has been charged with membership, and all of them are coming up for departmental trials on September 18. In the meantime, the New York City Board of Education has declared that it will not recognize the Teachers Union as a representative of its members.

The AFT resolution reads in part: "the denial of the individual's right to join organizations of his own choosing and to be represented by them is alien to our fundamental democratic rights." It noted that the Board of Education "has withdrawn recognition from a teachers' organization" in New York City, and it called upon the federation to "strongly oppose the denial to any group of teachers of the right to join organizations of their own free choice and the right to be represented by their organizations before their boards of education."

In another resolution the convention declared that there is today "a need for greater vigilance than ever before for the preservation of academic freedom in schools and universities" and pledged itself to the utmost vigilance in applying its policies of academic freedom. It came out against the tendency to lower educational standards, curtail educational budgets and reduce educational services as part of the home-front program.

This action by the AFT is truly heartening in these times.

It took particular courage because teachers are among the most closely watched for "radicalism" by all the bigots and super-patriots in the country. The drive to "rid the schools of reds" long preceded the "loyalty" program which now tends to extend itself into all regions of American life, and teachers are more easily picked out for persecution than most other workers.

Congratulations to the AFT on their stand. With it they have struck a blow for the continued freedom of all of us!



## Stop the Gift to Franco!

# Truman Lets Franco Loan Pass, Stays Mum

By PHILIP COBEN

The loan to fascist Spain, which will strengthen the most widely hated totalitarian regime this side of the Iron Curtain, has won out in the House, with the Truman administration—formally on record against it—playing a most suspicious role.

With almost every labor force as well as nearly all liberal, semi-liberal and even not-very-liberal elements ranged against the gift to Franco, little effort has so far been made to tighten up the opposition and make it effective—in the first place, to put pressure on Truman to give more than lip service to his expressed stand.

Although the AFL and CIO claim Truman as "on our side," on this issue—as clearcut a progres-

# Militant UAW Ranks Force Wage Hike at Chrysler

By WALTER JASON

DETROIT, Aug. 27—The series of wildcat strikes that plagued Chrysler Corporation in recent weeks brought results far beyond any auto worker's expectation and have opened a floodgate of wage demands on the rest of the industry which are bound to have enormous national repercussions.

Chrysler's truly precedent-shattering announcement of a ten-cent hourly increase for its 120,000 employees and 15 cents for the skilled trades was received with complete incredulity by its workers.

They just would not believe it at first.

The action of a voluntary grant came at a time when most of Chrysler was shut down by wildcat strikes which the United Auto Workers (CIO) leadership had sought vainly to stop. At one local union, two international representatives were vigorously booed for even daring to suggest the men go back to work and negotiate their grievance through "procedure."

Chrysler's sudden reversal of attitude on wage increases did not come because of a change in heart. Rather it was sheer economic necessity which forced the company to give the dime it refused to grant three days before the 14-week strike.

It should also be added that a prime cause of Chrysler's action is C. E. Wilson, president of General Motors Corporation, who forced the escalator clause on the UAW leadership after Walter Reuther had vowed it would not

ment, the irritation in the shops mounted. The report that Chrysler made better than \$39 million in the first six months of this year in spite of the 14-week shutdown did not improve relations between the workers and the company either.

### JOB ACTION DID IT

A sure sign of the mood of the Chrysler workers was the defeat of all but one of the local union presidents who had been part of the negotiating and strike-leadership team in the 14-week strike.

Another indication of the unrest was the growing number of small but significant walkouts, ostensibly over minor issues, but in reality a letting-off of steam over the inflation.

Behind the scenes, Norman Mathews, UAW Chrysler director, had secretly asked Chrysler in June—right after the GM contract was announced with a four-

(Turn to last page)

## FREEDOM IN DANGER!

As we go to press news has been received that the House of Representatives has passed the Un-American Activities Committee bill by a vote of 354 to 20.

This bill includes all the repressive, anti-democratic and unconstitutional measures of the Mundt-Ferguson bill on which LABOR ACTION has commented repeatedly. The over-all effect of the bill would be to legalize for all practical purposes the Communist Party, its front organizations, and all other organizations designated as "subversive" by a committee of five which would be created by passage of the bill. The handful of opponents of the bill in Congress denounced it as "unconstructive," "unconstitutional," a measure demanding "self-incrimination" and as a bill that would impose "thought control" and "police state" tactics on the United States. Previously President Truman had opposed passage of a bill like this which would make normal political activities virtually illegal for selected groups of people.

The labor movement has also criticized and attacked such a bill. Yet it is clear from the overwhelming vote in the House that many congressmen who are considered "friends of labor" and who have been endorsed by the political arms of the different labor organizations must have voted for it. In fact, the overwhelming majority of Democrats voted for this bill which labor denounces.

The issues involved here are far too serious to be lightly shoved aside on grounds that a lot of "good fellows" in Congress feel they have to vote for such a bill to meet the Republican offensive in the election campaign. If the labor movement takes seriously its charge that this bill is basically anti-democratic and subversive of the civil liberties of the nation, they can hardly accept the idea that our freedom is to be sold down the river in the interest of retaining a Democratic majority in Congress.

The labor movement has, in the past, made it clear that no congressman or senator who votes for the Taft-Hartley bill can expect labor support. Surely the preservation of political civil liberties in America is as important and dear to the labor movement as the preservation of those rights impaired by the Taft-Hartley Act!

It seems the Senate is to take up the vicious House bill very shortly. They are moving with lightning speed on this matter. This labor must act at once. The only possibility of turning back this vicious assault on civil liberties in America rests in labor's hands. Every local, every international should make it clear to each and every senator that a vote for this bill will mark him in labor's record as a clear and open enemy of the labor movement!

There is still time to stop this new version of the Mundt-Ferguson bill. But the time is running short!

(Continued on page 4)



# FE Claims Ripped By UAW Strike

By PETE JARMS  
CHICAGO, Aug. 28.—The strike of the United Auto Workers (CIO) at International Harvester was joined today by the Farm Equipment Council of the United Electrical Workers (FE-UE, independent, Stalinist-controlled). This will mean that the company's operations will be at a virtual standstill.

The UAW struck on August 23, the expiration date of its contract. At that time the FE had just announced, through the columns of the CP's Sunday Worker, that "sweeping wage gains were won at International Harvester by the UE this week as a result of the union's militant strike action (one-plant-at-a-time harassment campaign) and its stubborn refusal to get caught in a war-born wage freeze." The article goes on to say that it was "the largest package won by any union this year."

But it was not satisfactory to the workers themselves. This was shown by the fact that the men never returned to work at Louisville nor at the Forge Shop Tractor works in Chicago; and hardly had they come back at Rock Falls and Richmond when they went out again. The CP practice of claiming that every contract its people negotiate is the best just did not sound real. The problems were not solved.

But the UAW went on strike; at McCormick works in Chicago, where the UAW toolroom workers and office workers had active picket lines going, the FE leaders instructed their members to crash the UAW line.

This strike was an economic strike for all the gains which were also desired by the McCormick

workers. If the UAW gets them, the FE will get them too, even though the latter signed a contract last June extending the old contract for another two years. Yet the FE went in for strikebreaking.

In answer to the charge of "strikebreaking," the FE leaders replied that the strike was not a sincere one. But the workers at McCormick took the UAW leaflets asking for support with great interest. The pressure was on the FE.

The FE leaders got off the hook when the company canceled its wage offer because the contract was not ratified and the workers were not back to work. The company, it was reported, also canceled the agreement in order to avoid paying unemployment compensation, because the UAW was going to shut Harvester down in any case.

Immediately thereafter, the FE Harvester Council met and issued strike instructions, calling the company's act the "most brazen doublecross in modern labor history."

Meanwhile the UAW's strike is solid. Negotiations are continuing. Reports are that not much progress has been made.

But it is likely that the Harvester workers will come out of this strike in a much better position than they did after their 1948 strike. In their favor is the economic situation of the day, the size of Harvester profits and profit possibilities, and the impact of the Chrysler settlement. FE will then receive all the benefits attained, and boast around the country about what a real "militant" fighting union it is....

# MacArthur, Matthews Speak Out What Capital Circles Whisper

In the same week, this past week — no connection between them, the press says—the Truman administration has had to repudiate statements on foreign policy by two highly placed officials. One was its secretary of the navy, Francis P. Matthews, and the other was General MacArthur.

The speech by Matthews sounded as if it had been written in the Kremlin for the purpose—that is, as a speech to be delivered by an American statesman for maximum effectiveness when rebroadcast by the Russian propaganda network. As a matter of fact, however, it was a daring speaking-out of what a section of influential Washington opinion really believes. It is in this way that the Moscow despotism feeds on U. S. imperialist ideology, the one stimulating the other.

Matthews proclaimed in so many words that "To have peace we should be willing, and declare our intention, to pay any price, even the price of instituting a war to compel cooperation for peace." This price should be paid "though it cost us in a character new to a true democracy—an initiator of a war of aggression," said Matthews.

### FOR PREVENTIVE WAR

This is a declaration in the highest circles and in the most public manner of the program of a "preventive war." The State Department had to declare that Matthews' views did not represent government policy, and Ambassador-at-Large Jessup also swiped at it.

There can be little doubt that Matthews took his official life in his hands in making this speech in order to do his "patriotic" duty by speaking out what others in his

same circles are merely talking about among themselves.

There can be as little doubt that Matthews depends for protection upon those who, he knows, sympathize with his position while deploping any public statement of it (for purely tactical reasons). Truman has indicated so far, in fact, that this pronouncement of aggression will remain in his cabinet—"The incident is closed."

### FOR CHIANG

In the second case, MacArthur managed to make a public appeal for all-out defense of Chiang Kai-shek's bastion on Formosa as a kind of manifesto on behalf of the pro-Chiang crowd. The method was a statement to the Veterans of Foreign Wars convention which was killed—conveniently—too late to prevent its publication.

It has been represented that this was a blast against administration policy on the question. This is only half true. The administration had already reversed its attitude on Chiang—from that expressed in the famous White Paper of the State Department last year which wrote off aid to the Kuomintang regime—when Truman announced the naval defense of Formosa on June 27.

What is true is that Truman and Acheson have remained in this half-way house since then, without assuring all-out aid to Chiang but still assuming partial responsibility for his defense, and MacArthur is jumping in to demand a consistent pro-Chiang policy.

Most of MacArthur's statement is devoted to military-strategic considerations necessitating all-out defense of Formosa in his opinion—although he does not discuss at all the question of Formosa's defensibility. But it also speaks politically.

He writes about "all of the hypocrisy and the sophistry" which was swept aside by Truman's June 27 decision—thereby making a bow in the direction of his presumed commander in chief while taking a sideswipe at his policies. He attacks "the threadbare argument by those who advocate appeasement and defeatism in the Pacific that if we defend Formosa we alienate continental Asia."

His counter-argument is a simple expression of the military mind, written in the terms of the British-type sabih who "knows" that the only way to keep nations in hand is to overawe them:

"Those who speak thus do not understand the Orient. They do not grasp that it is in the pattern of Oriental psychology to respect and follow aggressive, resolute and dynamic leadership—to quickly turn from a leadership characterized by timidity or vacillation—and they underestimate the Oriental mentality." (The word "underestimate" in this connection is a precious example of hypocrisy.)

### MACARTHUR'S WEDGE

MacArthur is putting a wedge into the gap between the policy of the White Paper and the June 27 reversal on Formosa, and seeking to pound it through by appealing to American reaction over the head of an administration which has already conceded half the battle.

"Aggressive, resolute and dynamic leadership," as a matter of fact, has no more special appeal to "Oriental psychology" than to vacillators in the West. MacArthur's political coup is itself an attempt to apply the method (which, he says, works with "Orientals") to harden Washington's line in favor of Chiang.

Against this spokesman of uncompromising reaction, the labor movement has no "aggressive, resolute and dynamic leadership" of its own to offer, for a democratic foreign policy, as long as it goes along with Truman's Korean war, the Atlantic Pact, and the rest of the imperialist paraphernalia of the Western end of the cold war. And meanwhile Russian imperialism strengthens its hold over its victim by pointing to Formosa.

Get your L.A. every week! Subscribe at \$2 a year!

# Union Heads Wanted U. S. Rail Seizure. They Got It. What Now?

By LARRY O'CONNOR

The railroads of the nation have once more been "taken over" by the government in the face of a national strike call by the Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen and the Order of Railway Conductors.

No one in these unions is going to protest this action. Some time ago the BRT and the ORC requested President Truman to take over the railroads, and it is clear that the strike threat was made only to force this action which he had refused to take on the request of the unions.

It is hard to guess just what the union leaders have in mind. Government "seizure" neither compels the government to negotiate with the unions nor does it take a cent out of the new booming profits of the railroads.

The government has announced that it will continue to "hold" the railroads until the workers and employers have come to an agreement. Actually the corporations continue to operate their properties as before, the workers labor for the same wages and under the

same conditions as before, and a few army officers (many of them railroad presidents in disguise) "supervise" the whole works.

The government has already made it clear that it considers the settlement which was proposed by an emergency board and accepted by the employers as all that the workers are entitled to. The best guess on this "strategy" by the railroad union "executives" is that they have got themselves in a blind alley through their long years of docile acceptance of government rulings, and have no idea how to get out of it.

They cannot simply go to their memberships and tell them that their organizations can do nothing for them. Too many members would decide that dues payment is a luxury they can afford no longer. So the "executives" get the government in on it, hoping that somehow, out of the shuffle, they will either get a few cents more, at least will be able to blame the bankruptcy of their own policy on "powers beyond their control."

# S. E. D. Convention Bares Economic Crisis in East Zone; Worker Resistance to Stalinism

By HENRY CHASE

BERLIN, July.—It must have struck many a visitor attending the third conference of the Socialist Unity Party (the SED, Stalinist party of East Germany) and the Western Communist Party of Germany, that he was back of Hitler's Nuremberg rally. Four thousand visitors and delegates spontaneously rose, rhythmically clapping hands, shouting slogans, singing the International or the new party song, "The Party Is Always Right."

This performance is repeated at every reference of Stalin's name, to never-ending applause, interrupting for four days reports, speeches and meetings delivered by foreign delegates. It all went as George Orwell described in his book "1984."

But if the congress was successful in attracting widespread attention through press, radio, demonstrations, decorated party buildings and a mass of flags in the Russian sector of Berlin and the impressive participation of 25 foreign delegations, the reports of the various activities were a horse of a different color.

Max Reimann, the leader of the Western Communist Party of Germany, who was severely rebuked by Pieck, admitted that despite the general dissatisfaction

with living conditions that existed in West Germany the Communist Party had suffered heavy losses at the last election. "The party had not been able to convince the people of the peaceful intention of the Soviet Union, and the membership as well as leading functionaries wavered as to the correctness of the Oder-Neisse peace frontier." Owing to weakness within the party and the widespread influence of "sectarians" and "Trotskyist traitors" the working class of Western Germany had become a prey to the propaganda of the imperialist powers.

Berlin did not prove to be any more reliable. The former Stalinist stronghold AEG-Turbine (West Berlin) had lost most of its shop stewards to the Social Democrats. Party members refused to be drawn into any activity. They—so Lena Richter bitterly complained—maintained that realities were stronger than party slogans. They had become corrupted by full food shops in western Berlin and the high purchasing power of the Westmark, completely ignoring the successes of the "German Democratic Republic." This, she said, applied not only to one of the CP's former factory branches but to most party cells in Berlin.

record-breakers (Stakhanovites) are regarded as stooges and despised by everyone.

Therefore it is not surprising that the conference delegates complained about the mistakes the party had made in regard to trade-union work and had to admit the general poor response from the workers.

The low standard of life in the Russian Zone of Germany and the bad quality of goods produced for the general population,

### Appeal to Nazi Supporters

The following quotation is self-explanatory and needs no further comment. In addressing the conference Grotewohl said:

"The National Front of Democratic Germany is not limited to the inclusion of democratic forces only. On the contrary, we are prepared to collaborate with all patriots who have the interests of Germany at heart."

the very high wages received by activists, party officials and directors are the main reasons why the Stalinists are confronted by general opposition from the whole population.

In an effort to win support among the masses, the Stalinists are making great gestures to induce the most reactionary circles, including Nazi supporters, to join in a National Front to drive the Allied forces out of Germany, to establish their final aim, a united Stalinist Germany.

"No German patriot shall be excluded from the National Front of Democratic Germany if he is prepared to intercede for the justified national interests of the German people. This applies to former civil servants, soldiers, officers and generals of the German army as well as for employers, businessmen and for former members of the Nazi Party, and

for all men and women participating in economic and cultural activities.

"What is decisive is not the former organizational affiliation but how every German views the struggle for national liberation of the German people.

"The position of the party is clear. Whoever puts additional demands to the participants in the National Front—that they ought to be honestly 'anti-fascist' or genuine 'democrats'—is dangerously narrowing down the platform of the National Front of Democratic Germany. In that way the struggle for national liberation from American imperialism loses its all-embracing mass appeal."

It is very unfortunate for the Stalinist cause that the greater part of the German people who are not living in the Russian Zone are able to follow so closely the development of the Stalinist dictatorship and, despite great miseries, recoil from the picture.

# Papal Bull Denounces Liberal Thought in Reminiscent Style Totalitarianism—Two Brands

By HENRY JUDD

Let us suppose that Malik, that faceless representative of Stalinist Russia whose presidency of the UN Security Council is about to draw to a close, were to proclaim to the world in his last speech before that useless body of diplomats that "Marxist dogma is a truth proposed by the Russian government as an article of divine revelation and as such indisputable and immutable." Furthermore, that "the teaching authority of our government has been entrusted to it by Marx, Lenin and Stalin, our leaders, with the whole deposit of faith—scripture and tradition—to be preserved, guarded and interpreted."

Is it difficult to imagine the howl of indignation and protest which would go up at the proclaiming of such a totalitarian doctrine? From all sides, governments, liberals, scientists, philosophers, socialists, etc., would join in a united condemnation.

To be sure, Malik has never openly made such statements (even he would lack the necessary brass for that), but every anti-Stalinist knows that both Russian imperialism and the world-wide Stalinist movement largely base their activity and statements on such concepts. Aside from the fact that Stalinism has nothing in common with Marx and Lenin or their teachings, it is clear that this reactionary movement is based upon blind obedience, absolutism and the regimented mind. Just observe Malik, a shining specimen!

But if Malik did not say this, did anyone else? We regret to say, yes!

With a slight substitution of words (Catholic dogma for Marxist dogma; Roman Catholic Church for Russian government; the pope for Stalin, etc.), we have a literal quotation from the latest papal bull made public last week (New York Times, August 22).

As a matter of fact, someone with sufficient time and sense of humor might spend a pleasant half hour making the necessary substitutions of proper nouns and a document worthy of a philosophical statement of Stalinist doctrine, prepared by the ideologues of Moscow, would result. The similarity, even to condemnation of poor Jean-Paul Sartre and existentialism, is striking.

### STRAITJACKET ON TEACHERS

We are not, to be sure, implying that Stalinism and Catholicism are one and the same thing—the differences are obvious—but pointing out the enormous similarities between the two so far as approach, method of presentation and attitude toward the truth is concerned. Let us consider some other examples of this.

After a lengthy denunciation of various heresies and attempted liberalizations of Catholic thought, in which the various rites of the church are interpreted in a symbolic rather than a literal manner, the pope draws his conclusions. Evolution, free interpretation of the Old Testament, the biological and anthropological sciences, etc., are rejected, but not quite out of hand. Research and even "discussion" are permitted on these and similar subjects provided that "all are prepared to submit to the judgment of the church, to whom Christ has given the mission of interpreting authentically the sacred scripture and of defending dogmas of faith."

According to this hypocritical concept, the results of "research and discussion" must be subor-

dinated to conclusions and pronouncements which have already been made, before the indicated "research and discussion"! A fine atmosphere indeed for the objective pursuit of truth and science!

More significant are the conclusions, organizationally speaking, which the pope draws from his classic attack on "modernism" and contemporary thought. In his bull, the pope concludes as follows: "we charge bishops and superiors general of religious orders, binding them most seriously in conscience, to take most diligent care that such opinions [evolution, etc.] be not advanced in schools, in conferences or in writings of any kind, and that they be not taught in any manner whatsoever to the clergy or faithful." A clear enough statement of rigid censorship and proscription of texts, documents and material.

But consider this demand for totalitarian submission and the practice of an educational system of rigid indoctrination of the student: "Let teachers in ecclesiastical institutions be aware that they cannot with tranquil conscience exercise the office of teaching entrusted to them unless in the instruction of their students they religiously accept and exactly observe the norms which we have ordained. That due reverence and submission which in their unceasing labor they must profess toward teaching the authority of the church, let them instill also into the minds and hearts of their students."

### TOTALITARIAN VS. TOTALITARIAN

His Holiness has spoken, clear and unambiguously, in the voice of reaction and authoritarianism. All totalitarian systems, fascism, Nazism, Stalinism, etc., bear many common resemblances, particularly in their approach to issues of truth and progress. Grounded in its theological and structural inheritance from the Middle Ages, Catholicism has long been working toward the "modernization" of its inheritance in terms of acceptance of modern totalitarian thought, method and approach. Perhaps this papal bull will go down in history as the classic representation of Catholic totalitarianism in the twentieth century—hence its importance and our recommendation that everyone read the document.

But why this document at this particular moment? It is largely an effort once and for all, to give a firm codification and statutory basis to current church thought. "This is our stand," the pope is saying. As the New York Times has expressed it, "In effect the encyclical confirms that the Vatican does not intend to compromise on questions of faith and morals and bars the way to a reunion with other Christian churches unless it be based on acceptance of the Roman Catholic doctrine as the only true faith."

In another sense, it is the Vatican's bid for total religious and spiritual leadership over the world anti-Stalinist movement. In the name of one totalitarianism—the most ancient still alive—let us struggle against another, more modern one!

We are patiently awaiting the reaction of various liberal, scientific and educational circles to this amazing document. To date, only the Anglican bishops of England, always eager to keep alive their ancient struggle against Rome, have declared themselves. What of those bold representatives of liberalism, scientific thought and free education—Messrs. Hook, Farrell, et al.? Have they lost their tongues in that vast morass of the common front against the Russian brand of totalitarianism?

# Tenants Fight Calif. Negro Eviction

By ARLENE WILLIAMS and LOUIS THOMPSON

BERKELEY, Calif., Aug. 23.—Utilizing brute force and strikebreaking methods, the Codornices Village Housing Authority and the local police department were successful, after a running three-day battle, in evicting a Negro family of six from their apartment.

Codornices with a population of 10,000 is the only non-segregated housing project in the East Bay area, and is composed largely of industrial workers and University of California students, all veterans. It was here that the fight to retain the right of the Scales family to remain in the village was conducted.

The exact facts that surrounded the events leading up to this family's eviction are still confused and unclear, but the charge against them was merely "non-payment of one month's rent," and the tactics employed by the village housing authority and the police department were very brutal. These tactics and the fear of further evictions provoked the residents of the project into a head-on fight with both of these agencies.

At 3 p.m. on August 22, the Scales family was presented with an eviction notice and confronted with the project's trucks and moving men clearing out their furniture and belongings. The local housing council, a Stalinist-controlled group, was called and asked for aid. Word spread like wildfire, and in a matter of minutes several hundreds of people gathered at the Scales home. A pitched battle between the village tenants and the police resulted.

### STRONG-ARM EVICTION

The tenants, by sheer numbers, were successful in staving off the eviction that day by blocking stairways, doors and entrances. A permanent 24-hour vigil was established.

On the following morning, the housing council sent a mass delegation to the offices of the village authority in the village to demand of Housing Administrator Hampton a stay of eviction and reimbursement to this family for damages wrought to its personal property. In a very disorganized manner, this delegation, being denied a meeting with Hampton, milled around for an hour without direction. Then, surrounded by a dozen cops, Hampton tried to leave the premises in his car.

Despite threats of arrest, pushing and jostling by the cops, a large group of women, some of whom were pregnant, stood in front of the administrator's car and prevented his leaving. It was only with the aid of a police car and more policemen that Hampton was successful in ducking the tenants.

The housing council then became lax in the operation of its anti-eviction guard, and it was with comparative ease that early two mornings later, several dozen policemen assisted in the removal of the Scales family and its household possessions from its apartment. They cordoned off a two-square-block area, cut telephone wires and threatened the use of tear gas against the four women who were in the apartment at the time.

The Stalinist-controlled housing council, in its attempt to retain its prestige in the face of defeat and in its effort to find a scapegoat, launched a vicious attack on several residents of the village as "Trotskyite stoolpigeons and police agents."

### CP SLANDERS

The objects of this Stalinist attempt at character assassination were tenants whose help in the fight had been rejected by the housing council. In the past they had fought against the Stalinists'

use of the housing council for political purposes and had tried to make the council a large democratic organization, controlled directly by its members rather than from the outside by so-called "affiliate" organizations.

In fact, the Stalinist leaders of the council were so bankrupt that, after calling a meeting two hours after the eviction, they disbanded the meeting on the appearance of the tenants who had been opposing and criticizing their leadership.

That same evening, however, mustering all their forces, they called a public meeting to discuss the eviction issue. It was a crude affair, held outdoors with a couple of hundred people present. Discussion revolved mainly around the militant action taken by the village residents; the fact that this action was allowed to fizzle out by the council leadership was played down.

Stanley Weir, local organizer of the Independent Socialist League, spoke, and, while trying to keep the microphone from being pulled from him, branded the charge of "stoolpigeon" hurled against himself and other village residents as a means of dividing the tenants who are fighting the Scales case. His statements were partially drowned out in the cries of the Stalinists concentrated around the microphone.

He also issued a leaflet at the meeting which held the housing authority, the police and the burgling leadership of the Stalinists responsible for the defeat. It also included a series of positive proposals for dealing with current and future housing issues.

This eviction procedure marks the start of a new "get-tough" policy on the part of the housing authority. One of the main bones of contention now is a concealed rent hike in form of forcing tenants to mow the project lawns or be charged if they don't perform



# The ISL Program in Brief

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

### INTERESTED?

Get acquainted with the Independent Socialist League—

4 Court Square Long Island City 1 New York

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

Name
Address
State Tel.
City Zone

## Youth and Corner

### Discussion: on War Perspectives for Youth

By ROBERT MAGNUS

The present imperialist conflict between Russia and the United States for hegemony over Korea brings the world to the very brink of the coming global war.

Congress is swiftly passing huge appropriations measures for war and the draft; universal military training is being seriously considered; and militarism of all kinds is becoming the cultural climate of both working class and college youth in America. In this sense the war is upon us already.

What effects is it likely to have in the immediate future on American youth and on the prospects for the independent socialist movement among the youth?

For those who are veterans of the last war there may be a temporary respite. For the present, men with more than three months' service will not be drafted, etc. But this situation cannot last long. As time goes on and the war situation deepens, more and more veterans will be taken, and, in the long run, the imperialist machine will likely need the services of all able-bodied men and women in the United States. A glance at the powers and authority given the National Security Resources Board is sufficient indication of the enormous war planning that will be done by the government—planning which will require the services of hordes of white-collar personnel.

The development of the Korean war likewise proves that atomic bombs are not sufficient to successfully terminate modern wars. Cannon fodder is still a necessary prerequisite.

The American dream of rags-to-riches has, for the average American youth, been transmuted into a nightmarish opposite. In a strictly Orwellian sense, the future of youth today is contained in the heavy steel filing cabinets of the planners of atomic war.

But, for the present, the "partial mobilization" has made little impression on American society as a whole. The percentage of the total product going to produce the means of destruction increases month after month, but the total production is enormous (270 billion a year according to last estimates). The slight increase in unemployment over the last two years is being rapidly liquidated as war production increases. The standard of living has only been slightly affected by the cold war and the possible effects of the Korean situation cannot yet be determined.

The colleges continue with "peacetime" courses, strikes are still legal, and although civil liberties are rapidly being undermined, the main body of the American people, including the American labor movement, has not yet felt the results of such top-level judicial and administrative measures.

In other words, we have for the time being, "business as usual" in the present distorted semi-war sense of the term.

### Sees More Conservative Student Body

In a transitional period of this sort with employment increasing and chauvinism and government pressure becoming more adamant, the total situation among the youth is likely to become more conservative. Volunteers and selective drafting can have little effect in the long run, and universal military training is still a thing of the future.

That this "business as usual" is replete with reactionary attacks on academic freedom and civil liberties—applied by the police-state methods of purges, phony trials, judicial nods to the Smith Gag Act, strikebreaking, etc.—is a sufficient reminder of the future evolution of capitalist democracy when the choice is between guns and butter, war and democracy.

Political and legal terror, however, are so far being used against only a very small part of the population, although their indirect effects are much greater. The Stalinists are today receiving the worst treatment. Their leaders are being sent to jail, they are being purged everywhere, thrown out of jobs and trade unions. They are denied visas, made the subject of hysterical propaganda and are hunted the length and breadth of the land.

It is in this situation, then, that the Socialist Youth League will operate in the immediate future—a generally conservative student body frightened and quiescent under the pressure of war and the attacks on academic freedom; a working-class youth with chances for employment; and a still living, if completely "loyal," trade-union movement.

In this situation it is absolutely necessary to defend the democratic rights of Stalinists to hold jobs, to teach in schools and universities, and to continue as legal organizations while at the same time vigorously opposing Stalinism politically and organizationally—as an ideology and a social system. The Stalinists' demagogic "anti-war" attitude and their phony "peace petitions" and demonstrations must be shown in their true light as covers for the naked imperialist advance of the Russian state. American police-state methods have failed and will continue to fail to do this job.

(Concluded next week)

## Reading from Left to Right

THE PHILIPPINES: AN ECONOMIC DEPENDENCY, by William Alfeld. (Columbia Journal of International Affairs, Spring 1950)

A technical study of the actual meaning of Washington's most often trotted-out claim to anti-colonialism: "Didn't we give independence to the Philippines?" That grant of formal independence took place in 1946—July 4.

"But ill-considered actions by the United States government in the last months of its control have led to the questioning of the sincerity of its renunciation and the reality of Philippine independence," the author writes mildly. His own analysis, however, would seem to show that the thing was not "ill considered" but only too carefully planned.

"Exhibit A, presented by those charging the United States with 'economic imperialism,' is the Philippine Trade Act of 1946," which is to hold for 28 years. "By an act of the U. S. Congress, rather than by a negotiated treaty between two sovereign nations, American interests were given protection from Philippine competition, and the Philippine Republic was deprived of a part of its legislative prerogative and economic sovereignty. Special privileges were given to Americans in the Philippines without comparable rights being given to Filipinos in the United States. . . ."

These operating characteristics of the trade act were:

(1) Absolute quotas were placed on Philippine exports to the United States, creating an absolute ceiling for Philippine exporters, to protect U. S. producers. These quotas were allo-

cated to firms which were active in 1940. "Consequently, the old concerns have been re-established in all major fields as virtual monopolies. . . ."

(2) The U. S. can fix quotas upon any Philippine export which may come into competition with U. S. producers in the future, in case any angles were overlooked in the trade act.

(3) The Philippine peso was pegged at an overvalued rate.

(4) Americans have equal rights with Philippine citizens in exploitation of Philippine resources and public utilities; there is no comparable right for Philippine citizens in the U. S. "The entire act was dependent upon the acceptance of this provision. It caused bitter anti-American feeling in the islands as it required an amendment to the Philippine constitution. . . ."

(5) And "perhaps of greatest significance": the act imposed free-trade relations. The author considers this the biggest blow to real Philippine sovereignty in the bill, but the most complicated to demonstrate. A one-sided economy was reinforced, so that the Philippines necessarily remain an economic dependency of the U. S. "Recent trends indicate a return to the old colonial economy. . . . The economic position of the new republic has become progressively worse. . . ."

"The people of Asia regard our intentions toward the Philippines with suspicion; the Trade Act has not lessened that mistrust, nor has the failure to effectively aid the islands created a more stable economy. . . ."

## Franco Loan

(Continued from page 1)

son to suspect that a deal was tacitly or explicitly made: "the same bill also restored the full toll for the Point Four program as demanded by Truman.

### TWO GOLDEN SILENCES

As the New York Times reported it. . . .

"No administration leader spoke against it [the Spanish loan], although President Truman and the State Department had strongly opposed it. . . ."

"Just as the administration leaders let this matter go by in silence, so the Republican critics of the president's Point Four program were silent when that program was restored to its full \$26,900,000."

Silence for silence: one golden silence donating \$62½ million to the Spanish fascist regime, the other restoring near \$12 million to Point Four.

"While the president exerted all his influence to save Point Four, he made no further public appeal against the Spanish loan."

It may well be that Truman and Acheson do indeed consider the Spanish loan to be a "mistake"—and that because of its undoubted propaganda value for the Russians rather than any heartburning concern about propping up the butcher of the Spanish people—but the pro-Franco camarilla in this country will be slandering them if it accuses them of exerting themselves to stop the loan. At the same time, Truman's labor and liberal supporters have his paper

statements to console themselves with.

Harold L. Ickes has forthrightly pointed to the complexity of the administration in "this fascist salute by the senators to the pocket-size Spanish replica of Hitler, with 'Heil Franco!' on their lips"—steered through by Senator McCarran of Nevada and pushed through by every Republican in the House except one.

### ACCOMPLICE IN CRIME

"The [State] Department had known of the plottings of Franco in Washington. Again and again its attention has been called to the presence of a highly paid Franco lobby, headed by José Félix de Lequerica. . . ."

"With the silent consent of the State Department and assisted by Franco's well-greased lobby, De Lequerica has been permitted for over two years to weave his web here. . . . He is not registered as a foreign agent. . . ."

"In view of the record, Senator McCarran cannot be held entirely responsible for our obsequiousness toward Franco. The State Department must share the blame. Why has it given the skulking De Lequerica, minion of bloody-handed Franco, the freedom of Washington? Why has this bitter fascist foe of democracy been allowed to trample upon laws which the State Department and the Department of Justice are swift to invoke against others whose threat to our institutions is negligible compared to his?"

There is no doubt about the feelings of the U. S. labor move-

ment on this issue. Its leaders have been sufficiently concerned about the question to—have audiences with Truman in which the president personally assured them that he would do his utmost to stop the pro-Franco measure. And that was all. And so the bill seems now on the way to becoming law, because they had "confidence" in their "friend in the White House" and above all do not want to embarrass him by public action.

If the AFL-CIO leaders had previously thought that the loan was under control, the action of the House, and the backhand facilitation of it by the administration, should now disabuse them. (Or are they too assailed by doubts that perhaps . . . perhaps . . . the hope of military bases south of the Pyrenees outweighs any other considerations?)

They could stop it even now, at the 11th hour, by courageously making it a public scandal in the country, instead of allowing it to slip through with the Point Four bill. The Spanish people, pro-World War II victims of the Hitler-Mussolini-Franco axis, will not be comforted to know merely that they went on record against it.

### To the Hills

Washington, D. C., real-estate agents are right up to the minute. Their newspaper advertisements to sell homes in the country reflect the nature of the world today.

One ad offered an estate at Belle Mead, Va., with the inducement: "a safe fifty-eight miles from Washington." Another was headed: "Small Farms—Out Beyond Range of Atom Bombs." A third boasted a place as being "out of the radiation zone."

### Symbol

The military men have just won a battle in Washington—"Operation Protocol." By official decision of Secretary of State Acheson, on demand of Secretary of Defense Johnson, the members of the Joint Chiefs of Staff will outrank civilian undersecretaries and assistant secretaries at dinner parties. The civilians will take a back seat.

Subscribe to LABOR ACTION

### THE PRO-TITOISM OF THE SOCIALIST LEFT—6

## Yugo-Stalinism versus Socialist Democracy

By HAL DRAPER

Besides Djilas, whose defense of totalitarianism we quoted last week, and below Tito himself, the second top spokesman of the Yugoslav regime is Edvard Kardelj, the foreign minister.

From Kardelj, we also present the work which has been most enthusiastically hailed by the pro-Titoists and which has been published for international circulation by the Yugoslav propaganda agencies. It is On People's Democracy in Yugoslavia (published by Yugoslav Information Center, N. Y.). It is an expansion of a speech made in May 1949, published as an article in the Communist, CPY theoretical organ, and now circulated as a pamphlet. Its main subject at the time was decentralization (which is on our agenda).

Djilas' New Roads to Socialism and this pamphlet of Kardeljs are the two titles advertised by the Fourth International Trotskyists in their French organ Quatrième Internationale.

To the pro-Titoist claims which we listed last week, we can now add another, specifically referring to Kardelj's pamphlet. Louis Dalmas—ex-Trotskyist, ex-RDR, and now engaged in making himself a leading pro-Titoist publicist in France, honored by a personal interview with the hero-marshal himself—has written about this pamphlet that "The remarkable conception of democracy . . . is, in every point, communist [that is, Leninist] and revolutionary" (Les Temps Modernes, April 1950).

In his Chapter 4, boldly entitled "Principles on Which Our State Is Being Built," Kardelj sets about defending the one-party principle of the monolithic state system characteristic of Stalinism.

He does not, he says, "fear the reproaches of the false democrats from the West who cry, 'Yes, you give the benefits of democracy only to those who are on your side. You have a one-party system.'" Against this he adduces five general arguments, before proceeding to play on the theme of decentralization.

### "You're Another!" Says Tito

(1) The first is in the form of a quotation from Tito. "Comrade Tito has given them this answer," says Kardelj. Tito's answer says in effect, "You're another!"

"We can ask them one concrete question. How many parties do you have, gentlemen? You have only two. And what kind of parties are they basically? Basically, they are absolutely identical. Both are maintained and supported by the all-powerful dictatorship of the dollar. . . . Such are the democratic parties of the Western type. . . ."

The combined stupidity, irrelevance and falsehood of this "argument" is typically Stalinist. In the first place, it proves something about Tito's capitalist critics—hypocrisy—but nothing about Tito's people's democracy.

Secondly—even aside from the fact that "the democratic parties of the Western type" include powerful labor and social-democratic parties (powerful except in the U. S.), it is a question of what kind of parties are permitted.

But in the U. S. the Communist Party is being illegalized more and more, and even anti-Stalinist parties' limited freedom under capitalism is being curtailed and threatened? Exactly! This is exactly one fact which points the trend of capitalism toward totalitarianism. In Tito-Yugoslavia, this is not a trend but exists in full form—the one-party monolithic state.

For Stalinists (not for Marxists), the "You're another!" argument is a hypocritical justification for their own totalitarianism, not a legitimate attack upon the character of bourgeois democracy.

### Tomorrow and Tomorrow and Tomorrow

(2) Kardelj: "Democracy for the people—yes, but the clique of exploiters and their advocates are not a part of the people. . . . Our democracy exists only for them [the people]. But, tomorrow, with the disappearance of the last remnant of capitalist exploitation, all citizens of our country will be a part of the people, and democracy will exist for all."

Lenin made clear in his time that the disfranchisement of the bourgeoisie is no principle of workers' power, and regarded it in Russia as a product of the specific historic conjuncture. To present it as a "principle" is precisely to donate ammunition to the anti-Bolsheviks, who feed on the crimes of Stalinism. (I have discussed this point further in the current New International.)

In any case, even disfranchisement of "the clique of exploiters and their advocates" (a wide-open Stalinist addition to the formula) is no apology for a state principle which also excludes other workers' parties and any independent peasant party.

Besides: Kardelj's "tomorrow" is here, according to Tito himself. This June, Tito declared that "among us there is no longer a single enterprise, a single mine, a single institution which has remained in the hands of the Yugoslav or foreign capitalists." [Nouvelles Yougoslaves, July 18.]

With this "disappearance of the last remnant of capitalistic exploitation" in Yugoslavia, when presumably democracy now exists "for all," the monolithic one-party principle is not modified but rather re-emphasized, by Djilas.

For Kardelj, as for every other Stalinist totalitarian, "democracy for all" not only permits but requires giving the right to form a party to none, except the ruling regime. His argument for this is the rock-bottom argument of Stalinism on the question, namely—

### One Class—One Party?

(3) "The proponents of Western democracy are telling us that we have a one-party system and that, accordingly, we can have no democracy. Actually it is not a question of parties but of classes. In the West, several parties defend the rule of one class, the capitalist class. The role of the advance guard of the proletariat [the CP] as the leading and guiding force is something entirely different from the role of political parties in a capitalist state."

This is more or less the Stalinist theory of "one class—one party under 'socialism.'" The easiest thing to point out about this fakery is that there is more than one class in Yugoslavia, the vast majority being peasants. Even on the absurd theory that "socialism" makes possible a one-to-one correspondence between class and party, why a one-party principle?

The Stalinist mind answers: the CP, although it is a "workers' party," also best represents the peasants. Grant this for a moment: the question of socialist democratic rights arises precisely when we

ask: Suppose a part of the peasantry does not think so, mistakenly or not, and wants to have its own party to represent it within the framework of the socialist state?

To deny them this right, as a "principle on which our state is being built," can be justified only on the principles of totalitarianism.

But as a matter of fact, the "one class—one party" theory is not Marxist but Stalinist.

Kardelj mentions that under capitalist democracy "several parties defend the rule of one class." The reason is easy to understand. Within the capitalist class there are important differences of policy. These often stem from differences of interest among different groups of the same class. But not always by far. A frequent source of differences on policy is differences on how best to achieve the same interest—i. e., differences in method, differences in farsightedness, etc. One reason they form different parties is in order to settle their intra-class differences through the play of democracy.

These different capitalist parties present a united front when their common class interests are seriously threatened? Of course. So would (or should) different workers parties, or in general different parties which are based on a socialist state.

These different capitalist parties give way to a one-party dictatorship (fascism) when this is necessary for capitalism? Of course. This is because capitalism is a system in which a minority exploits a majority. To use this to justify a similar "principle" for socialism is to admit that your "socialism" is in reality a new exploitive system.

If it is true of capitalism that "several parties defend the rule of one class," why is this out of the question for socialism? Kardelj merely answers that the role of the CP is "something entirely different," etc.—in other words, answers nothing.

### Different Parties Under Socialism

(4) It is true that there are "differences of opinion" among our people, Kardelj continues—

"But political parties are not necessary to give expression to these differences, because in our country the legislative and executive powers are not divided to make it necessary for one party to obtain a majority and thus obtain control of the executive departments of the government."

It is not true that "the legislative and executive powers are not divided" in Yugoslavia (essentially the same as in the Western political systems) as far as governmental forms are concerned. They are united in practice only because of the one-party dictatorship.

Secondly, a one-party majority is not always a necessity for many capitalist political setups, as in France.

But even if these two baseless assertions were true, Kardelj's argument is a crude non-sequitur. The necessity or desire for a one-party working majority has nothing to do with the reason why different capitalist parties exist in the first place.

It is not only possible but even likely for different parties to come into existence under a healthy socialist democracy, especially with the "disappearance of the last remnant of capitalist exploitation," as proponents of different economic policies and tempos, political courses, foreign-policy tactics or even cultural programs, within the framework of socialism—let alone democratic rights for those who stand outside it ideologically but inside it constitutionally.

### "Democracy": the Right to Be "Constructive"

(5) Kardelj's final point is the very essence of Stalinist totalitarianism. The "differences of opinion" which do exist, but which cannot be expressed through different parties—these, he asserts, "find an immediate expression" under the Titoist system:

"It is necessary in particular to underline the fact that our People's Front constitutes an alliance of all toilers where the leading role of the Communist Party guarantees a clear socialist perspective in which each opinion—if it contains the least bit of constructive substance—can be expressed with a much better chance of being considered than under the system of bourgeois democracy."

"If it contains the least bit of constructive substance"—this means: if the criticism is on how the monolithic policy is to be carried out or in general is within the limits of the monolithic policy. This is what "constructive" self-criticism means under Stalinism.

But what if the criticism might impair "the leading role of the CP," or if it questions whether "the CP guarantees a clear socialist perspective," etc.? Who decides what is constructive and what is not, and from what point of view? Naturally, the one party which has a monopoly on politics, and from its clearly defined totalitarian view.

Even—we emphasize even—the same pro-Titoist who flatterly called Kardelj's work "in every point communist and revolutionary" boggles at this, which is at the heart of the Titoist view, but without any evident understanding that it is at the heart of it. Dalmas, later in the same article, interjects a modestly phrased wish for clarification:

"Let us note that the formula is clear only on one point: it is a single-party system. Kardelj does not say how 'the leading role of the Communist Party' is exercised in practice, how 'different opinions can make themselves felt,' nor what is the 'healthy and constructive substance' which is required of an individual opinion before it is 'taken into consideration.' One would like the Yugoslav leaders to do more than define A TENDENCY toward the growth of democracy: one would like them to make precise the application of their ideas to reality."

There is no indication that Dalmas understands that he has just more or less sent the rest of his article up a spout.

As a matter of fact, Kardelj is justified in claiming that Stalinist totalitarianism makes the expression of "constructive" criticism (provided we understand it in the way mentioned) more possible than under bourgeois democracy. This is because it inserts its tentacles into every nook and cranny of political and social life. "Tentacles" are used not only to grasp and crush, but also to feel out and explore. The more totalitarian the regime, the more acutely it feels the problem of having a barometer on the mood of the people. Democracy provides such a barometer, well or ill. Without it, we now know, Hitler consciously faced exactly this problem. (He did not solve it like the caliph Harun Al-Rashid who went among the people in disguise.)

Stalinist totalitarianism consciously seeks to work out ways and means of drawing the people into a form of "participation" in the regime without real democratic rights. It is these methods which it baptizes "economic democracy" or "people's democracy." Later, when we take up the Titoist "workers' councils," bear this in mind.

(Next week: A third Titoist defense of totalitarianism)



### LABOR ACTION

Independent Socialist Weekly

Vol. 14, No. 36

September 4, 1950

Published weekly by the Labor Action Publishing Company, 114 West 14 Street, New York City 11, N. Y. GENERAL EDITORIAL AND BUSINESS OFFICES: 4 Court Square, Long Island City 1, N. Y. Telephone: IRonsides 6-5117.

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

Editor: HAL DRAPER

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

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

### DEBATE—Friday, Sept. 22

Is Yugoslavia on the Road to Socialist Democracy?

Yes!

No!

O. JOHN ROGGE

HAL DRAPER

Manhattan Plaza, 66 East 4th Street, New York City

Admission 75 cents (including tax)



## Discussion on the War —

## "History Gives Us No 3rd Choice"

The following article by Susan Green is a criticism of the statement on the Korean war by the Political Committee of the Independent Socialist League which appeared on the front page of our issue of July 10.—Ed.

By SUSAN GREEN

In the first place the statement consists of factual arrangements to suit the political position. "In every part of the world, the imperialist powers that triumphed in the Second World War laid the powder barrels for the explosion of the Third World War," goes the statement. This places Russian imperialism and Western imperialism on the same level. But the actual course of events definitely shows that the Western nations, by their immediate and major disarming and calling home their troops, were willing to prepare for a period of peace. It is Russian imperialism—young, aggressive and alert to its opportunities to swallow big chunks of the globe—that sets the pace for rearming and for preparation for World War III.

This does not make Western imperialism angelic—though even at its zenith it never made satellite colonies of highly advanced European countries. What this does mean is that Russian imperialism and Western imperialism are at different stages of development, the former willing to stake much on expansion and the latter becoming aware that the days for expansion are numbered.

In the words "Western imperialism" used above, I include the whole Western bloc. Taking the United States as such, the nature of its imperialism has never been that of the European nations. Though it has taken over or dominated some strategic islands in parts of the world, though it has been behind a few two-gun revolutions in the Latin American countries in the past, its characteristic imperialist conduct has not been toward political domination but toward financial and economic penetration. *This characteristic cannot be ignored vis-à-vis Stalinist imperialism, which imposes a police state in its own image wherever it penetrates. This difference between the stages of each imperialist camp and between the mode of operation of each is vital for socialists to consider if they wish to continue the struggle for socialism.*

Referring specifically to Korea, the statement again wrongly puts both imperialisms on the same level of intention and of action. This is again not factual. While it is true that the United States set up and supported Rhee, that Rhee is a reactionary dictator who employs Japanese-trained police to liquidate his opponents, that in Korea as elsewhere the United States follows the pin-headed policy of supporting reactionaries to fight Stalinism and has no social program to offer—these facts are still only part of the whole.

## Policy Based on Selected Facts

Here are a few additional facts to complete the picture.

Political parties were permitted and actually functioned in South Korea. An opposition to Rhee grew and gained political strength. The outcome of the election last May was a defeat for Rhee, and as the press reported it, also a defeat for the Stalinists. Most of the members of the legislature were not returned to office, and the anti-Rhee factions won more than 120 of the 210 seats. Rhee's regime was consequently badly undermined. The United States, whose puppet he was, did nothing to come to his support, but took the verdict of the vote as conclusive. Could anything of this kind happen in Stalinist satellite countries—the development of opposition parties, the electoral defeat of a Kremlin-supported dictator?

No one is insane enough to say that South Korea was independent. It was a pawn of the Western bloc, and until there is some world settlement, there will be pawns and satellites of one major camp or the other. These are the lamentable world conditions that prevail, within which, however, the South Koreans had a measure of political freedom and even the possibility to do something for themselves to emerge from the feudalism in which they are steeped. Is it better that the Koreans be "given" a "solution" of the agrarian problem by the Stalinist police state?

Also in the category of arrangement of facts is the way in which the statement ignores the importance of the purely physical aspects of war. From the statement one is to infer that the South Koreans did not hold ground against the Northern assault simply because they did not support the Rhee government.

However, all the reports described the havoc rendered by the superior numbers and the superior training

and equipment of the Stalinist army. The South Korean soldiers were not trained for war but for police duty and for patrol guard. They were entirely unfamiliar with the monster mechanized armament of the Stalinist army, had no counter arms to cope with it, and were absolutely helpless before it. Certainly the stark military disparity had at least something to do with the Southern debacle. This military fact is not recognized by the statement; according to it the debacle had only political reasons.

A single military fact the statement does recognize is that the United States fights Stalinism "only by purely police and military means." The "only" is, however, wrong since the United States has also been spending many billions of dollars to give economic help to countries where Stalinism can still be defeated, and this help has shown results even in Korea.

Socialists very rightly criticize the ECA program, and we know that at best the results are as limited as are the inadequate concepts of capitalist thinking before deep-seated social problems and contradictions. Still there is quite a contrast between the ECA program on the one hand and on the other the kind of economic "help" the Stalinists have availed themselves of—at the expense of their unfortunate satellites.

The question I ask is this: Is the ISL so weak in its position that there is no choice between the two imperialisms, that it cannot acknowledge the whole truth about American imperialism? *Sound policies cannot be based on selected facts.*

## War Not of Our Making—But Outcome Important

To go from what I call the factual arrangement to other points of the PC statement. While it calls on labor to call a plague on both camps, it does, in effect, concede that a choice exists.

Of a Stalinist victory it says: "The victory of its arms would mean nothing but the extension of the slave power of Stalinism over the whole territory of Korea, and therefore a disastrous blow to the people of Korea and the cause of democracy and socialism everywhere else."

Of a United States or United Nations victory it says: "Any victory gained in Korea on such a basis can only have reactionary consequences." There is indeed a choice between a positive, known disastrous blow to the Korean people, to the cause of democracy and socialism, through a Stalinist victory, and expected reactionary consequences which may or may not develop from a Western victory.

Especially and concretely would a Stalinist victory in Korea be a blow to the people of Asia. The triumph of the Stalinist army in Korea could strike despair into anti-Stalinist national groups in Asiatic countries. Contrariwise such a triumph would embolden all the Stalinists in countries where the die has not yet been cast—including India. *It is sad but true that in certain circumstances military victory is the best of all arguments, and a Stalinist victory in Korea could have such far-reaching political consequences that the entire Far East could be won by Stalinism.*

The statement reads: "Far from ensuring the independence of Korea, it [a United States victory] will guarantee its utter dependence upon, if not permanent occupation by, American imperialism." Except for the word "permanent" about which we can't say too much, this is of course the prospect. But the question is—and the statement evades it—would Russian domination and occupation be less or more disastrous for the Korean people, for the Asiatic peoples, for democracy, for socialism?

Labor definitely has a choice between a greater and a lesser evil in the contest between Stalinism and Western capitalism, which by the way embraces the British Labor government as well as American capitalist democracy. The stand that labor should call a plague on "both your houses" is against labor's interests since the victory of Stalinism would mean the end of the independent labor movements of the world and the end of the possibility of democratic human progress, until another era in human history. The Korean war is the test case. Labor's independent survival throughout the world depends on the military defeat of Stalinism. *Can this defeat be had, under actual world conditions today, in any other way than through the military victory of the Western bloc?*

The war with all its heartbreaking horrors is not of our making—true. But it is here, or may be here, and ipso facto we are vitally interested in the outcome. In another century, when the problems of politics and of war were less complicated than they are today, Marx and Engels saw the advisability of the German socialists supporting the arms of the German government against France. And again they saw the possibility of such support against Russia in a war between Germany and Russia. They were trying to evaluate the military results in terms of socialist progress. They may have been wrong in their evaluation. But are we wrong when we evaluate a Stalinist victory as a world-wide disaster for humanity, for democracy, for socialism?

## The Difference Is Vital for Labor

The claim is made that as the United States prepares for war the rights of the people will be trampled upon and militarization will wipe out democracy, so that there will be little difference between Russian totalitarianism and American militarism. This claim was made in World War II against Hitlerism and capitalist democracy.

However, from British militarization for World War II there emerged a Labor government, and in America militarization was extremely mild and proved merely a wartime phenomenon.

True, the enormity of an atom war and the nature of Stalinist infiltration may bring quicker and tighter restrictions during World War III. However, there is a most significant political difference between militarization during the war—the extension of which into peacetime would be fought even by capitalists in America and of course by labor—and the all-time, well-established totalitarian regime of Stalinism.

The ISL still makes a distinction between choosing the lesser evil in a civil war and in an international war. In Spain the capitalist republic was considered worthy of defense against a fascist regime, but in World War II all camps were imperialist—and that was that. However, the choice of capitalist democracy against fascism was just as valid on the international arena as on the national—unless there were a third choice, a choice created by actual political possibilities. Again, if in Czechoslovakia, instead of the Stalinists taking over as they did, there had been a civil war between Benes supporters and Stalinists, undoubtedly the ISL would have deemed the former worthy of support. *Is Stalinism, then, less of an evil vis-à-vis capitalist democracy on the international scene?*

## Accepting Political Realities

The reason why we have to choose between capitalist democracy and Stalinist totalitarianism in this war is because history gives us no third choice. In World War II we were perhaps justified in hoping for the third choice. Today to think of a third choice as a reality is to delude oneself completely. Tacitly the ISL concedes this because it has virtually dropped its slogan for a Third Camp. The statement of the PC, at the crucial outbreak of the shooting war, does not even mention the Third Camp. Instead it resorts to general phrases about "opposition to imperialism," "democratic policy," etc., which are a dime-a-dozen on any counter. And this fate of the Third Camp slogan is not by virtue of conscious change of policy through discussion, but by unwilling yielding to the heavy pressure of political realities. It must be added also that the same unwilling yielding to the pressure of political realities is shown in the absence from the statement of the demand for the withdrawal of United States troops from Korea. *This is a logical action from the political stand taken. The stand is, however, so illogical that the action cannot be taken.*

The only people who can consistently say a plague on both your houses are the pacifists who are opposing war as a moral issue. There is an undeniable logic in their position, especially toward atom warfare. But the ISL claims to be in politics, to be a group of politicians seeking human progress through the struggle of the working people. And the ISL refuses to act on its knowledge that Stalinism's military victory will herald a new dark age for mankind.

Labor, by and large, also knows this about Stalinism—learned partly, we hope, from us; partly from other minority groups; and partly from capitalist sources. To try to convince labor that it has no choice as between the two war camps, when it understands what happens to free unions under Stalinism, is to bar the ISL from having any influence on labor in this important period. And there is much that may be done by the ISL to help labor out of its still infantile political life, if the ISL develops a less doctrinaire and more realistic war policy.

Such a policy would be: to acknowledge the necessity of the choice of the lesser evil, giving, therefore, military support to the Western bloc while continuing political criticism and opposition. This would, of course, necessitate working out a course of action in instances where military results would be affected by labor's actions.

Such a position is not only correct per se, but it permits a closer affinity with labor. The ISL's call to labor to develop criticism, opposition and independence would have a better chance to be heard. We might be heard also when we shout that Stalinism can be permanently defeated only by effectuating a program for social change along democratic and not totalitarian lines; that capitalism is proving itself unable to do this; that labor has the responsibility to formulate such a program.

The mere possibility for labor to take a position of political criticism of the government, while giving military support, and to put forth its own political program, is proof that capitalist democracy is for labor the desirable lesser evil to Stalinism.

## A basic pamphlet—

"SOCIALISM:  
THE HOPE OF HUMANITY"  
by Max Shachtman

Read it! 10 cents

Labor Action Book Service

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

## THE INDEPENDENT SOCIALIST VIEW

## Socialist Policy in the War

By MAX SHACHTMAN

Some people refuse to learn. Others refuse to remember. And still others remember what they have learned only up to the moment when events call upon them to put it into practice, whereupon they start to forget.

Critics of the Independent Socialist League's position on the war are asking that we support the United States in the war, not only in Korea, but in the Third World War which is being prepared.

Why? Because there is a big difference between capitalist democracy and Stalinist totalitarianism. While the former is an evil, it still permits the existence of a labor movement and some democracy; the latter is, however, a far greater evil since it wipes out all forms of democracy.

But since we have been saying something like this for some time, and since something like it can now be read in almost every American newspaper, the repetition of it does not extend the dimensions of our knowledge. It only shows that if some people do not learn, others do.

Why, then? Because Stalinism has now grown so powerful that it now threatens the capitalist world and along with it the very existence of any democracy and any form of working-class and socialist movement, not in some general way but with arms in hand. While it would be a good thing if there were a big movement independent of the two evils, this does not exist and has no prospect of coming into existence "under actual world conditions." This dictates to those who champion such a movement only the choice between the two evils and the choice, for realistic people, should fall upon the lesser of the two.

To many people, these simple arguments may and do seem plausible. To socialists—those who remember what they have learned—they do not. They are arguments for an end to the socialist movement and the perspective of socialist freedom. They were not invented by their most recent sponsors but only adopted and adapted by them.

Little more is necessary to confirm this than a close reading of what has been written against the position of the ISL by those who have forgotten what they once learned.

What stands out most prominently from the contributions of our critics? It is not what they write and deal with. It is what they do not write or even refer to!

## Going to the Roots

We are chided, and not with the maximum of friendliness or loyalty, with having selected and arranged some of the facts in our statement on the war in Korea and omitting others. We failed, it seems, to mention the fact that the Syngman Rhee regime did not imprison or murder every one of its critics and opponents and that it was a few per cent short of a mathematically complete police state. This fact—that is what it is—was indeed neglected in the statement, which preferred to deal with the main essentials and to omit the trivia. But if this is a mistake, it cannot be corrected by criticisms which emphasize the trivia to the exclusion of the essentials.

A socialist is not the ordinary man-in-the-street who is saturated with the ignorance and prejudices pumped into him every day from a hundred pipelines. The socialist endeavors to think about social problems scientifically, and not with his intestines but with his head. The first question he asks himself about any problem that needs tackling, any force that must be combated, is this: *How has this problem arisen, how has this force emerged?*

Only after this question has been answered as ably as social science permits, is it possible to tackle it intelligently, effectively and with progressive results. If ever this procedure applied to a social problem, it applies to the problem of Stalinism.

It is therefore positively astounding that our critics, so anxious to crush Stalinism, do not follow such a procedure in the present case, especially since they were once familiar with it. Not one of them asks these questions or even appears to be conscious of the need to do so much as refer to them:

*How does it happen that this monstrosity of Stalinism has grown so powerful that it threatens imminently to triumph over everybody and everything else?*

*How does it happen that the working class and social movements now face a choice, or so it is claimed, only between two evils?*

*How does it happen that, as one critic claims, the ONLY way left to defeat Stalinism is by the military might of decadent capitalist imperialism, by supporting it in an atom-bomb war which the most optimistic commentator acknowledges will imperil the very existence of civilization?*

## The Two Systems

These crucial questions demand answers. Our critics triumph over the demand. They obviate all need for answers by not posing the questions or acknowledging that they exist. The device is simple, but effective. Also, it gives them more space in which at last to reveal the information, to take on stimulating example, that bad as American imperialism is, "its characteristic imperialist conduct has not been toward political domination" of any important modern country, which is the most heartening tidings the German and Japanese people have read since the war ended.

Patiently and tirelessly we have given our answers to the crucial questions. We have heard no better ones. They were set forth again and admirably by Comrade Ben Hall in last week's issue of LABOR ACTION and by Comrade Mary Bell in the issue before that. We will

repeat them, not for the last time, but time and again, until they have made their way widely.

In the struggle between capitalism and Stalinism we have a struggle not only between two imperialisms but between two different social systems. That is true, and we have no objection to learning it again from our critics. Likewise true and infinitely more important is our conception of the relationship between these two systems.

Stalinism arose out of the failure of the international working class to emulate the Russian workers in putting an end to capitalism. It arose out of the failure of the working class and its organizations to break with the capitalist class, its parties, its politics, its wars, its society. It arose out of (and of course it contributed to) the failure of the socialist movement to carry on a vigorous and uncompromising struggle against the decay of capitalism in the name of a clear-cut socialist alternative.

## Source of Stalinism's Power

The same reasons explain the growth of the power and influence of Stalinism in more recent times. An almost mathematically exact relationship can be established between the failure of the labor and socialist movements to present an independent socialist answer to the crisis of capitalism as it becomes deeper and more extensive—on the one side—and the growth of Stalinism as it presents an anti-capitalist (anti-capitalist, but not socialist) answer to the problems of society—on the other side.

Or to put it differently: Stalinism is the punishment inflicted on the working class for its failure, or rather the failure of its official leadership, to cut loose from sinking capitalism and to strike out aggressively toward class independence and socialism.

Or still another way: Stalinism derives its social power from its ability to provide an anti-capitalist (but reactionary) solution to those social problems which capitalism, in any given situation or in any given country, can no longer cope with on a capitalist basis and which the official labor movement is not organized to cope with on a socialist basis and in a socialist way.

These are the generalizations from which we proceed in our political action. Generalizations? To some people the word conveys the notion of some academic, lifeless "abstractions," good enough perhaps for mental gymnastics but of little value in practical political activity. To us, they are the concentrated expression of what is relevant, significant and decisive in the actual experiences of society for the past three decades, continually confirmed by new experiences every day.

From these "definitions" of Stalinism, it follows for us that its social power can be undermined and destroyed ONLY to the extent that the labor movement throws off all responsibility for the politics of capitalism, its wars included, and leads the way out of the present blind alley of society with an independent program of socialist reconstruction. Nothing more is needed and nothing less will do.

## A House on Fire

"All this may be good and well," we can almost hear our critics exclaim impatiently, "in a general sort of way. But concretely, this very minute, we are faced with a war in which we must choose between the victory of the side which will permit us to survive and the victory of the side which will exterminate us. Politics is practical activity, and to be practical right now means to choose one or the other. We too would be for the Third Camp if it existed. But it doesn't. It is not realistic right now. It has no chance of coming into existence until Stalinism is smashed. And, like it or not, the only force capable under actual world conditions today of smashing it, is the military might of American imperialism and its associates."

What a magnificently practical ring this has to it! It is sure to appeal to the man-in-the-street. He thinks with his intestines. Like the liberal who has lost his head or never had any, he will be impressed with its eminently good "common sense." It sounds so much like those other "common sense" arguments about the "fire in the house" which are favored by practical politicians like Franklin Roosevelt and Sidney Hook, who have had such distinguished success in the fight against Stalinism:

"If the house is on fire, you don't hesitate to turn the hose on it even if it is owned by an unpleasantly rich landlord, for after all the basement does shelter your family and there is not other house [no Third Camp!] yet built for you to move into if this one burns to the ground."

Or this: "If your own hut is threatened by the fire spreading from your neighbor's magnificent house, you work with him on the same hose to put it out, without

putting him through too severe an examination about his political views and intentions."

But even a fireman, if he was scientifically trained for his work, has learned to be wary if not contemptuous of such "common sense." In the first place, he does not turn over the handling of the hose to anybody who just happens to be around and who may do more harm with it than good. Far more important than that, however, he wants to know of the very beginning just what kind of fire he is dealing with. Some types of fire will only spread if you pour water into them! They need special chemical streams to be extinguished and water may be the worst thing you could spray them with. In any case, even a scared fire-fighter will not lose his head to the point where he shoots a stream of gasoline onto a fire just because it comes out of a hose and something "practical" must be done "immediately."

It is the decay of capitalist society, including the labor movement in it, that generates the fuel that feeds the fire of Stalinism. Is that right or wrong? Is that the fundamental point or not? Is that the point of departure for socialist political science and political action or not?

## Not Even Nehru...

These are the questions we would like to see answered by our hitherto severe but silent critics. They evade these questions and propose that we contribute our mite to feeding the Stalinist fire.

And when is this proposed? Right on the very heels of the most disastrous and instructive collapse of the "practical" politicians, namely, the events in China. It is interesting that the so-very-practical critics omit all reference to this indeed-so-practical experience. Why? Isn't it comparable with the case of Korea? It is, and almost to the point of identicalness.

Hardly a word would have to be changed in what Susan Green writes about Korea, except to substitute the name of the country, for her remarks to have applied yesterday to China. Isn't it important? Korea is only a trifle in comparison with China, whose case involves almost one-fourth the population of the entire world.

What is the net result of the economic, political and military support which American imperialism has given to the Chinese Syngman Rhee and his regime in the war against Stalinism? And the net result of the support, active or passive, which the labor movement gave to American imperialism policy in China? A stupendous victory for Stalinism—its greatest since it conquered Russia herself—and a tremendous discreditment of American imperialism and its associates and supporters in the eyes of all the colonial peoples of the world.

What conclusion is to be drawn from the decidedly practical and not-at-all abstract experience we have just had with the course of American imperialism and the policy of supporting it in its struggle with Stalinism? Very simple: Follow the same policy in Korea! Continue the same policy in Formosa, with the same Chiang Kai-shek (not a word about Formosa in Green's article, which has words in it to spare!) Continue the same policy in Indo-China, with the Chiang and Syngman Rhee whose name in that country is Bao Dai!

Why, even so limited a bourgeois politician as Nehru understands the problem better, and he takes good care to keep as far away from responsibility and support of American imperialism in Korea and Asia in general as he can keep, given what he is and what he represents. Our critics do not even show the understanding of a Nehru. It is ONE of the harshest things we can say about them....

## The Comparison with Spain

In support of the American imperialist war, our position in the Spanish civil war is invoked. Incredible!

In Spain, the revolutionary socialists did not wait for the fascists to attack the Loyalist government. We advocated and urged the working-class organizations, including those that were at the head of the then government, to break with the fascists and launch a war, political and military, against them. When the labor organizations and the government finally did launch the war (even if they were forced into it by the initiative of Franco), we hailed it with enthusiasm and supported it unconditionally. We supported it even though the reformist Loyalist regime tried to limit the fight against fascism to the defense of bourgeois democracy. All we insisted on was that the fight against the fascists be intensified, that it be deepened and widened, that it be conducted more and more consistently and aggressively, that the working class which was conducting the fight should adopt more thoroughly working-class, that is, socialist, measures and aims in the fight.

We did not support the Loyalist camp reluctantly and with sighs and regrets about the absence of a Third Camp. Not only was there no Third Camp, but we did not talk or dream about it or desire to establish one. The Loyalist camp was our camp, captained by reformist leaders and limited in its objectives, but our camp nevertheless. That's why, not only in Spain, but all over the world, we could and did enlist support for it (as if that were necessary! All the oppressed, everywhere, supported the fight against Franco spontaneously).

Where is the comparison—any comparison—with the present case? Should we call upon the Washington government to make its fight against Stalinism more thoroughgoing? "more consistently" working-class in character? "more" socialistic? Do we or should we call upon it to crush the Stalinist movement in this country, or condemn it for not doing so? Is that to be the "political criticism" which accompanies our "military support"?

(Continued on page 8)

LABOR ACTION  
BOOK SERVICE

can help you build your own labor and socialist library. . . . Write for free book list.

And remember: we also supply books of ALL publishers. Get ALL your books from

## LABOR ACTION BOOK SERVICE

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



# Socialist Policy in the War --

(Continued from page 7)

Do we or should we urge it to break more drastically with the Stalinist regimes in Russia and other countries? Do we or should we call upon it to launch a war upon Russia in order to gain our enthusiastic support? That is the line of Navy Secretary Matthews—and not of him alone—and it is a consistently imperialist line.

Should we and our friends in other countries—we have such friends, because we are internationalists and not American chauvinists—go everywhere among the workers—say, in England, France, Italy and India—to tell them: "We do not support American capitalism because it is not carrying on an aggressive enough struggle against Stalinism; but as soon as the United States launches a full-scale war against Russia and her satellites, we, as good international socialists, will support it?"

A hundred years ago, Marx and Engels advocated an aggressive war against czarist Russia as the main pillar of international reaction; they called such a war a sacred war for the Germans and for European democracy in general; and they had courage and conviction enough to present their views openly and militantly. If we go by the "analysis" and "arguments" of our critics, one of whom does indeed make a vague but inconclusive reference to the old position of Marx and Engels, why not follow through to the very end, even a little further than our badly disoriented friend Rudzienski?

We do not envy the advocates of such a position, especially in countries like England, France, Italy and India. And those lands, among others, are where they will have to advocate their position, not only tomorrow but today. Surely they have not abandoned their internationalist spirit to the point where they are willing to let the Americans fight in Korea, Formosa and Indo-China—those to start with—by themselves, without the support of sizable forces from England, France and India. And surely they will not neglect their internationalist duty in urging the people of these countries to help in the fight (which is what we did, unhesitatingly and enthusiastically, in the case of Spain).

We recommend the matter of such internationalist activity for their consideration. To us, it seems to follow as a duty, for one critic writes that "The Korean war is the test case. Labor's independent survival throughout the world depends on the military defeat of Stalinism. Can this defeat be had, under actual world conditions today, in any other way than through the military victory of the Western bloc?"

## It Means Abandoning Socialism!

If the exercise of this duty does not stir a sympathetic response from, say, the people of India or even the head of their government, it will not be altogether our fault or the result of this article. Nor is it our fault if it means the abandonment of socialist principles and perspectives and a gift to capitalist reaction and Stalinism.

**Abandonment of socialism? Yes, that and nothing less, and with it the abandonment of hope for human progress, for rising out of the bloody slime into which we are being dragged.**

The hope for humanity lies in repeating until it is generally understood—as Green says at the end of her article in a way that is utterly meaningless for her position—"that Stalinism can be permanently defeated only by effectuating a program for social change along democratic and not totalitarian lines; that capitalism is proving itself unable to do this; that labor has the responsibility to formulate such a program." In other words, that the *only* progressive alternative to Stalinist barbarism is the fight for socialism.

Capitalism, whose outstanding spokesman and organ-

izer today is American imperialism, can offer only a reactionary alternative. Everywhere, increasing millions of people sense this more and more. They fear what they abhor: growing economic and political reaction, the onrush of the atomic bomb war. Suppose socialists were to say:

—War is coming, and you must prepare now—starting with Korea, Formosa, etc.—to support American imperialism in the war.

—But doesn't Green write that "in Korea as elsewhere the United States follows the pinheaded policy of supporting reactionaries to fight Stalinism and has no social program to offer"? Shouldn't that be amended so that "elsewhere" reads "everywhere," and that its support of reaction is not simply a "pinheaded policy" but that it is pinheaded to expect any other policy from American capitalism, and that it does have a "social program" to offer, but it is the social program of feudal landowners, colonial quislings, Francoist and other fascists, monopoly capitalists, Vatican reaction and the like?

—Yes, that may well be. But though that is bad enough, the victory of Stalinism in the war would be worse for you and for all of us.

—But is there no way of preventing this monstrous war, or at least of organizing such a movement against it so that we can not only bring it to an early end but end it in such a way that war and oppression are forever ended?

—Alas, no. That would require a Third Camp independent of the capitalist and Stalinist worlds and opposed to both of them and to their wars. It does not exist.

—But you are a socialist who said that it is the *only* force that can bring an end to war and reaction. Should you not try to build it up out of all the elements that are at hand?

—You must understand that failure to support American imperialism in the war means the victory of Stalinism, which is the worst possible outcome. Under actual world conditions today, the only way Stalinism can be defeated is by military force, and the only military force is the United States and its bloc. You must support it. Today to think of a Third Camp as a reality is to delude oneself completely.

—Then "a program for social change along democratic and totalitarian lines," which capitalism is incapable of adopting and which must be the basis of the Third Camp, is likewise a delusion.

—It is a pity, but that's how it is; at least for the next period; at least until Stalinism is wiped out by the military power of the United States. But after Stalinism is wiped out by the war, such a program and movement will be in place in order to defeat Stalinism . . . "permanently."

We have no intention or desire, no right and no need, to abandon the fight for socialism in this way or in any other. The Third Camp is nothing but the camp of the workers and oppressed peoples everywhere who are sick to death of insecurity, exploitation, subjection and increasingly innumerable wars, who aspire to freedom, peace and equality.

We never promised that we would be able to organize them into an independent movement, packed, wrapped, sealed and delivered by a specified date. We did say that unless they are organized into a movement independent of capitalism and Stalinism, the decay and disintegration of the world would continue, as it has. We did say that the forces of the Third Camp, of socialism and liberty, are here, and it is our sworn duty to help organize them into an independent movement.

The only way we know how to do this is: Tell the truth about capitalism and Stalinism; help make those who can reach conscious of the problem of society today

and how to solve it, and increase the clarity of those who are already partly conscious of it.

Take but two examples, because they are the outstanding ones: millions in India reject Stalinism but they reject American imperialism as well; millions of workers in Britain reject Stalinism but they chafe angrily at their dependence upon American imperialism and at its demands that they toe the mark set by Washington.

## We Stand for the Third Camp

We will do nothing to erase these encouraging signs! We will do everything we and our friends can do to deepen the understanding of capitalist imperialism and Stalinist totalitarianism among these millions, and help them become what they strive half-consciously to be—**independent rallying centers of resistance to the two reactions, hope for a mighty force that can cope with both of them. And we will act the same way not only on those continents, but on our own, and in our own land, too. We will continue in our way even if we are alone for a time. But we will not be alone.**

To build the foundations for hope in the future requires not only opposition to Stalinism but, among other reasons, precisely because of that, opposition to the war—the present "little" one and monster war which is being prepared so feverishly and callously. We are not pacifist, we are not "conscientious objectors," we do not refuse military service, either in the draft or in the army itself, for those are not our ways, as everybody knows. But we do not support the war in Korea, which is our socialist duty, and is in the great anti-imperialist tradition of this country's opponents of the wars against Cuba, Mexico, the Philippines and Nicaragua.

Our opposition to the war does not mean support of Stalinism, in Russia or elsewhere. Only ignorant or mendacious people say that. The best that can be said for such people is that they are so completely skeptical about the ability of the masses to attain socialist independence, freedom and peace, that in their obtuseness they conclude that the only way American imperialism can be opposed is by helping Stalinist imperialism. We will try to teach the ignorant better; and we will answer the mendacious as they deserve to be answered.

**Our opposition to Stalinist imperialism is not one whit less uncompromising than our opposition to American imperialism. We do not need and we will not need any instruction on how to fight the latter so that the former is not the gainer thereby. We do not oppose American imperialism so that it may be defeated by Stalinism: It is not Stalinism we want to see take power in this country; we are working for the power of the working class. As always, we shall be guided accordingly. During this war we shall continue without relaxation our fight for the cause of the working class, of democracy, of socialism and against all reactionary attacks upon them. We will see what the war-supporters do!**

The Social-Democrats, to whom the Third Camp is a joke because they long ago ceased to regard socialism as a real fighting goal, have naturally proclaimed their adherence to the cause of American imperialism in Korea, and in passing they swept Norman Thomas' group along with them. The Cannonites, to whom the Third Camp is an incomprehensible and uncomprehended blasphemy because they regard Stalinist totalitarianism as part of the working-class camp, have just as naturally proclaimed their adherence to the side of the Stalinists in Korea.

The voice of socialist independence and internationalism is stilled in those movements or reduced to a whisper.

In our movement, it will remain clear and firm. It will be heard, and it will be echoed.

# Force Chrysler Wage Boost --

(Continued from page 1)

cent wage increase and the escalator clause—to give the Chrysler workers a raise. But the company rejected this request, of course.

Events in recent weeks changed the corporation's mind. Production had become chaotic; the rate of quits reached unbelievably high levels; workmanship standards went down; wildcats occurred everywhere, with the men out of control of the union; and the sum total result was a growing and very acute shortage of manpower!

Skilled workers could get 25 cents an hour more in unorganized shops than at Chrysler. Metal finishers and torch solderers could get a dime more an hour elsewhere. Why work at Chrysler for \$1.70 when at Hudson or Briggs you could get \$1.78½ or \$1.80? Last week when the De Soto wildcat shut down many other plants and the GM wage boost was announced, approximately 1,000 workers quit in the two major Chrysler plants!

And their rank and file was clearly getting out of hand from the union leadership, as the wildcats showed and as many com-

mitteemen told management. Threats of discharge had little effect on men already determined to get a job elsewhere, if necessary, to make a living.

So Chrysler decided to act. It called Mathews and his assistant into two secret conferences and informed the union what it was going to do. The results were a surprise to everyone including Walter Reuther. The executive board of the UAW had authorized Mathews to make his move in June, but no one expected Chrysler to give him such a break.

## EFFECT ON UAW HEADS

This is an important point, for one of the results of the Chrysler decision, in spite of attempts of the UAW leadership to claim credit for the gain, is to expose the UAW leaders' argument that nothing could be done about wage increases because contracts are sacred and binding. This argument was clearly an alibi for a conservative do-nothing policy.

Ford UAW officials, who in recent weeks endlessly explained to Ford workers that nothing could be done about a wage increase until the reopening clause in January, 1951, look a little silly now.

Obviously results will be coming sooner at Ford than the UAW expected.

Settlements at the International Harvester strike, Packard and elsewhere must be on a far higher level than the UAW planned as its 1950 package. At Briggs, Emil Mazy has already announced a demand for more wages, even though the new contract is less than a month old and did contain a small increase in wages.

The fact that the bulk of the auto workers will get or are now getting higher wages than the UAW leadership thought possible, or set their sights on as "realistic," in 1950 speaks volumes of criticism about the whole policy of the Reuther leadership at this critical juncture.

Again, it was action of the rank and file, based on the militant traditions of this union, which gave the first lead and gained partial victory in the struggle against the inflationary trend.

## STEEL TOO

The UAW is destined for further crises if the cost of living continues to rise, for the Chrysler precedent signifies that wage de-

mands may be made, irrespective of contract dates. The implications of this are tremendous! To be sure, Chrysler was careful to point out that its action was "outside the terms of the contract," but this will carry little weight with the rank and file pressed by inflation.

Suppose GM workers get another nickel six months from now? If Chrysler did it once, why not twice? The UAW leaders cannot as easily evade the burning issues of inflation, fabulous profits, and low wages, by pointing to wage reopening clauses in contracts, and saying, "Just wait until next year, we'll show you!"

The events in the auto industry also make life a little more difficult for CIO President Philip Murray. His steel negotiations are slated for November. Can he do less than Reuther will claim HE did? Back in 1948 Murray was rebuffed by the steel industry until offer GM and Chrysler workers won a 13-cent package. Then the steel barons saved Murray's face by granting a ten-cent raise to all steel workers.

The whole CIO leadership now faces more problems in terms of national policy which they can no

longer easily evade. One month ago, the Reuther leadership was worried about a wage freeze that would include nullification of the escalator clause in the GM contract. Now they are faced with the Chrysler precedent to show higher wages can be won—and, as Chrysler admitted, without price increases!

Will the CIO leadership adopt a program calling for an escalator clause in all contracts to protect any wage increases given, and to offset the inflationary trend? How can they alibi out of it, when industry admits it can pay more wages, does so, and GM is such a large company that no one can ignore the wage boosts its workers will continue to receive in this period? Next spring, the GM workers are to get a 4-cent hourly "annual improvement factor" raise.

And above all, how can the CIO leadership continue to hide its collective head in the sand when the rank and file show signs of rebellion as in the Chrysler walkouts, and these wildcat actions bring immediate results which CIO leaders excluded from the realm of possibility?