

# LABOR ACTION

Independent Socialist Weekly

SEPTEMBER 18, 1950

FIVE CENTS

## DEBATE:

### "Is Yugoslavia On the Road To Socialist Democracy?"

Yes! | No!  
O. JOHN ROGGE | HAL DRAPER

Friday, Sept. 22 8:00 P. M.

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

Admission 75 cents  
(including tax)

## Fair Deal Senators Join Reactionaries To Pass "Concentration Camp" McCarran Bill

### Congress Has No Time For Excess Profits Tax; But Plenty to Tax You

Congress has passed the Defense Production Act of 1950 and President Truman has addressed the nation on the nature of the economic controls to be imposed upon the people as a result of the war in Korea. The specific measures enacted by the congressional bill are in themselves neither new or startling. LABOR ACTION has already written about their essential features.

The most important aspect of the measure, in so far as the mass of people are concerned, is the section dealing with price and wage stabilization. Here the reactionary Congress asserted its will by linking price control to wage control. While it gives the president the power to invoke ceilings on prices and wages, when and if he sees fit, he cannot place a ceiling on prices without simultaneously placing a ceiling on wages. In a word, there will be no price control without a wage freeze.

#### A CLEVER SCHEME

This was a clever scheme worked out by this businessmen's Congress and it operates completely in the interests of the profiteers.

How? Since the beginning of the "police action" in Korea, there has been a 13 per cent rise in the prices of essential commodities. Those affected most drastically by this rise in the cost of living are the millions of wage earners in the factories, mines, transportation and commercial enterprises.

Yet there is still no price control. Wages have not kept pace with this rise in the cost of living—they have lagged pretty far behind even with the increases granted in several of the leading industries. Given this fact, no real protection of the economic standards of the people is possible with this bill, and none was intended.

Thus if the president invokes a ceiling on prices when and if he feels that the country faces an inflationary spiral, an automatic wage freeze takes place. The real damage has been done, for while there have been instances where labor has won wage increases, these do not compensate by any means for the rise in prices. For the millions whose incomes have remained static, the results will be catastrophic.

At the same time that Congress

passed the Defense Production Act it rejected any and all propositions to include in it an excess profits tax measure. Efforts of various administration spokesmen to include such legislation in the act were rejected. This action was not a partisan triumph of the Republicans but was accomplished by the joint efforts of reactionary blocs of both parties.

Only a few days ago, Sam Rayburn, Democratic speaker of the House of Representatives, declared, according to the New York Times, that "he would rule out of order any attempt to force inclusion of any excess profits levy in the interim tax bill that would raise \$4,508,000,000 for immediate mobilization needs."

Several Fair Deal Democrats,  
(Turn to last page)

By SAM ADAMS

After a sharp debate lasting seven days, the Senate has passed an omnibus "anti-subversive" bill by a vote of 70 to 7. The bill, which is a completely undemocratic one and a violation of the basic principles of the Bill of Rights, will now go to conference with the House, to be sent thereafter in final form to the president for his signature.

We should remind our readers that the bitter contest which took place in Senate was based on its consideration of two bills, one introduced by Senator McCarran, which embodied the Mundt-Ferguson Bill, in addition to a whole series of other matters, and the Kilgore Bill which called for the establishment of concentration camps for the detention of known communists,

and potential spies and saboteurs. The president announced in advance that he would veto the McCarran measure if it passed the Senate and that he personally favored the Kilgore proposal on the grounds that it was more democratic and in keeping with the "ideals" of the constitution than the McCarran measure!

Originally, the Mundt-Ferguson Bill called for the registration of the Communist Party and its various movements. It appeared that the bill would carry in the Senate, for the House had already approved registration provisions. But along came Senator McCarran, chairman of the Judiciary Committee. He incorporated the Mundt-Ferguson Bill into one of his own, broadening its scope considerably and even including a proposition for the setting up of a new bureau of passports and visas in the State Department, with special status, though not entirely independent. This bureau would ostensibly prevent the granting of passports and visas to what McCarran termed the "most dangerous" of spies: diplomatic agents of foreign countries.

#### A TRAGIC COMEDY

What followed in the Senate debate was low comedy, but of a tragic nature. The unprincipled

know-nothings on Capitol Hill were joined by the great "liberal" statesmen, despite the differences of their respective bills, in attempting to secure legislation which is the product of hysteria and is anti-democratic.

It was in opposition to this bill that Kilgore, together with the "liberals" proposed their substitute, concentration camp measure. With the introduction of this Kilgore measure, the Senate debate began in earnest and it revealed the extreme backwardness, stupidity and ignorance of its leading members. The low intellectual moral stature of senate leaders is

(Turn to last page)

### Acheson's Brand of Diplomacy— Weapons Vs. "Hordes"

Whom are we preparing to fight? Russia? That alone would be a staggering, costly project, especially for a capitalist United States which cannot undermine the confidence of the Russian people in their own regime and disintegrate its armies from within. But Secretary of State Acheson is bolder than that. He is ready to take on, not only Russia, but unnamed millions of people who might support it. "It doesn't make any difference that you are outnumbered," he said in a television broadcast. "It depends on the strength of the organization, superiority of your weapons. You can hold back all sorts of hordes if you have that."

But weapons do not fight by themselves. "The job is to raise the men who are going to use those goods and that equipment in order to provide the defense

for the West. It isn't going to be short . . . and it isn't going to be easy. And it is going to be done in a period which is going to be dangerous."

Why will our soldiers have to fight the "hordes" of the world? Why will they have to die "out-numbered"? Even if they are victorious, how great will be the price?

This price is not the necessary cost of fighting Stalinism. It is the price of maintaining capitalism in the United States. Acheson's words prove that a capitalist government isolates the American workers from the oppressed peoples of whole continents. A labor government, a socialist government, a truly democratic government in the United States could isolate Stalinism and unify the masses of all countries in a struggle against it.



## Banks Flee From A-Bomb

If atomic bombs should fall on American cities they might kill hundreds of thousands of people in a few minutes. But measures are now being taken which aim to ensure that no atom bomb could seriously disturb the core of the capitalist system which is its property relations.

New York banks are preparing to microfilm all their records and send the copies to safe places outside the city. Lists of all securities

held in trust funds will be microfilmed. The same for lists of stockholders and their holdings in cases where banks act as transfer agents for corporations. Records will be microfilmed and sent out daily so that no surprise attack would disrupt the golden stream of dividends.

The banks believe that their safety deposit vaults are safe from atomic destruction. At Hiroshima a safety deposit vault lo-

cated above-ground near the center of the bomb blast survived intact although the building in which it was located was pretty much destroyed.

To date action to protect the civilian population of our great cities has been mostly talk. But the securities and deposits which record the right of capitalists to live off the productive section of the population will be preserved, regardless.



# British Trade Union Congress Dumps Wage Freeze; Opens Road For Socialist Policy

By GORDON HASKELL

The British Trade Union Congress, which convened on September 4 at Brighton reflected with unusual clarity the problems which confront the British workers.

The clarity was unusual because on the vital question of maintaining a wage ceiling the Congress rejected the policy of its executive body, and by a narrow majority of 3,949,000 to 3,727,000 votes (in the TUC the delegates vote the membership they represent) ordered its General Council to abandon the policy of voluntary wage restraints.

### PRESSURE FROM RANKS

It is not a common thing for the TUC to overrule its executive on a major question. As a matter of fact, it is no more likely to happen than in our own CIO or AFL national conventions. A tremendous pressure must have been built up by the rank and file before the delegates would dare to buck their powerful national bureaucracy.

The workers of Britain find themselves in a most difficult situation. Their own political party is in power. Ever since the war this party has found itself compelled to urge a policy of "austerity" on its most solid and fervent following, the organized workers. The policy was accepted, not without grumbling, of course, because the British Labor Party leadership was able to make a convincing case for the idea that Britain could not buy the raw materials and food necessary for the functioning of her industries and the feeding of her population unless consumption goods were kept to a minimum and production for export was pushed to a maximum.

This policy of self-restraint by the workers was not accepted by all. Before the Congress reversed the official stand for no wage increases, wage claims had already been entered on behalf of some five million of the 7,800,000 workers affiliated to the TUC. There have been a number of strikes in different industries, but most of them were over conditions or resulted from disputes over the

"flexible" portions of the generally rigid wage policy.

The workers have been chafing over the continued low standard of living. Since the devaluation of the pound the cost of living has been rising, and it is obvious that it will continue to rise as the effects of devaluation work themselves back from the realm of foreign trade to the domestic market. This in spite of the fact that the labor government has followed a consistent policy of trying to keep food prices down by large-scale subsidies and bulk buying of food products.

### FAIR SHARES AND PROFITS

Perhaps equally irritating to the workers has been the continuation of high profit levels throughout much of British industry under the BLP regime. "Fair shares" has been made a reality only in the sense that the standard of living of the very lowest income groups has been raised through a minimum wage law and through the medical and other social measures carried out by the government. The standard of living of the rich is still luxurious compared to that of the workers.

Thus the resolution which carried against a stubborn fight by the executive also called on the government to introduce statutory limit on profits. The leaders could not put up an effective argument against the rebels who maintained that wages could be raised out of profits without affecting prices, and that there was no basis for wage controls until prices were controlled also.

On the same day the delegates also defeated the General Council by about two million votes on a resolution demanding immediate institution of equal pay for women for equal work. The council had asked that the resolution be deferred to a later date.

However, an attempt to put the TUC on record against continued compulsory arbitration was defeated. This move was led by J. B. Figgins of the National Union of Railwaymen.

It seems that the Stalinists played a considerable role in leading the revolt against the leadership on the wage question. They

had been defeated resoundingly on a resolution which opposed support to the United Nations in the Korean war and on a proposal that the British government reopen, through the United Nations, the question of international control of atomic energy and the outlawing of the atom bomb.

On the question of the Korean war the TUC supported the government and its leadership by a vote of 6,942,000 to 595,000 votes. On the question of the atom bomb, however, the opposition was able to muster 1,972,000 votes.

This, taken together with the votes on wage policy, is a significant omen. The war in Korea is, after all, far away from Britain. The actual physical support given the United States by the British government has been small, and even the announced policy of rearmament is put forth as something which will not necessarily reduce the present standard of living of the workers.

The atom bomb, however, has much more immediate and dangerous potentialities for the British people. On that a much larger percentage of the workers are anxious to have every possibility explored. And although the question of wages is clearly tied up with the role Britain will have to play as part of the American war camp, the workers are willing to overlook this tie-up and vote for their class interests.

There is a contradiction in the attitude of the workers on these questions. And there is no doubt that the Stalinists will exploit this contradiction to the full. They will do everything in their power to become champions of the legitimate demands of the British working class against their employers. If the BLP tries to continue its policy of stimulating production by permitting high profits while at the same time sitting on the

wage lid, it may yet create a situation in which the Stalinists can win widespread support among British workers.

### DOES BLP HAVE CHOICE?

But does the BLP have any feasible alternative to the policies it is following? It would hardly seem so, as long as it maintains on the one hand its allegiance to the capitalist camp in the world-wide struggle with Stalinism, and on the other its internal policy of social peace with the capitalist class.

The former policy necessarily commits the government to an ever-expanding armament economy and hence to lowering the standard of living of the British workers. The policy of compromise with the capitalist class restrains the government from taking any steps (such as a statutory limit on profits) which would seriously endanger the stately pace of its "struggle" with the wealthy section of the population.

But the TUC revolt on wages may well be the first storm signal for the leadership of the BLP itself. Its conference meets shortly. If the rank and file revolt on wage restraints, with all its implications for the whole domestic policy of the BLP, should be successful at the Labor Party conference, we may, at long last, witness the beginning of the development of a powerful and militant left wing within the structure of the BLP.

Such an occurrence would not only nip in the bud any chance the Stalinists may have of exploiting the present situation for their own despicable ends. It would also give courage to the socialists and the oppressed peoples all over the world and thus make a major contribution toward the development of the Third Camp of opposition to both Stalinist and capitalist imperialism and the war for the world which they are preparing.

## Not in the Headlines

### Advertisers Don't Influence Papers?

Last week LABOR ACTION reported that in Chicago the Board of Education had withdrawn a textbook from classroom use on charges that it told "untruths" about the newspapers. One of the "untruths" was that papers often slant their news to please the advertisers.

A report by the American Newspaper Publishers' Association discloses that 100 large corporations spent \$208 million last year for newspaper advertising, an increase of 46.9 per cent over the previous year.

Of course, the fact of such an expenditure is no proof that the newspapers pay any attention to the wishes of their advertisers in slanting the news.

### IUE Workers Picket Alleged Stalinists

About 100 workers picketed the Westinghouse Electric Elevator Co. plant in Jersey City on September 8 for about half an hour before work began in protest against the continued employment of seventeen alleged Stalinists by the company.

The workers, most of whom belong to the IUE-CIO, demonstrated for half an hour before the plant opened and then went in to work. They said they would repeat the demonstration.

The men admitted that they had no proof that sixteen of the suspected workers were actually members of the Communist Party. They insisted that the seventeenth, a former union president, had been a member of the CP in Hudson County.

## OHIO LABOR NOTES

### Heavy IUE Strike Vote at GE Shows Workers Ranks Solid.

By JOE HAUSER

While the nation-wide General Electric strike was called off by the IUE-CIO, a vote was taken in Cleveland GE units indicating majority support for a strike if it is undertaken. GE workers here were not prepared by their union for last week's strike call, and there was considerable resentment among active unionists over the sudden manner in which the strike was announced.

At a stewards' meeting held by IUE Local 707 here last Sunday it was decided to comply with the strike order as the only course which could be taken. A membership meeting was called for Monday, Labor Day, in order to mobilize the plant workers.

By the time the meeting was called, Carey had called off the stoppage at the request of the government. The membership decided, however, to hold a strike authorization vote anyway, to show the sentiment of the workers.

General Electric issued a last-minute statement claiming that there was nothing to strike about, since their contract offer was so "generous." The national IUE tried to call off the vote as unnecessary under its mediation arrangement. But the stewards insisted on going through with it to show they had the backing of the rank and file.

About 95 per cent of the workers in the plants voted and of these 73 1/2 per cent voted in favor of striking if the IUE fails to conclude a satisfactory agreement with GE. Thus the claim of General Electric that their workers are not really behind the strike movement was effectively answered.

(As we go to press news has been received that 1500 members of the IUE have gone on strike at the GE plant in Cleveland. The total number of workers out of the plant has climbed to 5000 as the rest of the workers refuse to pass the IUE picket line.—Ed.)

### Stalinist Antics

There was quite a turmoil in Local 45, UAW-CIO, recently, with Bert Foster, only officer ever to deviate from the strict CP line in this local, right in the middle. Foster got into two controversies. In one of them he was battling the Stalinists and in the other he was aligned with them.

First Foster, who is a regular columnist for the union paper, "The Eye Opener," wrote a column criticizing the activities of

two of the local leaders as making people think that the local itself was supporting the Stalinist-inspired North Koreans. His article continued on to indicate why he supported the UN action in Korea and stated his belief that this was the sentiment of the overwhelming majority of the Fisher Body workers.

As might have been expected, Leo Fenster, editor of the paper and well known for his party-line activities in the UAW, refused to print the article. Foster appealed this to the Executive Board of the local, making the issue freedom of the press. After a delay of over a month the board finally voted almost unanimously to back Foster's right to have his article printed, and without any censorship. The Stalinists were caught with their guard down on the free press issue, and most of them were forced to vote against their true sentiments.

The second controversy involved the hiring of Norman Berman as office secretary. Berman had worked in the plant up to two or three years ago, when he quit to work for the Progressive Party. He had been a leading figure in the local and had distinguished himself for subservience to the CP line. Needing to fill a vacancy in office help for the local, Foster had hired Berman, and this set off quite a stir among the workers in the union. The Executive Board voted, with only one or two dissents, to confirm this appointment.

These incidents reveal some of the difficulties of the opposition to the Stalinists in the local. There is no one in any position of prominence in the union who can give consistent leadership to this opposition. Foster is known to be free from the taint of Stalinism, and many workers support him for this reason. Yet while he does occasionally come into head-on conflict with the CP, he more often goes along with them and, as in the Berman case, actually puts himself on the spot to aid them.

Most of the other anti-Stalinists show their sentiments by staying away from meetings and refraining from any union activities, thus allowing the gifted smear artists of the CP to paint them as anti-union.

The "free press" issue made the party-liners look very bad in the eyes of the union members and it is up to the opposition to exploit this as much as possible. Fenster will probably delay as long as possible issuing another paper but will eventually have to do so.

## New Stalinist Magazine "March of Labor" Seeks To Form Ideological Rallying-Ground for CP Unions

The Stalinists have started a new periodical, "March of Labor," to push their political and trade-union line. The first issue, that of August, 1950, gives a good sampling of what can be expected from this new Stalinist organ.

The lead article is entitled "Take the Offensive for Peace," and is written by James Durkin, president of the United Office and Professional Workers, a Stalinist-controlled union from way back. This article, as well as almost every other one in the issue, plugs heavily for the Stalinist "peace campaign" as the key policy for labor today.

The second article, written by John Steuben, the magazine's editor, is on "Reuther's Five-Year Deep Freeze." The article attacks the General Motors five-year contract not only on the ground that such a long agreement tends to reduce the ability of the rank and file to participate in the determination of their own conditions and wages, but also for its pension and escalator provisions.

Russ Nixon, Washington representative of the Stalinist-controlled

United Electrical Workers, is the author of "Gang-Up Against UE," which gives the Stalinist side of the IUE-UE struggle for the workers in the electrical industry.

Throughout the magazine are scattered little items under the general heading "Union Highlights" which show an unbroken record of UE and other CP-controlled union victories.

The whole magazine is a typical Stalinist product. There is no word of independent discussion of any differences of opinion which might

# U. S. Policy in Latin America Helps Totalitarian Movements

The following article from a correspondent in Latin America should be of special interest to readers of LABOR ACTION for its vivid portrayal of the effects of U. S. foreign policy in that continent. The views expressed on socialist policy in the struggle between Stalinism and American imperialism are the author's and do not necessarily reflect the position of LABOR ACTION.—Ed.

By JUAN ROBLES

SANTIAGO, Chile, August—It is a peculiar phenomenon that the greatest economic and political power of the world has a catastrophic international policy. Lately the "Good Neighbor" of the North has behaved very badly in our South American continent.

A few months ago there was strong pressure on the Latin-American countries to lower their currency in relation to the dollar. The benefits of such an economic policy to the North American bourgeoisie are evident; it simply meant to cheapen South American raw materials and to raise the price of American industrial goods. The policy of enthrallment and subjugation, a policy of "bad neighborhood" and of imperialism was revealed before Latin America.

But this was just a beginning. The impudent pressure by American monopolies to lower the prices of coffee, copper, tin, sugar, petroleum, cotton and other South American products, already in devalued currency, in order to increase the advantage of the American capitalists to the detriment of the interests of the Latin-American people, followed immediately.

The Truman government did not do a thing to stop this policy of capitalist spoliation, of theft and pillage, the aim of which is called in economics "primitive accumulation." On the contrary, Miller, the State Department secretary for Latin America, converted himself into a spokesman and carrier of this policy of the monopolies. He declared to the frightened creole politicians that the United States does not need their products any more nor can it pay the prices till now in force. In Rio de Janeiro a courteous but determined Brazilian replied that the United States had proceeded with enough economic cynicism in Brazil. Mr. Miller was followed by a drove of FBI agents, advisers, American technical politicians, and by the UN, who arrogantly interfered in the internal affairs of the South American countries, looked for "communists," reorganized local

police, initiated "anti-totalitarian" campaigns and trampled on the pride and national sovereignty of the Spanish Americans.

### U. S. PROMOTES REACTION

The result of this "intelligent" policy of Mr. Acheson and his helper, Mr. Miller, was the growth of anti-democratic tendencies, the promotion of totalitarian movements and coups d'etat. The "anti-communist" offensive was transformed into an attack against independent worker and democratic elements. Mr. Miller did an excellent job to help Juan Domingo Peron in his expansion, as a standard bearer of Spanish-American resistance against American imperialism. The Department of State has encouraged a totalitarian coup against the government of Democratic Action in Venezuela.

A few months ago there was strong pressure on the Latin-American countries to lower their currency in relation to the dollar. The benefits of such an economic policy to the North American bourgeoisie are evident; it simply meant to cheapen South American raw materials and to raise the price of American industrial goods. The policy of enthrallment and subjugation, a policy of "bad neighborhood" and of imperialism was revealed before Latin America.

But this was just a beginning. The impudent pressure by American monopolies to lower the prices of coffee, copper, tin, sugar, petroleum, cotton and other South American products, already in devalued currency, in order to increase the advantage of the American capitalists to the detriment of the interests of the Latin-American people, followed immediately.

The Truman government did not do a thing to stop this policy of capitalist spoliation, of theft and pillage, the aim of which is called in economics "primitive accumulation." On the contrary, Miller, the State Department secretary for Latin America, converted himself into a spokesman and carrier of this policy of the monopolies. He declared to the frightened creole politicians that the United States does not need their products any more nor can it pay the prices till now in force. In Rio de Janeiro a courteous but determined Brazilian replied that the United States had proceeded with enough economic cynicism in Brazil. Mr. Miller was followed by a drove of FBI agents, advisers, American technical politicians, and by the UN, who arrogantly interfered in the internal affairs of the South American countries, looked for "communists," reorganized local

### POLITICAL HUCKSTERS

A few weeks before the happenings in Korea, droves of American diplomats, "technicians" and "businessmen" strutted in South America like the owners of the world, declaring that they needed neither our products nor our raw material. They did not know then that they would receive a blow from Stalin, and what a blow!

Now Mr. Miller, the same one who undervalued Spanish-American goods, declares hastily that the United States will pay good prices for the same raw materials which were so unimportant a short time ago. A huckster in politics! This is termed promoting democracy, fighting for democracy and stabilizing democracy in Spanish America.

What is the result of this brutal and petty "strategy"? The democratic elements of the middle class and of the proletariat are completely repressed in favor of the domestic totalitarianism patronized by Peron. We have the totalitarian government of Delgado Chabaud in Venezuela because this is convenient to the American petroleum monopolists. Instead of a government of Haya de la Torre or at least of Bustamante, we have in Peru the Odría dictatorship because it pleases the American no-

politists. In Bolivia, democracy was completely defeated and replaced by a totalitarian officer dictatorship, under a democratic mask. A Falangist, a Franco adept, Gomez, has defeated liberal opposition in Colombia, restoring a Francoist dictatorship. The president of Paraguay seeks blessings and patronage from the Casa Rosada in Buenos Aires. In Brazil, Getulio Vargas prepares to secure power and replace the caricature of democracy by Dutra. And in this way we could continue with examples, going from one country to another.

And in the end we would have to say in whose name we speak; whose interests inspire our criticism and our rage. We are neither followers of Stalinism, which deals out ringing blows to the Americans; nor do we admire J. D. Peron or Getulio Vargas. We try to create a political doctrine of the South American proletariat, an independent policy, anti-totalitarian but also anti-imperialist. We are for a policy in defense of human rights but also of the national rights of the whole of Spanish-Portuguese America; a democratic policy in its essence and therefore, a socialist and workers' policy. We speak in the name of revolutionary, anti-imperialist and anti-Stalinist socialism. We speak in the name of the exploited and oppressed masses from the Mexican-United States border to the South Pole.

### DEFEAT OF STALINISM

The war in Korea demonstrates that the Yankee bourgeoisie is completely taken by surprise and politically ignorant. It lacks preparation. Revolutionary socialism, as a world tendency, is interested in the complete and unconditional defeat of Stalinism; we are defeatists toward Russia and wish the complete destruction of Stalinism, the North American bourgeoisie notwithstanding, because the interests of world socialism demand it.

But we still do not wish for the complete victory of the Yankee bourgeoisie, of North American imperialism, which has us in its grip. Such a victory would signify the end of civilization, a world slavery, a barbarism. Let us pray that such a thing will never happen and that we independent socialists will be shoulder to shoulder with the working masses so that it cannot happen. Thus we hope and desire the defeat of the American monopolies, of this brutal and troglodyte bourgeoisie, of the slave-traders and policemen of the FBI.

This does not mean that we desire the defeat of the United States as a nation. On the contrary, we hope for and fight for the victory of the American proletariat, for a workers' government in the United States, for victory of world socialism. Over the ruins of the two gigantic and reactionary evils of Stalinist totalitarianism and capitalist slavery will surge a new world, a truly socialist world, without boundaries or races, without imperialism, without exploitation.

We criticize American policy in our continent, because we are interested in the destruction of its Jim Crow colonial policy. Because we wish for the defeat of Stalinism and the American policy of degradation as a way to a socialist victory.

(Translated by C. Alvarez.)

## IUE Makes GE Gulp Dose Of Its Own Castor Oil

By LARRY O'CONNOR

The International Union of Electrical Workers, CIO, deftly turned the deceitful advertising campaign of the General Electric Corporation into a collective bargaining trap for the corporation last week when it offered to accept the "terms" offered by the company as they were stated in the advertisements.

On Thursday, September 7, GE ran full-page advertisements in newspapers all over the country which read, in part, as follows: "That means ten cents to 15 1/2 cents an hour in wage increases offered in the ninety days of negotiations."

"And the increased pensions and insurance program in addition are worth still another 15 cents to 28 cents an hour to our employees."

"And the new holiday offered—Election Day—means another day's pay without work."

"The total of the wage offers and the value of insurance and pension programs is obviously worth 25 cents to 43 1/2 cents an hour—plus the extra holiday."

settle for the minimum of 25 cents, and that if the negotiators could not agree on how to distribute the package a third party would be called in to distribute it.

### CAUGHT IN THE ACT

The company representative then exposed the fraud which they had attempted to put over on the public in their advertisements.

Lemuel R. Boulware, vice-president of GE in charge of industrial relations, told reporters that the insurance and pension figures in the advertisement represented the total value of the pensions and insurance after the increases were added to the old agreement figures. Further, that the figures in the ad did not indicate what the company proposed to pay in the way of pension and insurance moneys, but rather how much per hour a worker would have to pay for such insurance and pensions if he were buying them from an insurance company with his own money.

Asked if the advertisement did not require close reading to grasp the point that the pension and insurance figure included values in the old agreement, Boulware commented that "maybe we were careless."

If that was "carelessness," we would hate to see a company advertisement in a union dispute in which the company really put its mind to misleading the public!

## Of Potato Bugs and Rats

By BENNO SAREL

The denizens of the Kremlin have made an international issue of the doryphora (potato bugs to you) in Saxony fields. The press of Berlin has taken up its campaign with renewed vigor, charging that American planes working at night have discharged millions of potato bugs ("Colorado beetles" the Germans call them) upon the fields of the German People's Republic.

Naturally, this can be seen merely as a smoke screen to hide the failure of Eastern German agriculture. According to the interzonal agreements made in Frankfurt on October 8, 1949, the Soviet zone is to deliver in the course of this year, 100,000 tons of potatoes to the Western sectors of Berlin. Not only will that be impossible but recently Eastern Germany has had to buy 50,000 tons of potatoes from... the United States. One might conclude that American potato bugs couldn't derive nourishment from German potatoes, necessitating importations from their native land.

### A LITTLE "DORYPHORIC" HISTORY

It is likely that this potato bug campaign appears more ridiculous in Western European eyes than in the Eastern half of the continent. A brief history of the spread of the potato bug is necessary to understand this fact.

Doryphora were first found in Colorado (whence the German name). Isolated specimens were carried to Europe in ships. But it was not until 1922, a century after its discovery, that the potato bug really succeeded in taking root. From that date on France was infested. In 1936 they found the bug in the Saar. By 1938, it conquered the Rhineland. In 1944 it was found in Bavaria and Western Thuringia. In 1945 in Brandenburg and Saxe-Anhalt.

The years 1949 and about all 1950 were particularly favorable for the conquest of virgin territory by the potato bug. Spring storms and a favorable wind permitted the bugs to infest Saxony and pass on into Poland (already familiar with the parasites in its Northern regions).

peasant, could possibly have believed that airplanes had scattered them.

Of course, the conquests by the potato bugs in the Soviet Zone in the last two years may also be explained by the fact that nothing was done to combat them. The only effective counter-measure for the bugs is to wet down all the potato fields with anti-parasitic sprays. However, lacking the necessary apparatus and chemicals, this was not done.

### IN POLAND: POTATO BUGS AND FIELD RATS

This brilliant campaign of Gerhart Eisler, East Berlin propaganda minister, was adopted, also, by his Warsaw colleague. Recently, Marshal Rokossovsky's newspaper, the *Polskie Zbrojna*, gravely affirmed that the potato bugs scattered by American aviators were traveling from Saxony into Poland. The same news was broadcast by Radio Warsaw. But they say in that city, that the announcer was so moved that instead of speaking of the destruction of the potato bugs, he spoke of the destruction of the peasants....

Another plague menaces Poland: field rats. But strangely enough, only one newspaper has mentioned it in the past month. The *Rzeczpospolita* noted in a small item: "The rats have also destroyed 150,000 sown hectares (roughly 375,000 acres) in the Eastern districts of the country. An attempt is being made to combat them with poisoned grain. But at the moment, they are so numerous that, according to eyewitnesses, tractor tracks in the fields are red with their blood."

Since this item, not a word on this plague. Could these be rats that come from RUSSIA?

### You're Invited

to speak your mind in the letter column of L.A., "Readers Take the Floor." It's YOUR forum. Our policy is to publish all letters of general political interest, regardless of views. Keep them to 500 words.



Available: BOUND VOLUMES of Labor Action 1945 to 1948 \$3.00 a volume Order from: Labor Action Book Service 4 Court Square Long Island City 1, N. Y.



# The ISL Program in Brief

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

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

Stalinism, in Russia and wherever it 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

# YOU and SCIENCE

## CYBERNETICS MEANCES CAPITALISM

Cybernetics, the new technology of mechanical and electronic devices which replace human hands and brains, was discussed by Dr. Norbert Wiener last week as a threat to the established social order.

Interviewed in New York in connection with his new book, "The Human Use of Human Beings" (Houghton Mifflin, N. Y.), Dr. Wiener stated that the war drive will greatly speed up the application of automatic factories and that they would displace large numbers of workers who now do assembly line work and other repetitive tasks.

Usually a revolutionary industrial development like these almost wholly automatic factories takes place only over a long period of years. For one thing, the investment of fixed capital required is tremendous. For another, as long as the existing machinery is fairly productive many capitalists resist the expense of replacing it. Thus the social structure is given some time in which to absorb the shock of the new development and to adjust itself to it. In actuality, of course, this has frequently involved a great deal of poverty and misery for the workers who had to make the adjustment with the slender resources at their command.

Dr. Wiener believes, however, that the war is going to speed up the application of cybernetics tremendously. Automatic factories can be set up in two or three years on a preliminary basis under the lash of wartime production demands, and in five years in a definitive way.

And even if America were to come out of a war victorious, Dr. Wiener believes that the pressure for a large-scale build-up of automatic factories would not be reduced much. An American victory would require large occupation forces all over the world and the manpower thus used would stimulate the need for the continued

construction of such plants. At the end of the occupation period, large numbers of returning service men would find their jobs taken by automatic machinery. The resulting unemployment problem would be too big for private business and industry to solve and would require more government intervention than this country has ever seen, in Dr. Wiener's opinion.

Among the measures the government would have to employ, he said, were a dole, either open or hidden, temporary or permanent, and the licensing of automatic machinery.

### FOR THIRTY-HOUR WEEK

Further, he said that the demand for the thirty-hour week was a step in the right direction to take care of such a situation. Americans might have to adopt something like the French businessman's ambition to retire at an early age and the long English week-end, he said. (To that we might add the Latin American siesta.)

LABOR ACTION has commented in the past on W. Wiener's concern over the impact of cybernetics on capitalist society. In this interview he is reported as saying that to some extent the United States might have to abandon its anti-monopoly tradition. It seems much more likely that a widespread application of cybernetics would have such a devastating effect on our economy of scarcity that it could be maintained only by establishing a neo-fascist or collectivist totalitarian regime.

The alternative would be to abandon scarcity economics and bow gracefully or otherwise to the reality of an economy which could produce plenty for all with a minimum of human drudgery. This would involve the public ownership of the means of production, economic as well as political democracy and wide-scale economic and social planning. That is, of course, one way of describing democratic socialism.

## The FIGHT for SOCIALISM

by Max Shachtman

A basic primer in the principles and program of Independent Socialism

\$1.00 Cloth-bound \$2.00

INDEPENDENT SOCIALIST PRESS  
4 Court Square Long Island City 1, N. Y.



## LABOR ACTION

Independent Socialist Weekly

Vol. 14, No. 38 September 18, 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: IRKensides 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.

## Reading from Left to Right

THE STATE OF DELAWARE, by William Hines. (American Mercury, August)

In this profile of a state which is "a grand duchy of the DuPonts," the phenomenon of the "Delaware corporation" is explained. Chartering corporations is the state's biggest business, normally representing about one-third of its entire government revenue.

"There is no mystery about Delaware's corporation law. Its attractiveness, especially to the biggest concerns, lies in low maximum taxes, the ease with which firms can be organized, wide powers given corporations, and the trivial obligations imposed by the state. Once organized, all a corporation must do within Delaware is maintain a principal office where the corporate sign is displayed and a duplicate stock ledger is kept. . . . One Wilmington group alone acts as principal office for more than a thousand corporations. . . ."

"In Delaware, when one speaks of the Company, one means DuPont. Likewise . . . when one refers to the Family." The DuPonts literally own nearly half the state.

The "uniqueness" of Delaware is reflected in the state of its journalism. There are many "one-paper cities" and towns, but there is only one "one-paper state"—DuPont's Delaware. Dover, the state capital, has no daily paper at all! What there is in the newspaper field is owned by the Family.

"The state of Delaware is a grand duchy of the DuPonts mainly in its subordination financially to the Family. . . ."

Delaware's role in behalf of the big corporate interests, is, of course, one of the big arguments in favor of federal chartering of corporations, instead of the present situation where the separate states have sovereign power to do so. "States' rights" in this field, as in so many others, is a boon to the money powers.

## "Mystical Moods Which Threaten The Conquests of Rationality"

By JAMES M. FENWICK  
OPUS 21, by Philip Wylie. Pocket Books, Inc. New York, 25c.

Alfred North Whitehead once perceptively pointed out that though we live in an age of science, very little of it has found reflection in the novel.

One of the attractions of Philip Wylie in his more pretentious books such as "Opus 21" is that he does deal with the possibilities and problems created by modern science. It is this that gives his novels a contemporaneity of the same sort which Koestler achieves in approaching problems from their political side. He thereby escapes the banalities which inevitably result from reworking current novel material in the nineteenth century tradition.

Wylie is, moreover, not buffeted by the pretensions of modern science. Even though he criticizes it from the point of view of his own particular bias, he says things that badly need saying but are seldom said. "If you pure scientists were pure guys purely devoted to science," Wylie says, "Hitler could never have hired a dozen of the lot of you in Germany, or Stalin coerced six. . . . And by far the most probable result of the failure of pure scientists to behave purely toward science will be the end of the possibility of further top-level scientific investigation for a century or two."

There are other things which are good in "Opus 21." There is the attack on Puritan sex mores. "Love takes two people. If neither is injured, made less, turned hateful, rendered afraid—if the purposes of instinct, become aware and consciously directed, are not finally frustrated—no specific behavior will offend this dim-sensed nature."

There is the long attack on institutionalized religion, which has earned him the criticism of both Protestant and Catholic press. There is his matter-of-fact approach to homosexuality. There is his revulsion at the antics of the American Legion. There is his protest against thought control.

### MESSAGE IS REACTIONARY

But the message of this essay-novel is basically a reactionary one. Whatever viable insights are present are incidental to his main contentions, which are based upon the more questionable aspects of C. G. Jung's psychoanalytic theory. "Everything," says Wylie, "is sick and doomed." The world is sliding into the abyss because mankind has not been able to establish a concord between the conscious and the deep wisdom of instinct expressed in the unconscious. For Wylie this instinct has a religious caste; he speaks of "God—whom I call instinct." God, it would seem, manifests himself through the unconscious, through instinct. (For all his alleged modernity in "Opus 21," this regressive mysticism of Wylie's prompts

a weak, unclear dream scene in which Christ appears in the B-29 which is on its way to bomb Hiroshima.)

### NO HOPE FOR WORLD

Actually, despite this religious propensity, Wylie holds no hope for the modern world. The current task is only to attempt to find out the nature of this instinct in order that the conscious can be made congruent with the unconscious. The fact of the matter, however, is the following: "Because of instinct, however, all the mad men and all the mad societies will be brushed like bugs from the earth's crust and replaced by better, sensibler men—or if necessary, by silence. By silence while evolution is retooled and instinct tries again with a new form."

This is, of course, another variation of the psychoanalytical interpretation of history which has become so popular since the diffusion of Freud's writings—in this case with religious and Toynebean overtones. And, as is true in most of these theories, the role of rationality is played down to the point of being denied effectiveness altogether. Of Einstein, for example, Wylie says: "Poor Dr. E. Like all the reasonable men, seemingly he cannot perceive that what he conceives of as irrational is the force that governs human destiny! He assumes it's just a matter of enlightening the politicians. The dedication of reason—the worship of common logic—cuts off human personality from natural truth. . . ."

Similarly—for the Western world, at least—Wylie denies the effect of political and economic phenomena in producing the current dilemma: "The misery and aggression of the world, the hate and warlike sentiment. . . are due to two causes: physical hunger in the Orient; in the Occident, the fantastic sex repressions derived from Christianity, so-called, and obtaining still in the materialist societies. . . ."

For our part, without denying the importance of the irrational in the world, an application of Occam's razor is sufficient to resolve the points raised by Wylie.

### APPEAL TO INTELLIGENTSIA

Wylie's ideas are such as to be especially appealing to the petty-bourgeois intelligentsia, which finds itself under pressure from both the bourgeoisie and from the working class. (We here intend "petty-bourgeois intelligentsia" to be construed in its broadest sense as comprising, say, that stratum of the United States population that reads "Consumers Union Reports" and listens to classical records.)

He is bitter against the common man and speaks of "the unconscious hostility of the mob toward the fruit of intelligence." He is somewhat less bitter toward the rich ("Business is the lone God of our Congress"). There is an

ambiance of well-being throughout the book, but not a well-being which is made to seem out of reach: the home-a-building in Miami, the notations of money being passed from hand to hand, the lobster bisque, the drinking in permanence, the brilliant call girls, the hotel euphoria, the trips by plane, etc.

For all its surface verve the book is in reality a very moral one in most of the conventional senses—and thereby can, in the end, find acceptance by the intelligentsia in spite of all the mental ravings, sexual and otherwise, that might have taken place during the reading of the book.

In "Opus 21," after all, the young atom physicist does not marry the sophisticated Lilith-like call girl. He remains (after analysis, of course) in general circulation for, say, more normal type girls such as exist among the readership of "Opus 21." Homosexuality is dealt with and justified as a recessive component of normal sexuality. There is no attempt to justify the harder case—when it is the dominant component in a person. Wylie's amateur therapy with Yvonne in the book—he encourages her to indulge in a homosexual experience—is only for the purpose of leading her back to her normal heterosexual marriage. And throughout there is no involvement on the part of the author-protagonist who serves as the moral archetype in the book. Despite all of his lavishly distributed iconoclasm he remains outside Gomerrah—in fact, he doesn't even drink. Virtue, indeed, triumphs. It is a happy ending.

Well, Norman Douglas had most of this over thirty years ago in "South Wind" and did it infinitely better—with more wit and with a Hellenism we find more agreeable than Wylie's shoving around in Jung's mysticism.

### TURNING TO MYSTICISM

The decline of capitalism and the proliferation of the invading barbarism of Stalinism, two events whose laws of motion remain inexplicable to the intelligentsia, are, as was the case in the decline of Rome confronted by its barbarism, inducing mystical moods which threaten the conquests of rational social investigation. Here, for example, is Diana Trilling writing on "Opus 21" in The Nation: "Mr. Wylie understands what few better-disciplined moralists are willing to acknowledge—the extent to which a faulty attitude toward man's biological nature creates the horrors of modern society. He knows that politics begins in the cradle, that the distortions we force upon the human emotions in infancy, and especially upon our sexual emotions, are of a kind which are hardly amenable to correction at peace tables or in atom commissions."

It is an adequate statement of the decay of The Nation—and, more generally, of liberal thinking.

## THE PRO-TITOISM OF THE SOCIALIST LEFT—8

# The Index to the Tito-Stalinist Regime

By HAL DRAPER

One thing should certainly be clear from the preceding articles: the leaders of the Tito regime are not in the slightest degree backward about proclaiming their belief in the monolithic one-party state system as a "principle on which our state is being built."

Such frankness is, of course, no inherent characteristic of either Moscow-Stalinism or Yugo-Stalinism. It happens to be the vogue right now since the Titoists evidently see no reason for dissembling overmuch on this point. It is their pro-Titoist apologists who would like to hide it in the closet.

Five years ago, to be sure, a Yugoslav CP leader thought it worthwhile to indulge in a precious bit of doubletalk: "There is no one-party system, but it is quite clear that the National Liberation Front [now called the People's Front] is the only political organization in our country." That was Zuyovic in a radio broadcast on March 1, 1945. (He was then a top leader of the CPY, but was purged three years later as a pro-Cominformist even before the Cominform resolution.)

Today, however, the Yugoslav leaders not only speak openly of their one-party system but, with standard Stalinist gall, pretend that any other concept is a subject for irrepressible laughter. We quoted the Yugoslav Newsletter last week about how opposition would be "laughed out of existence." This seems to be the regular "line," stupid as it is. In fact, they are so terribly overcome with guffaws at the thought that they sometimes can say little else in justification of their far-from-droll totalitarian system.

### "Universal Mirth"

Thus there was Wolfgang Leonhard, who beams German-language propaganda over the Yugoslav radio, "interpreting" the March election. He chuckled that—

"It was possible to read in some of the Western newspapers that the elections were undemocratic because the old bourgeois opposition parties were not admitted and because there was only the list for the People's Front . . . they [the Yugoslavs] laughed about the Western arguments because in present-day Yugoslavia the very thought of dragging out some old bourgeois politicians from among their mothballs simply causes universal mirth." [Belgrade radio, April 3.]

Which was all he thought good to say about the one-party system, whence he went on to explain that all this was due to the "socialist revolution."

The Russian Stalinists require mandatory lectures on "the happy life under socialism" even in their slave-labor camps. Obviously the Yugoslav Tito-Stalinists are not up to this level. The latter merely speak of "universal mirth" at the very idea of political opposition, right after an election in which official figures show for some districts, especially in Croatia, that as many as 20 per cent of those who voted cast their ballot-balls against the regime. Not to speak of the countryside 6.8 per cent officially recorded as voting against the regime.

These official percentages obviously merely register the most courageous or most bitter core of those who would grasp at any chance to organize against the regime. Bourgeois? Nonsense. Nor do we pretend that they were revolutionary workers opposing the Tito dictatorship from the point of view of genuine socialism. The great bulk were no doubt small peasants antagonistic to the regime for various reasons, good and bad, which have yet to be discussed. But the Stalinist minds of the Titoist propagandists can discuss political opposition only in their own way.

### Adopting the Master's Method

This totalitarian cynicism is absorbed by the Titoists' camp followers who call themselves the Fourth International and "Trotskyists." The French organ of this group (*La Verité*, April issue No. 2, 1950) printed an article in which it urged youth and workers to go to Yugoslavia to "see for themselves." To underline this appeal presumably, it quoted a declaration of the bourgeois Yugoslav Radical Party-in-exile which charged lack of democracy in Yugoslavia. This party (and its leaders) is, of course, banned in Yugoslavia, like all other opposition parties.

And *La Verité* comments on its charge: "Those who today hurl such accusations at the same time refuse to put them to the test on the spot," namely, by going to Yugoslavia to see for themselves! Yes, indeed, of all the things which could be said about the bourgeois Yugoslav Radical Party, this is certainly crushing: that they refuse to test Titoist "democracy" on the spot! Our honest pro-Titoist apologists not only conceal the truth about the Yugoslavs' one-party principle but already adopt their masters' method of saddling the victim with the crimes of the tyrant.

(We will be able to bear up under the inevitable accusation from these honest men that: "Ah ho! You see, those 'Shachtmanites' are now defending even the Yugoslav Radical Party!")

Perhaps our pro-Titoist subjects believe that we are assigning too much importance to this question of the Yugo-Stalinists' monolithic one-party state principle?

We assign no more importance to the question than does Leon Trotsky in his book *The Revolution Betrayed*. And no less. In his chapter on "The New Constitution" of Stalin's in 1936, Trotsky takes apart the Stalinist arguments for the one-party principle. We have already seen these arguments in the mouths of Kardej and Djilas; in general the Tito-Stalinists are no cleverer than their Russian cousins in thinking up justifications for totalitarianism. There is the "one class—one party" principle, the "no need" argument, the impermissibility of capitalist restoration, etc.

### Cachet of the Regime

Writing of "The Soviet Thermidor," Trotsky discusses the effect of the civil wars on Bolshevik democracy: "The opposition parties were forbidden one after the other. This measure, obviously in conflict with the spirit of Soviet democracy, the leaders of Bolshevism regarded not as a principle, but as an episodic act of self-defense." [Page 96.] It was self-defense against parties which were organizing or advocating armed overthrow of the revolution, in an immediately desperate situation so unlike Titos that comparison is absurd. But even what is necessary in self-defense has its social consequences. On the basic background of the decline of the European revolution and the growth of the bureaucracy in reaction to it, the growth of tired and passive moods among the masses, etc., the Stalinist counter-revolution took off to convert the episodic means of self-defense into their system of totalitarianism.

"The prohibition of oppositional parties brought after it the pro-

## FOOTNOTES ON A CRITIC

In re: Gérard Bloch's recent article in the Fourth International Trotskyist press replying to our position on Titoism.

### (4) Seeing Triple

The major point in the first part of Bloch's article is a demonstration that there have been no less than three different "Shachtmanite positions" on the Tito break. This unique claim will come as something of a surprise to our readers.

The "first Shachtmanite position," as summarized by Bloch, boils down to the fact that we regard the Titoists as still essentially Stalinists—Stalinists who have broken with Moscow, "in fundamentally the same way that the rising bourgeoisie of the colonial countries seek increasing independence from the big capitalist nations that rule them." He even gives this quotation from Max Shachtman quite accurately.

This was indeed the "first Shachtmanite position" and still is, of course. When Bloch comes to "the second Shachtmanite position"—adopted when "the Shachtmanites sensed for the first time the need to change their position"—the reader will expect him to quote (or, in a pinch, invent) something which is in contradiction with that position.

But the "second Shachtmanite position" turns out to be—our position that in case of Russian attack we are for the defense of Yugoslav national independence against Moscow even under the Tito regime. That's all!

In Bloch's brand of thinking, this may be incompatible with our view of Titoism as a national-Stalinist regime: in that case we are wrong to hold the position. But he is supposed to be demonstrating that we changed our position on this or something else.

Actually Bloch's complaint seems to be—not about any "change" of position—but this: "Draper completely neglects to offer any explanation why his organization took 18 months [sic], and changed positions twice, before remembering that 'Marxists support all legitimate struggles of peoples for national independence.'"

This is based on the fact that Bloch read about our position on the question in the resolution adopted by the ISL national convention in April 1949, which he gives as the date of the "second Shachtmanite position." (For Bloch, April 1949 came 18 months after June 1948, when the Cominform break took place. . . . All right, we'll regard this boner as a typographical error.) Whenever it was that Bloch learned of our position on the question is his own affair, but:

On July 9, 1948—eleven days after the Cominform break—Comrade Max Shachtman took up the question of defense of Yugoslavia in case of Russian aggression at the ISL public meeting on the event, and answered exactly as we do now. The Political Committee of the ISL endorsed this and (I add this hesitantly since we do not boast about "unanimity") unanimously.

Since Bloch, in France, was naturally not one of the hundreds of people present at that meeting, we do not denounce him for being unaware of the fact; we merely enlighten him.

Along with other questions of policy on Stalinism, this question also went into the pre-convention discussion which began not long thereafter, looking toward the April 1949 convention of the ISL. The draft resolution on the international situation was published in our open bulletin in November 1948; Bloch and his friends could have read it then. This was the resolution adopted at the convention.

We explain this merely to satisfy Bloch's expressed curiosity. What it all has to do with a "second Shachtmanite position" is a subject for others' curiosity.

This brings us to Bloch's version of the "third" ISL position. Bloch is understandably brief on this point: this "third" position appeared when "on November 21, 1949, LABOR ACTION carried a 'discussion article' signed by Rudzienski" and Bloch quotes the following from it:

"Without identifying ourselves with Tito as the Fourth International has done, we must defend the Yugoslavian people, and all other peoples subjugated by the Kremlin, against Russian aggression as well as against capitalist intervention."

We go into a fog at this point since Bloch does not even bother to explain how this is supposed to differ from the "second" position of defense. (It would be irrelevant to point out that Bloch explicitly quotes from a discussion article and that Rudzienski is not even a member of the ISL, since the sentence actually quoted is unexceptionable.)

Inhibition of factions. The prohibition of factions ended in a prohibition to think otherwise than the inflexible leaders. The police-manufactured monolithism of the party resulted in a bureaucratic impunity which has become the source of all kinds of wantonness and corruption." [Page 105.]

The Stalinist one-party system was not the starting-point of this development; it was at once its consequence and the index of what had happened—the cachet of the regime, as it is the cachet of Tito's regime.

### First Step of the Revolution

And therefore it would be at the top of the agenda for a democratic socialist revolution:

"Let us assume first that the Soviet bureaucracy is overthrown by a revolutionary party. . . . Such a party would begin with the restoration of democracy in the trade unions and the Soviets. It would be able to, and would have to, restore freedom of Soviet parties. Together with the masses and at their head, it would carry out a ruthless purgation of the state apparatus. It would abolish ranks and decorations, all kinds of privileges," etc. [Page 252. Our emphasis.]

It certainly never occurred to Trotsky that "decentralization" was an adequate substitute for democracy.

Trotsky quotes Victor Serge: "What remains of the October Revolution if every worker who permits himself to make a demand or express a critical judgment is subject to imprisonment? Oh, after that you can establish as many secret ballots as you please!" And Trotsky adds: "It is true: even Hitler did not infringe upon the secret ballot." [Page 270.]

(Next week: the Titoist principle of the monolithic party)



LP Leaders Beat Back Move to Run Own Candidates:

# The Liberal Party Convention

By TONY TOWERS

In opening the State Convention of the Liberal Party, held in New York City on September 6 and 7, Chairman Adolf A. Berle, in his keynote address, stated that the party had reached an historic stage in its development. It had ceased to be a party of protest, and had now become a party of power. And with power have come all the sobering consequences of responsibility.

The ex-Assistant Secretary of State made plain what the party leaders consider responsible behavior: a firm and unyielding grip on the coat tails of the Democratic Party while attempting to give the impression of an arm-in-arm coalition bent upon the new men of power. Just how this power had been utilized in the pre-convention deals which occupied the leaders day and night was never reported to the 400 delegates to the convention, many of whom were unionists. They had already read in the newspapers that the Liberal Party leaders had committed themselves to support the Democratic ticket, and the convention was to rubber-stamp decisions made in the usual smoke and bottle-filled rooms.

Berle justified the line which the Liberal Party had taken in the 1949 election and judged it to be a triumph of their flexibility in politics. Politics, you see, is a tough game and you can't be encumbered by any dogmas or hard-and-fast principles. You strike the best bargains you can. Thus in the 1949 election, the Liberals had supported Democrat Herbert H. Lehman for Governor and the Republican-Fusionist Newbold Morris for Mayor of New York.

## Liberal Vote Doubled

This policy was justified because the Liberal Party vote had doubled to some 420,000 for Lehman and to 373,000 in New York City alone for Morris. These were practical results, insisted Berle, which vindicated their policy. For the first time the party had nosed out the Communist-controlled American Labor Party, making the Liberals the second largest party in the Bronx and close to second in Brooklyn.

Such power is enough to make weak men heady. If might ever be enough to give some people radical ideas—such as the idea that now is the time for the Liberal Party to run its own candidates. But sober-minded leaders like Berle, Vice Chairman David Dubinsky of the International Ladies' Garment Workers and Vice Chairman Alex Rose of the Hatters Union (the two unions forming the party's base) anticipated this possibility.

In their convention addresses they repeated the same old refrain. The Liberal Party must use its strength and influence wisely (as decided by the leaders in their pre-convention deals with the Democrats). The apparatus had already been loaded and it was now to be hauled forth for acceptance by the assembled delegates, who were urged to do nothing to upset it. At no time was any report given them of just what had gone on behind the scenes. In this respect they had no advantage over the state conventions of the Democrats and Republicans.

## No More Soul-Saving

A party with such a large bloc of votes as theirs, Berle asserted, had to weigh carefully the consequences of every step. It was no longer so small that it could indulge in soul salvation, knowing that its acts of protest would not affect elections one way or another. If the party were to run independent candidates now, it would result in the defeat of the good men in the Democratic Party. To protest, and divide the vote, would mean the victory of the reactionaries.

These speeches were but the opening salvos in a barrage which reached full fury on the second day of the convention. They were intended to intimidate, and possibly silence, an opposition which had embarked on a campaign before the convention opened to run an independent Liberal against the Democratic candidate for governor.

Before the fight on the candidates hit the floor on the second day, an interesting session was spent debating the proposed national platform. It highlighted the uneasy and difficult position in which the more "advanced" liberals (some with socialist backgrounds, for instance) found themselves. The platform presented was already a masterpiece of "liberalism." Every formulation had been carefully screened to give the least possible offense to any known variety of liberal. Thus it already had been compromised to death.

It was in the usual rhetoric which men of good will love to roll out and was couched in the most abstract and general terms which could safely embrace all shades of liberalism. The section on civil liberties, to cite but one instance, referred grandiloquently to guaranteeing civil rights and civil liberties for everyone, and successfully evaded any reference to the Communists or to pending national and state bills on this matter.

The foreign policy section excited the hottest discussion. The convention became quite a free-for-all with lively pro-and-con debate on various amendments, suggestions and criticisms. The platform proposed full support to "Truman's defensive program for the containment of Communism" ("defensive" was read as "aggressive"—one of those revealing slips of the tongue). It detailed all-out support for the United Nations and American policy against Russia.

However, though the delegates agreed substantially with the general line, many of them objected to its formulations. Many felt that it emphasized too strongly the military defeat of Stalinism but lacked what they called an attractive alternative of socially-minded liberalism to appeal to the peoples of Europe and Asia. These delegates were acutely aware that guns are no substitute for a fighting ideology, and they squirmed in every di-

rection in an attempt to find a suitable ideology with which to decorate the turrets of American armor.

Undoubtedly the criticism represented an effort on the part of some delegates to distinguish themselves from blatant supporters of the war, and a vain wish to infuse progressive aims into American policy. Thus one upstate delegate proposed that Reuther's "total peace offensive" be incorporated in the platform.

## To Contain or to Crush?

Other delegates found even tougher going in trying to "improve" the platform. Dan James, New Leader managing editor, objected to the static and passive concept of "containing" communism. Are we to forget the millions in slave labor camps in Russia or the countries overrun by the Communist hordes? James didn't want to CONTAIN communism; he wanted to CRUSH it. His call to action was cruelly misunderstood as a call, à la Matthews, for a preventive war of aggression against Russia. This he later vehemently denied.

James faced the typical dilemma of those who want to prettify the war aims; who want somehow to devise a "socialistic" and progressive program of American imperialism and its struggle for world supremacy. He could only elaborate by talking about expanding the Voice of America and extending our non-military techniques to penetrate the Iron Curtain. Committed to support of private enterprise, and living off the rich crumbs of the American capitalist table, such liberals cannot understand the hatred of the peoples of the world toward capitalism and its attendant miseries, nor why they respond to the demagogic appeal of Stalinism.

When it looked as though the convention was being divided between the "containers" and the "crushers," James appealed to the "oracle" within the Liberal Party, Berle, to issue forth and rescue it from what might be interpreted as a serious disagreement. Berle fulfilled the role expected of him by declaring that there wasn't too much of a difference in policy—just a matter of words. Semantics be praised! Perhaps some formulation such as "combatting" communism would bridge the difference. Both military and ideological weapons could roll over this bridge, and thus everyone would be happy. The containers and the crushers joined forces to "combat" communism.

This then was the level of political discussion at the Liberal Party convention. All proposals and changes were referred to committee and the following day the amended and properly compromised platform was accepted.

The big fight of the convention revolved around the endorsement of the Democratic candidate for governor of New York State, Congressman Walter Lynch. About him the New York Times has stated: "In the New York delegation in the House he is regarded as the spokesman for Mr. Flynn," or in less polite circles, the notorious Boss Flynn of the Bronx. The Democratic candidate for senator, Herbert H. Lehman, was endorsed without opposition, after the usual nominating speeches about his great services to labor and liberalism.

## No Price Too High?

Then came Lynch's turn. The nominators bravely tried to dredge forth reasons why Liberals should support him. One had the impression that the same kind of speeches would have been made for the Democrats' first proposal, Judge Conway, of anti-labor and anti-Negro background. The main argument was that Lehman's victory must be assured and no price was too high to pay.

Was that why the Liberal Party leaders had not come out publicly against Conway's candidacy? It was the CIO and the AFL political leaders who had scotched his nomination and openly declared him unacceptable to labor, thus forcing the Democratic machine to produce the "more acceptable to labor" Lynch. But for their intervention, it is probable that the convention would have been called upon to endorse Conway on the "no price too high" theory.

So obscure and unknown was Lynch to the Liberal Party delegates that one of the delegates nominating him, after building up to a climax, stuttered around unable to recall the name of his candidate. The delegates roared with laughter and obligingly supplied Lynch's name.

The revolt from the floor was led by some of the local club leaders from Brooklyn, Queens, and the Bronx—candidates themselves on the Liberal line. The younger elements, particularly the student Liberals from the colleges, whole-heartedly participated in the revolt. They proposed that the party run an independent candidate for Governor—Berle himself. Perhaps the most enthusiastic moment of the convention was reached at this point with rounds of applause.

The Brooklyn delegate declared that he had left the

## 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.

Democratic Party three years ago because he was sick of boss-picked candidates and now he was asked to accept such pickings again. Had Berle and Dubinsky forgotten their speeches of just a year ago against the candidates of Boss Flynn and Tammany? Would the five county bosses put up these candidates if they were not "safe" and "reliable" from their point of view? With such questions, he challenged the policy of the leadership and warned that the very life of the party was at stake if it accepted candidates like Lynch and Pecora.

The Queens delegate plaintively pleaded his loyalty to the party and asked: how can we answer the voters who will ask us why we are rubber-stamping Democratic Party candidates this year after fighting them tooth and nail last year? How can we appear as a party of sincere and honest liberalism if we make such deals? The Bronx delegate came from Lynch's own backyard and she blasted away at him. Politics makes strange bed-fellows indeed! She revealed that the local Liberals had been reluctant about supporting him for Congress and that had he not been nominated for governor they would have put up a Liberal candidate against him. (Incidentally after their years of loyal support to Bronx Democrats, the Liberals are being prodded into independent action by Boss Flynn who has forbidden his candidates to take Liberal endorsement. There's no gratitude in politics!) The delegate pointed out the ridiculous position they were in. Here was a candidate whom the Liberals would have opposed for Congress, now suddenly acceptable for governor. What sense did it make? And she was echoing the sentiments of many a delegate sick of rotten deals.

## Berle Sells the Line

The applause these delegates received was heavy and sustained although the leadership viewed the audience stonily and shortly took the floor to lay down the line. Berle described the Fair Deal as hanging by a few threads (what happened to labor's great victory in the 1948 congressional elections?) and urged the necessity to subordinate everything to assure Lehman's re-election. Now was the time for Liberals to sacrifice the luxury of saving their souls and having a gorgeous time tilting at things that are wrong and, instead, to accept their responsible role. (Shall their poor souls then be eternally damned and things never set right? For surely Liberals will never want to be irresponsible!)

Alex Rose, having just returned from England on a three-day jaunt to the British Trade Union Congress, deepened the question by advancing a theory which he surely did not pick up in London. In Europe, he said, they form coalitions after elections. Here we go them one better: we form our coalitions before elections (good old American know-how).

However, Rose did not explain just where the representatives of the Liberal Party got lost in the shuffle of coalition-making. Now there is a coalition of three Democratic candidates and no Liberal visible to the naked eye. Of course, this coalition may take after that famous old coalition of Jonah and the whale.

Dubinsky tried to palm off Pecora as actually the Liberal Party choice forced on the reluctant and unwilling Democratic Party bosses. This was the great victory and possibly the dark horse of the coalition. Back in 1933, Pecora made his liberal reputation in an investigation of J. P. Morgan & Co. and was then safely moth-balled on the judicial bench by the Democrats. The Liberal Party rescued him from his dark corner and, dusted off, he was ready to fight for La Guardia's mantle.

Berle's concluding remarks were perhaps the most significant. In cautious but unmistakable terms, he assured the delegates that once the party doubles its vote, to say 800,000 in the state, the delegates can write their own ticket. Then only Berle said, "we can do as we please." To the delegates this meant an end to unsavory deals, compromises and endorsements of Democrats and occasional Republicans. They greeted this half-promise warmly, and in itself this concession by Berle was an indication of the strength of the desire for independence among the rank and file of the party.

Berle declined to run as an independent candidate and hence no vote was taken which could gauge the sentiment of the delegates. The voice vote for Lynch carried against a scattering of Noes.

However, the fight had been made, and it was a healthy sign of questioning the leadership's policy even within the limitations set by the leadership itself. It brought to the surface the widespread sentiment for major independent candidates, and a growing restiveness against the deals made on top. The leadership had been placed on the defensive and had been forced to recognize the opposition to its policies. Too many local leaders had complained of their sad experiences at the hands of Democratic bosses who used them when they wanted them and then double-crossed them. These delegates were fed up with machine-picked candidates on a state and local scale. Their own experiences were teaching them the necessity of putting up their own party men whom they knew and whom they could control. They were anxious to build a party of their own with candidates of their own. And some of this sentiment became vocal at the convention. Such delegates were interested in their political souls and were unwilling to sell them to the Democratic bosses.

The real "power" in the Liberal Party lies in its effective use of its strength not as an adjunct of the Democratic Party but as a rallying center for labor and liberal support. Power is not utilized when it is short-circuited in the Democratic Party machinery. The Liberal Party can play a progressive role in the first feeble steps which New York State unionists are taking onto the road of independent political action for labor only to the extent that it divorces itself from the boss parties and strikes off independently. To remain hog-tied to the Democratic Party is to delay that process.

## Comments on the Labor Action Discussion on Socialist Policy and Korea

# Everything Depends on Defeating Third Camp Program Only Immediate Menace of Stalinism

By SUSAN GREEN

To accuse an opponent of not having learned anything is hardly an argument. If the compliment was returned, the argument would be equally feeble. To imply that an opponent thinks with his intestines is again of no value in a discussion. When the same person agrees, he is, of course, thinking with his head. Nor is the charge that an opponent has weakly succumbed to events a better argument than the counter-charge of doctrinarism in face of events. Such embellishments had better be dropped.

The reader must bear in mind that the ISL statement on Korea took the Korean war as the grand opening of World War III. Therefore, the contest has become a military one. The writer does not therefore negate, as Comrade Shachtman states, the facts of the roots of Stalinism, and that it can be countered in the contest of social systems only by one better than both Stalinism and capitalism. The writer merely contends that a Stalinist military victory will end the struggle for that better system—and that is paramount.

## No Disagreement About Rhee Regime

Much is written on the Rhee regime. Yet there is not disagreement about the Rhee regime. Incidentally, it might be asked whether, if the Korean war were a civil war, Korean socialists would be for the defeat of the Stalinists even at the hands of the Rhee army. But this is not the question raised either by the ISL statement or by this writer's criticism. Both agree that Korea is either to be the slave satellite of the Kremlin or to be occupied by the United States. The writer contends, not for Rhee, but that United States occupation permits the Koreans to overthrow Rhee, while a Stalinist dictatorship ends all people's rights. "Trivial," says Comrade Shachtman.

He states that the lesser evil of United States imperialism would "be the most heartening tidings the German and Japanese have read since the war ended." The Germans have, however, already heard these tidings. Comrade Shachtman must also have heard that several political parties function in Western Germany—even the Communist Party—and that within the framework of occupation, life in Western Germany attracts people to flee from the Soviet zone. In Japan the MacArthur administration is certainly no exemplary democracy, still there is no equation between it and a Stalinist regime. Those who continue to underestimate the effects of Stalinism in satellite countries should study Rudziński's article in August 21 LA. If Polish socialists can see no way out of their political prison than the military defeat of Stalinism in a war, that indeed is an affirmation of what happens to the struggle for socialism under Stalinist total, terroristic suppression.

Comrade Shachtman again tells us that the roots of Stalinism are in capitalism and the source of Stalinism's power in working class failure. Nazism was also so rooted and could seek power for the same reason. Yet Trotsky was for the defeat of Hitlerism by the Noskes, Welses, Hilferdings, by the Brüning government, all enemies of the working class, whose overthrow was necessary to clean up the social swamp out of which Nazism emerged.

## Must Reflect Immediate Menace

At this point a dozen comrades want to rush into print to demonstrate the differences between

that circumstance in Germany and the international situation we are discussing. They need not bother. All the differences are known. Not the differences are important here, but the historic common denominator. There are some junctures in human affairs of national or international scope, when everything depends on defeating the immediate menace.

Comrade Shachtman gave some expert advice on fire-fighting. However, it is not wise to sit in a burning house—perhaps writing an article against landlords—and be roasted alive. Better help put out the fire and go about the business of fighting landlords, which one cannot do if roasted.

The charge is made that the writer's position is an abandonment of socialism. This is a mistaken notion of the implications of critical military support. A page out of Russian history is pertinent here.

The Bolsheviks fought Kerensky, but they were for the defeat of the Kornilov insurrection by Kerensky. A well-known quotation from Lenin on "abandoning socialism" is in order: "Without diminishing our hostility to him even by one single note, without taking back one word from what we have said against him, without giving up the task of overthrowing Kerensky, we say: We must calculate the moment. We will not overthrow Kerensky at present. We approach the question of the struggle against him differently: by explaining the weaknesses and vacillations of Kerensky to the people (who are fighting against Kornilov)."

Again, the historic circumstances are vastly different, but the historic common denominator exists. Then the fate of the revolution depended on the defeat of Kornilov. In World War III the fate of democracy and of socialism depends on preventing world domination by Stalinism.

## Where Is Mass Movement?

Ben Hall writes of the third camp as if it were a reality, and Comrade Shachtman as if it were forming in England and in India. Such evaluation of potentialities as if they were already realized is reminiscent of our late Comrade Johnson. In that discussion the revolutionary theory of "spontaneous combustion" was exploded. The majority of the ISL held that the minimal requirement for a successful revolutionary mass movement is a leading party. Where is this minimal requirement?

If, during World War III, groups form to lead a mass impulse against both camps, would they not have to be like the resistance movements of World War II? While having an existence and aim of their own, the latter aided and were indeed part of the allied forces. They could not say a plague on both your houses, though they had no use for capitalism. Should a third camp movement develop in World War III, though opposed to both capitalism and Stalinism, its first objective—imposed by the war itself—would be the military defeat of Stalinism.

The differences between Stalinism and capitalist democracy are such as to warrant recognition in ISL policy. If its policy is so changed, it can maintain its connection with the workers during this war period. It can carry on its education about Stalinism's roots and source of power, about capitalism's inability to counter a social program to Stalinism, about the independent role of labor. With the present policy the ISL simply isolates itself from the workers, with nothing to compensate for it.

By BEN HALL

"Ben Hall writes of the Third Camp as if it were a reality, and Comrade Shachtman as if it were already forming in England and in India." So writes Susan Green. We say simply that only a Third Camp program can unite the peoples of the world in a struggle for democracy. Otherwise only a chauvinist, nationalistic policy is possible. If there is no real Third Camp, how achieve such unification? Does she suggest that we attempt to unify the workers of the world behind the American army? This remains a somewhat hazy aspect of the thinking of all present-day pro-war socialists.

"With the present policy, the ISL simply isolates itself from the workers. . . . What Comrade Green says may unfortunately be true. The American labor movement, however, already follows HER policy and as a result isolates itself from the world's masses and prepares a mass slaughter for its sons in a futile effort to control the world. Her policy would not overcome the isolation of the socialist program among the workers. It would merely represent its suicidal adaptation to the isolation of the American workers from the workers of the world. Small gain!"

The reference to Johnson is somewhat obscure. We argued against Johnson that socialists could reach the masses only in the course of a consistent, uncompromising struggle for democracy. Green therefore considers it demonstrated that socialists must defend a war to occupy Korea. Where we propose an internationalist socialist program against all imperialist domination, she suggests a program of occupation "socialism."

Green would have the people of Korea overthrow Rhee by supporting American occupation. How irritating that the people of Korea will not rally to the aid of the United States because it installed Rhee! She would rest the fate of the socialist program on the occupation of Korea by the United States. This is truly the road to the masses of Asia . . . only not for socialists but for Stalinism.

What has this got to do with a possible war between the two big imperialisms? Both sides prepare for an uncompromising, not-so-vacillatory war for domination of the earth. Each side "vacillates" and displays "weaknesses" out of fear that its supporters will be not too numerous and to aggressive but too few and too passive.

## AN AGGRESSIVE POLICY?

The United States vacillates in the Korean war; it does not bomb Chinese or Russian supply bases. Shall we demand an "aggressive" policy as we would in a genuine war against fascism and for democracy? The United States refused to go to war to save Chiang's neck; it displayed "weaknesses." Should socialists have demanded a "strong" policy? This might be a fine program for preventive war-mongers and atom bombardiers but hardly for socialist internationalists.

The masses of the world can only gain from "vacillations" and "weaknesses" which on both sides postpone the outbreak of war. But only under one condition: that this interregnum of peace strengthens their position, clarifies their social aims, develops a clearer and more consistent anti-imperialist, democratic program. Here in the United States the labor movement enjoys democracy. If it does not use the possibility of fighting against capitalism without subservience to Stalinism, of fighting for freedom without subservience to capitalism, it will squander its democracy as it pours out its blood.

In the next war resistance will appear on both sides of the trenches. All occupying armies, Stalinist and capitalist, will hit up against peoples who want freedom and independence. Some will fight under the banner of Stalinism because they want freedom from capitalist imperialism. How can a Stalinist influence resistance be

But in the next war resistance will appear on both sides of the trenches. All occupying armies, Stalinist and capitalist, will hit up against peoples who want freedom and independence. Some will fight under the banner of Stalinism because they want freedom from capitalist imperialism. How can a Stalinist influence resistance be

# Readers Take the Floor . . .

## Took Stand Long Before Korea War

To the Editor:

In LABOR ACTION of August 21, my letter on socialist policy in the war is published, with replies by the Editor and by Comrade Mary Bell.

Since LABOR ACTION's rule of not ordinarily permitting discussion articles of over 1,000 words from readers prevents me from re-

plying at length to the Editor and Comrade Bell, I shall confine myself to correcting two direct misrepresentations of my position by Comrade Bell.

She begins her article with a reference to the theory of the "lesser evil" which "our three correspondents" advance. She remarks that this proposal "did not come before the actual outbreak of the hot war in Korea, but only after Truman . . . ordered U. S. troops to Korea." And she then speaks of the "proponents of the 'lesser evil' theory" who are "presumably for the 'third alternative' . . . in time of peace," but who, "once the war breaks out" find themselves "forced to choose—"

Comrade Bell seems to find it disgraceful that anyone should modify their views under the pressure of events, although this is an old (and admirable) Bolshevik custom. In MY case, however, Comrade Bell did not take the trouble to find out that my position on the war was stated in an

article in the discussion bulletin of the ISL published in the summer of 1949. My article is dated April 15, 1949; and the ideas it contains were made known to various people some months before that date.

There is another misrepresentation in Comrade Bell's article. Quoting a phrase from my letter, she remarks on how ridiculous it is to suggest that a tiny organization like the ISL should "have some influence on the conduct of the war, democratize it, as it were, or give it a 'socialistic' tinge." Comrade Bell certainly did not find any such idea in MY letter. I speak, very emphatically, of the choices "imposed by the brutal realities of the present world situation." Does that sound as if I hoped to give the war a "socialistic tinge"? On the contrary, it is the theoreticians of the Third Camp who have delusions along THAT line!

H. D. COLEMAN  
St. Louis

Interested? For information about the INDEPENDENT SOCIALIST LEAGUE

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

## The Standard Biographical Work—

### "KARL MARX"

by Franz Mehring

British edition, cloth-bound—\$3.00—while they last

### LABOR ACTION BOOK SERVICE

4 Court Square

Long Island City 1, N. Y.



# McCarren Bill --

(Continued from page 1)  
of subsidiary interest, however. What is important is the way in which they trampled underfoot basic democratic ideas. The "liberals," the fair dealers, and even some outstanding leaders of the ADA, revealed that democratic interests and ideals are entirely subordinate to their current political interests.

## UNCONSTITUTIONAL!

In criticizing the McCarran Bill, they charged that it was unconstitutional and could not be sustained before the Supreme Court. Senator Paul H. Douglas, former professor at the University of Chicago, ex-socialist in his sympathies, gave four reasons why the McCarran Bill should not be passed.

He contended that the bill was clumsy and would tie up the courts for from six to nine years in order to enforce registration and reports on the Stalinists and their front organizations. The latter would employ "constitutional delaying tactics." Evidently the bill was ill-constructed!

Again, the bill would permit the Stalinists, or any other movement (socialist and anti-Stalinist) charged by the Administration, to continue to function while their cases were being decided.

Thirdly, the McCarran measure would permit the smearing of innocent people, frighten honest people doing "good work" and finally, it would permit the punishment of loyal and innocent persons or groups, according to the N. Y. Times, "for exercising their right to oppose social and international programs with which they sincerely disagreed."

How is all this to be overcome? By passing the Kilgore Detention Bill which calls for the establishing of "detention camps," i.e., to use the proper term, concentration camps!

Another great liberal, lame duck Senator Frank P. Graham, Democrat of North Carolina, held that the McCarran Bill would violate the First Amendment. In defending the Kilgore bill he added: "It reaffirms the values of the old and recent laws, proposes new laws and expresses its faith in the now-well-coordinated program of loy-

alty and security." This includes the Attorney General's utterly tyrannical subversive list from which no organization has been able to obtain any legal redress to date.

## "GESTAPO PROCEEDINGS"

The reactionaries, in turn, had a hey-day with the Kilgore Bill. Senators Mundt and Ferguson charged that the bill would employ concentration camp action that would jail persons without trial; it would constitute "gestapo proceedings."

In his own behalf, McCarran decried the Kilgore substitute by saying: "There is no better way of destroying a law than by inserting somewhere along the line an unconstitutional amendment. This internment proposal would be found unconstitutional in any court of the land."

But these gentlemen were not yet through. Kilgore denounced the McCarran bill as a "legislative hodge-podge" and "an impractical conglomeration of provisions, many of them patently unconstitutional."

He probably never expected the rejoinder from McCarran that "The Kilgore Bill is a blueprint for the establishment of a dictatorship of the proletariat in the U. S." How McCarran arrived at this ignorant and stupid conclusion is unimportant. What is important is the level of the senatorial discussion.

After this sharp debate between these men of principle, the general public was led to believe that the fight over the two totalitarian measures would be made to the end.

However, in the final debate a crossing of lines took place with great speed—as a matter of fact, so rapid was the fusion of the groups that as we go to press the newspapers have not been able to get a full and accurate report of the text of all the amendments.

The Kilgore bill was defeated on a straight vote, but its main concentration camp measure was incorporated into the McCarran Bill. The McCarran Bill, with the new passport and visa proposal deleted, was then carried with its provisions for registration joined to the detention camp proposal of Kilgore.

All the senators who opposed the Kilgore Bill because it proposed "gestapo proceedings" voted for it. All those who fought it because no court in the land would uphold its constitutionality, voted for the combined measure.

## LIBERALS VOTE "JA"

And the great liberals? Douglas, Kilgore, the Republican liberal Wayne Morse, and that great leader of the ADA, Humphrey? They voted for it too. And so did O'Mahoney, and Benton, and McMahon. And they voted for it even though they believed that the McCarran Bill was unconstitutional, a violation of the First Amendment and a threat to innocent groups and individuals.

What will President Truman do now? He has said repeatedly that he would veto the McCarran bill. Will he veto it now that it incorporates the main features of the Kilgore bill? We will not know for several days.

But we do know that the Senate and House actions are the signal for an intensification of the witch-hunt and hysteria that is slowly emerging in the nation. Self-appointed censors of the political views of people and movements, self-appointed gauleiters issue racket sheets and pamphlets threatening the reputations and jobs of hundreds and thousands of peoples.

## THE POLICE MENTALITY

All of this is done in the name of fighting the Communist Party and Stalinism. What a pitiful spectacle it is, for none of these measures can successfully carry out such a struggle. The struggle against Stalinism is essentially an ideological struggle which can never succeed by police measures, or be carried out by people with a police mentality.

As a socialist paper, as an opponent of capitalism and all that it stands for we are the most adamant, indefatigable enemies of Stalinism and have been from the very beginning of our existence. But we are unalterably opposed to this congressional action which threatens the democratic rights of the people. It institutes police state measures which cannot advance the struggle against Stalinism, but which threaten all progressive and socialist organizations.

# WITH THE ISL



You are invited to attend meetings, classes, lectures and socials sponsored by local branches of the Independent Socialist League.  
For general information and literature, write to: Independent Socialist League, 4 Court Square, Long Island City 1, N. Y. (telephone IRonsides 6-5117). For information about the Socialist Youth League: same address.

**AKRON**  
Write to Box 221.

**BALTIMORE**  
Write to national office of ISL.

**BUFFALO**  
Write to national office of ISL.

**CHICAGO**  
333 West North Ave., Room 3.  
Tel.: MICHigan 9003.  
SYL: same.

**CLEVELAND**  
Write to Box 1190, Station B.

**DETROIT**  
Meets Thursday evenings at Labor Action Hall, 8212 Twelfth St. (near Seward), Room 25. Educational program for evening begins at 8:30.

**LOS ANGELES**  
221 W. 2nd St., Room 218.

**NEWARK**  
248 Market Street.

**NEW YORK CITY**  
City Center and Labor Action Hall: 114 West 14 Street, third floor. Tel.: WATkins 4-4222, CHELSEA 2-9681.

Open meetings at Labor Action Hall on Thursday nights at 8:45 o'clock. Admission free.

SYL: for all information on New York SYL, address 114 West 14 Street.

**PHILADELPHIA**  
1139 W. Girard Ave., third floor. Meetings Mondays at 8 p.m. Open house, Sundays 8:30-10 p.m.

**PITTSBURGH**  
Write to national office of ISL.

**READING**  
Write to P. O. Box 1671.

**SAN FRANCISCO-OAKLAND**  
Labor Action Hall, 466 Tenth St., Room 218, Oakland 7.  
Office hours: Tues. and Thurs., 7:30-10 p.m.; Wed., 1-4 p.m.  
Labor Action and The New International on asle at The Golden Gate News Agency, 66 Third St., off Market St.

**SEATTLE**  
Write to Labor Action, Box 358.

**ST. LOUIS**  
Write to Douglas Bridge, P. O. Box 3414, Maplewood Branch, Maplewood, Mo.

**WEST VIRGINIA**  
Write to national office of ISL.

**YOUNGSTOWN**  
Write to national office of ISL.

# Profit Tax --

(Continued from page 1)  
having been defeated in their efforts to include an excess profits measure in the Defense Production Act, tried again when the new tax bill was introduced. But Rayburn said, even though he personally favored the measure, it could not be included in the current tax bill because it was a "new matter." This may come as a surprise to some when it is remembered how many "new matters" were attached to other bills such as FEPC, rent control and displaced persons, in order to defeat them, without the speaker's drastic intervention.

As matters stand now, unanimous consent is required in the House to send the tax bill into conference. This unanimous consent has not yet come since two Democrats, Stephen M. Young of Ohio and Herman P. Eberhart of Pennsylvania, have objected and demanded the inclusion of an excess profits tax (as asked for by the president).

## WE NEED TIME . . .

Rayburn opposed these objections, saying: "Nothing can be gained by objecting here because you cannot get an excess profits tax in this bill." His view was echoed by the Democratic chairman of the House Ways and Means Committee, who added: "I am as much in favor of an excess profits tax as any member, but we need time to write this tax in a way that we could feel responsible for it."

In the meantime, we can be certain that the current interim bill raising income taxes and bearing heaviest against the wage earners, will be passed. For that the reactionary congressional leaders do not need time. They feel quite competent to pass measures which affect the mass of people adversely. It is only when confronted with pressure to enact measures which affect the enormous profits of big business and the monopolies engaged in war production that they hesitate and find it impossible to

act with any swiftness. That is the way it was in the last war; that is the way it is happening in the present situation.

And all of this is only the beginning. The president's message disclosed that the government is spending \$15,000,000,000 a year for defense. By next June, he said, "we expect to be spending at the rate of at least \$30,000,000,000. In the year after that, we shall probably have to spend much more than \$30,000,000,000. And we must be prepared to maintain a very strong defense program for many years to come."

The president does not offer a very bright future to the people of the United States. He has merely emphasized what we have described so often as the only possible future for a capitalist society: war and its accompanying barbarism. The American people face life under a permanent war economy presaging a difficult economic and political situation for them. We shall return to this subject in future issues of LABOR ACTION.

# At Whom Was John L. Lewis Aiming When He Let Go At Old Bill Green?

John L. Lewis' recent "memorandum" to William Green of the AFL has given rise to a lot of guessing about what the old maverick of the labor movement may have been driving at.

One theory (Murray Kempton in the New York Post) is that Lewis was telling the CIO that he has more in common with it than with the AFL. The notion seems to be that in taking a slap at the AFL's "innate craving for orthodox respectability" Lewis was trying to tell the CIO, with its more militant tradition, that he is their natural ally in the present situation.

This theory seems more a product of a historical nostalgia on the part of the writer than anything else. Is Phillip Murray's craving for respectability any less "innate" than Green's? In fact, the memorandum clearly tells both Green and the CIO that "any mess" they may cook up in the way of labor unity without the UMW will have to be eaten by both of them.

In its issue of September 9 Business Week suggests another theory which seems more likely. The AFL and CIO have been anxious to work out some kind of a deal with the administration in

Washington to get representation on any labor-control body which may be set up. Although Murray has opposed a wage freeze or a no-strike pledge at least until after the United Steel Workers get a new contract with the steel industry, it is clear that he is willing to go along with the government's plans for labor peace and "economic stability" once his union has caught up with the UAW in this round of wage increases.

In effect, Business Week states, Lewis was serving notice that the UMW will not be bound by any agreement made between the government and the AFL-CIO:

"That is what Lewis is telling Symington and Truman in his letter to Green. He could have done it by reminding them how the Mine Workers, snubbed by Roosevelt, went their own way upsetting patterns and keeping the labor front in an uproar during the last war. He was in character, however, when he chose to make his point by lampoon."

That seems a pretty good theory, as far as it goes. Actually, Lewis was taking a round-house punch at all his enemies. He was letting it be known that neither the government, in its labor-freeze plans, nor the AFL and CIO, in their "unity" negotiations, can afford to leave half a million miners and John L. Lewis out of their calculations.

THE BRITISH POLITICAL SCENE IS PORTRAYED EACH WEEK

— IN —  
**THE SOCIALIST LEADER**  
Britain's Foremost Weekly

Yearly Subscription—Three Dollars  
Shorter Periods Pro Rata

Order from:  
**SOCIALIST LEADER**  
318 Regents Park Road  
Finchley, London, N. 3, England

The Handy Way  
To Subscribe!

**LABOR ACTION**  
Independent Socialist Weekly  
4 Court Square  
Long Island City 1, N. Y.

Please enter my subscription:  
 NEW  RENEWAL  
 6 months at \$1.00  
 1 year at \$2.00

NAME .....  
(please print)

ADDRESS .....

.....

ZONE ..... APT. ....

CITY .....

STATE .....

Bill me  
 Payment enclosed.