

LABOR ACTION

Independent Socialist Weekly

AUGUST 21, 1950

FIVE CENTS

**Pro and Con on the War:
Three Letters from Pro-War Critics
War and the 'Lesser Evil' — A Reply**

... page 6

The Belgian Strikes — Why?

... page 3

The Yugoslavs and the Korean War

... page 4

Three Fellow Travelers Jump Off the CP Line

The American Stalinists received a one-two-three blow this past week when a trio of their most useful fellow travelers (useful up to recently) deserted their badly listing ship.

Heading the parade was Henry Wallace who now followed up his previous attack on the Stalinists' war in Korea by formally resigning from the Progressive Party, whose nominal leader he has been. Following up likewise his earlier full endorsement of U. S.-UN intervention in Korea, he also showed his basic political mettle by announcing that he had revised his views even on the use of the atom bomb—its use would be justified, as he saw it, by the events in Korea! From the CP's adulated "peace leader," he has found no difficulty in jumping over to the extreme right wing of the war camp. The socialist view of Wallace's "peace" ideology in its heyday needs no further insistence.

Most hypocritical of the switches was that of Lee Pressman, ex-general counsel of the CIO who left the job to become a leader of the Wallace movement. Unlike Wallace,

Pressman was never a befuddled victim of the Stalinist machine, but rather one of its shrewdest operators (whether he possessed a party card or not). He performed this job to the full, for example, on behalf of the CP machine in the Progressive Party at the convention which nominated Wallace for president.

Pressman announced his resignation from the American Labor Party (Stalinist front in New York) on August 11. He explained that the ALP does not "represent or reflect the democratic and progressive interests or aspirations of the American people but rather of the Communist Party."

This discovery, which no doubt burst upon Pressman as a shock, was greeted by ALP leader Marcantonio with "Good riddance!"

Third blow was dealt by Corliss Lamont who, however, stayed in the Progressive Party. His statement "deplored" the North Koreans' aggression (no tieup with Russia), and called Russia's UN boycott tactic a "serious mistake." It is clear that he has taken only a first step out of the Stalinist camp as yet.

Why Stalinism Advances—

U. S. Policy Abroad Leans On Forces of Reaction

By GORDON HASKELL

Each passing week in the stepped-up struggle between Stalinism and Western capitalism makes clearer the importance of the ideological side of the conflict.

Ideology! The word sounds strange to most Americans. And in the past the importance attached to it by socialists seemed to many "hard-headed" and "practical" Americans in and out of the labor movement to be just part of their strange way of looking at things.

Up till now the failure of the political, social and economic ideas of American capitalism to make headway among the masses in foreign countries has been attributed chiefly to two causes: Americans were not spending enough money on the Voice of America or on other propaganda agencies abroad. Secondly, these foreigners are just too backward to grasp the blessings of the "American Way of Life" and hence to believe in it fervently, as they should.

Till now, many leaders in American politics could shrug their

shoulders with the feeling that if the foreigners are not smart enough to see that the American way is the best way, that is their own funeral. But today they face the fact that the failure of America to win masses of people all over the world to its objectives in the world-wide struggle can result

for its own imperialist interests. They have reason to be worried. Hence the new interest in the daily press about "ideology" and "propaganda war."

To start right at home: It is becoming increasingly clear that Americans themselves have only the vaguest idea of what the struggle is about. For American boys fighting in Korea, this is a double tragedy. To fight and to die in a war, far away from home, is a terrible thing for anyone, no matter how strongly he may believe in the cause for which he is fighting. But to live in filth, to strain every muscle and fiber of one's being, and to die without knowing why—that is a human tragedy.

WHAT CAN THEY EXPECT?

In an article in the New York Times of August 13, Richard J. H. Johnston quotes a commander of infantry in Korea: "I can tell my men what to do. I can show them how, to do it. But until they understand why they are doing it, they can't do it well. Those men are doing the best they can, but as you can see it's not enough."

And he quotes a 19-year-old corporal: "I keep asking myself what I am doing here. The funny thing is I can't answer my own question."

Every report from the front with regard to the ideological preparation of the American troops is the same. And yet, these men are not much different from any cross-section of American youth today. If this is true of American troops, how much more is it true of the tens of millions of non-Americans whom America is trying to enlist on her side in this struggle for the world?

ALLIED WITH REACTION

The papers have been full of discussions of the effectiveness of Malik versus Austin in the United Nations propaganda battle. An article in the same issue of the N. Y. Times describes the way in which the Stalinists spread their ideas among the millions of Asia, and compares it to the methods and effectiveness of the American effort.

"In many cases," the article reads, "pro-Russian propaganda is sandwiched in with propaganda for such popular movements as land reform. For example, a Communist pamphlet explaining how the land should be distributed more evenly will contain complimentary references to the Russian system of land-holding and complimentary references to the tenant farm system in the United States. This pamphlet will be read

(Turn to last page)

THE UAW AND DEMOCRACY AT HOME

Last week we reported the instructions sent out by the leaders of the United Auto Workers (CIO) to local unions, warning against the use of violence by UAW members against alleged Stalinists. Several cases had occurred in UAW plants.

The main message struck an exceedingly welcome note for the trade-union movement, and can only be hailed. The UAW magazine, *Ammunition*, in a new issue (August) repeats this message.

"Debate them, expose them, ridicule them, but keep your hands in your pockets," it is headed. Right!

It recalls that the Stalinists themselves have used "lynch mob tactics" but warns that "people who take over the brutality and cynicism of the Communists give away their own moral defenses in the fight against Communism. . . . People who disregard the legal rights, even of Communists, and who resort to lynch law, may be anti-Communist, but they are not on the side the UAW is committed to." Right!

It recalls the early history of the UAW itself when "the companies organized lynch mobs to attack people who joined unions under the pretext they were Communists." Right!

It asks, "how do you deal with Communists?" and answers: "Argument . . . Facts . . . Ridicule . . ." (And it might add: *Organize to vote them out of any responsible positions of leadership in any union!*)

All of which ought to be a bible for the labor movement on how to stop the Stalinists at home.

All the more reason, therefore, precisely because the UAW is not just another union, to draw attention to the following sentences in this very same statement:

"Where you are really concerned about someone you honestly believe to be a Communist, it's not your job to take the law into your hands.

"In that case, notify the FBI. The FBI knows better than you what to do."

If that is unclear there is nothing else to clear it up. But it sounds only too clear.

What "law" should not be taken into your hands to deal with "someone you honestly believe to be a Communist"? Are the authors of the statement under the impression there is such a law which is directed against "Communists" as such, provided you "honestly believe" your fellow worker has a party card?

Even the Mundt-Ferguson bill has not been passed, and we thought the UAW was against it.

In any case, is the UAW leadership advocating "fingering" CPers for the FBI as a "legal" substitute for beating them up?

If so, what was the point about "arguments . . . facts . . . ridicule," etc., and the other excellent points made in the first part of the statement? Does the UAW leadership think that legal terror against dangerous thoughts is any more democratic because a law is passed or an executive decree is handed down?

Walter Reuther and his fellow officers ought to be asked for an explanation by UAW militants who do want to "watch out that a reactionary anti-Communist doesn't trick you into destroying the very protections that are your defenses against injustice."

DEBATE—Friday, Sept. 22

IS YUGOSLAVIA ON THE ROAD
TO SOCIALIST DEMOCRACY?

Yes!

No!

O. JOHN ROGGE

HAL DRAPER

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

UAW Ranks Push For Union Action

By WALTER JASON

DETROIT, Aug. 14—Pressure of the United Auto Workers Union ranks for action against the zooming cost of living was reflected on two important sections of the industry.

The Ford department of the UAW-CIO, backing the resolution of Ford Local 600, demanded wage increases from Henry Ford, even though the wage reopening clause ostensibly precludes such a demand until January, 1951.

At South Bend, Ind., the Bendix workers rejected a contract containing the usual 1950 package, the second such recent incident. Hudson Local is trying to renegotiate its contract which was rejected by the ranks.

The announcement by Ken Bannon, Ford department director for the UAW-CIO, that the union was asking for immediate wage negotiations, came after Ford had already turned down such a plea from the officials of Ford Local 600.

Ailurophile

Representative John D. Rankin of Mississippi, who froths at the idea of anti-lynching legislation, recently almost went out loud when he pleaded with Congress to do something about the 848,000 cats annually killed in highway accidents.

Discrimination

In Paris, France, a labor relations court took up the unprecedented problem of whether an employee has a right to tattoo a picture of his boss on the part of his anatomy where he sits down. A worker in a wholesale dry goods firm complained to the court that he was fired when the boss found out.

LET NOT THE LEFT HAND KNOW...

Left Hand: Truman Opposes Mundt Bill; Right Hand: Moves to Jail CPers on Bail

By ROBERT MAGNUS

Hard on the heels of President Truman's message to Congress last Tuesday counseling caution in passing legislation which would undermine civil liberties and free speech in the United States, his administration moved to cancel the bail of the eleven convicted Stalinist leader.

The move closely followed the jailing of Harry Bridges, West Coast Stalinist longshore leader, recently convicted of perjury in San Francisco. Bridges' bail was also revoked and he was sent to jail.

The frenetic haste with which the government is clapping its Stalinist opponents behind bars is only paralleled by the speed with which the American judiciary is prostituting its "justice" to the needs of the Korean war.

The Stalinists were convicted in New York on October 14, after a long trial, on grounds of a "conspiracy to teach and advocate the overthrow of the government" by force or violence. They immediately appealed the decision, which was sustained on August 1 by the United States Court of Appeals.

The ex-liberal jurist, Judge Learned Hand, upheld the constitutionality of the Smith Gag Act under which the Stalinists were indicted. The CP leaders were out on bail during the normal fifteen-day interval between affirmation of a conviction and execution of the sentence when the government demanded their imprisonment.

The popularity of this move is bound to have repercussions in other segments of the auto industry. Thus far, however, there has been no sign of action on the Chrysler front.

The threat of a strike at Ford on January 2, 1951, unless a wage demand has been met by that time, was also issued by the General Council of Ford Local 600.

Of course, under the present contract, the UAW-CIO could be found guilty of an unfair labor practice by striking now for wage increases at Ford. Nonetheless, rank-and-file pressure is so great that the UAW leaders are talking along that direction.

Officially, the UAW leadership dominated by Walter Reuther has been relatively silent on the whole issue, and the question has been asked a million times in the shop: "When is the union going to do something about prices?"

Current agitation for wage increases to offset the inflationary trend will get hotter when the announcement of General Motors' wage increase comes out in two weeks. The escalator clause, ridiculed, misunderstood and rejected in some places, as at Chrysler in 1948, is certainly coming into its own as a sound idea.

The beginning of the wage demand at Ford is a triumph for the shrewd maneuvers of the Stalinists, who are forcing Carl Stellato, president of 600, to adopt their program on various issues at the very time he is busy denouncing them. Stellato's attempt to suspend five officials as "Communists" pending trial was defeated by the General Council. Furthermore, Stellato found it necessary personally to bring charges against the five individuals. The other three top officers of the local broke with him on the issue.

LET NOT THE LEFT HAND KNOW...

Left Hand: Truman Opposes Mundt Bill; Right Hand: Moves to Jail CPers on Bail

The grounds given by the government for its action are based on the negation of the "clear and present danger" formula laid down in Judge Hanft's decision—which decision the Stalinists are appealing to the Supreme Court. Sufficient unto the day is the legal formula thereof: "the defendants have pursued and will continue to pursue a course of conduct and activity dangerous to the public welfare and national security of the United States."

FAIR WORDS

What such activities were, beyond strict adherence to the party line on Korea, no one knows, although the order was issued "after study of all data... on the defendants—including FBI reports." The contents of the reports, were, of course, not disclosed.

While the attorney general, the FBI, the judiciary and all the organs of governmental power work to silence with bureaucratic stupidity and high-handedness the Stalinist "threat" to our "national security," Congress and the president are engaged in a hypocritical argument as how best to effectively silence opposition to the war.

Truman's message to Congress on "security" had the color of an attempt to combat partially the "anti-red" hysteria which has been sweeping the nation and Congress since the beginning of the imperialist war over Korea. The reactionaries—Republican and Democrat—not content with the speed of the administration's moves against "subversives," have been

LABOR SCOPE

Wage Struggles Pushed by Unions Point to Clashes Ahead

By LARRY O'CONNOR

A lot of problems face the unions with regard to collective bargaining in the months ahead. Policies adopted before the big rearmanment push which started last month will have to be revised. Union members are thinking in terms of how best to protect themselves against the wage-freeze and labor-freeze policies which they fear will be adopted by the government in the not-too-distant future.

The evidence indicates that there will be something away from the great emphasis laid on pension and social-security contract demands during the past two years. Unions coming up for contract negotiations this fall and early next year will still be pushing for some of these demands, but wage increases are likely to be the chief bone of contention.

And despite all the fervent support of the rearmanment program on the part of union leaders, it seems that right now the intention is to push hard for these demands, even if it will take strikes to get them. The union leaders may hope that employers, with prospects of juicy war contracts and even cost-plus arrangements dangling before them, will not resist wage demands too much. But resist or not, the ranks want wage increases to shield them against the rapidly rising cost of living, and as a cushion against any wage freeze that may be imposed.

And plenty of important contracts are going to be open in the next few months. The United Steel Workers can reopen on wages on January 1, 1951. The United Auto Workers' contract with Ford opens on the same date and the Chrysler contract can be reopened on wages on July 1 of next year.

In the electrical industry the pressure is building up in both

the General Electric and Westinghouse chains for a speedy contract. The struggle between the CIO and Stalinist-dominated electrical unions has been so hot that neither of them has been able to push contract negotiations with the chains too hard, but with the prospect of a possible wage freeze the workers are in no mood to be caught with their wage scales down.

CLASHES AHEAD

The United Rubber Workers has announced that it will start negotiating at once with the demand set at 25 cents per hour hike, plus six cents an hour to even up inequities.

Both AFL and CIO meatpacking unions have been in negotiations. Last week they settled with Armour for an eleven cents per hour hike. The contract will run for two years with wage-reopening dates on February 11 and August 11, 1951, and February 11, 1952. Various other improvements in the contract were also won.

The United Mine Workers cannot reopen their contract until April 1 of next year. In the farm equipment industry contracts are opening up in the next couple of months.

As we go to press, the workers at Packard in Detroit are on strike over contract negotiations. They are demanding pensions, insurance and a cost-of-living pay increase.

The operating railroad unions still have their wage movement hanging fire. The Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen and the Order of Railway Conductors have been seeking every avenue of pressure short of a strike to force the railroads into serious concessions over their demand for a 40-hour week without decrease in weekly take-home pay. They have gone so far as to request the government to seize the railroads.

SPOTLIGHT ON ESCALATOR

In this connection, there is quite a bit of guessing in both union and capitalist circles on what the government will do about such things as the General Motors escalator clause and the "productivity" increase won in the last union contract in the event of a wage freeze. During World War II automatic rises provided in some contracts were barred unless they fitted into the "Little Steal" formula. Yet even the politicians realize that union leaders would have a tough time putting over such a deal on workers who had won automatic increases of either the escalator or "productivity increase" types in their contracts.

With the cost of living already jumping, and with further rises indicated for some time to come, the value of an escalator clause like the one in the GM contract is so evident that even the blind workers are bound to see the light. Every union which does not want to get left hopelessly behind, should demand it in coming contract negotiations, and it should be made clear to the government that increases falling due under such contracts cannot be ruled out by a wage freeze. In all such contracts the weakness is that wage rises come AFTER price rises. They do not ACCOMPANY them, and no one but the cheapest demagogue can claim that they are a CAUSE of price increases.

The difference of opinion between the president and Congress, for whether by administrative and judicial decree or by congressional "law," free speech and civil liberties are being given short shrift in order to bolster the Korean war.

The labor movement and what is left of liberalism in this country needs to beware of resting content with Truman's "moderate" views. His mild opposition is not a principled defense of civil liberties but a difference on the speed and method by which they should be curtailed. The Attorney General's

But to date nothing has been gained, and their recent statements have sounded more and more desperate. After what the government did to the switchmen's strike over this same issue, they are obviously leery of calling the men out.

But, on the other hand, to simply back down and admit defeat without striking a blow would be a pretty hard thing for the leadership to explain to the ranks. So fireworks in this industry may also appear.

Taken by and large, things do not look too bright for "industrial peace" on the home front for the next few months.

Some businessmen's publications are predicting that a number of employers may be willing to give wage increases now with the thought in mind that if a real labor shortage develops they will be in a better position to attract workers if their wages are not too low. But too much store cannot be put by such speculations. Employers in vital industries know that the government will see to it that they get enough workers if overall controls should be imposed, regardless of wage levels.

A number of unions have come out for price controls without wage controls. But all government and employer talk puts wage controls first on the list in the event of all-out mobilization. Talk and protest from the unions will not be enough.

In this connection, there is quite a bit of guessing in both union and capitalist circles on what the government will do about such things as the General Motors escalator clause and the "productivity" increase won in the last union contract in the event of a wage freeze. During World War II automatic rises provided in some contracts were barred unless they fitted into the "Little Steal" formula. Yet even the politicians realize that union leaders would have a tough time putting over such a deal on workers who had won automatic increases of either the escalator or "productivity increase" types in their contracts.

With the cost of living already jumping, and with further rises indicated for some time to come, the value of an escalator clause like the one in the GM contract is so evident that even the blind workers are bound to see the light. Every union which does not want to get left hopelessly behind, should demand it in coming contract negotiations, and it should be made clear to the government that increases falling due under such contracts cannot be ruled out by a wage freeze. In all such contracts the weakness is that wage rises come AFTER price rises. They do not ACCOMPANY them, and no one but the cheapest demagogue can claim that they are a CAUSE of price increases.

The difference of opinion between the president and Congress, for whether by administrative and judicial decree or by congressional "law," free speech and civil liberties are being given short shrift in order to bolster the Korean war.

The labor movement and what is left of liberalism in this country needs to beware of resting content with Truman's "moderate" views. His mild opposition is not a principled defense of civil liberties but a difference on the speed and method by which they should be curtailed. The Attorney General's

Why Belgian Workers Rose Up Against King

By R. G.

BRUSSELS, Aug. 6 (Special to Labor Action)—Now that the main excitement of the anti-Leopold movement and strikes has died down, the Belgians are finding time to ask themselves some pointed questions. Who won what? Just what happened anyway? And most puzzling: Why did it happen? How did the whole country come to the verge of an insurrection over such a fantastic, illusory issue?

Yes, on the surface the issue appears unreal. The collaborator King Leopold is still nominally the king; he has only promised to retire and temporarily transfer his powers to Prince Baudoin. Nevertheless the Belgian workers, led by the Socialist Party, won a clear victory.

What they won is intangible: the trend toward clerical fascism has been cut short and reversed. It is the workers who now hold the initiative, and they are using it, in the first place, to demand higher wages and shorter hours. The Antwerp dockers and many others are still on strike; the union leaders are trying to get them to work pending a national labor conference to revise pay scales throughout the nation. Such a revision was one of the demands tacked on to the demand for the king's abdication.

WORKERS READY TO ACT

The ability of a people to become so roused reflects, of course, deep feelings about long-standing needs. There is a strong and persistent class consciousness here, based on genuine class differentiation. The country is terribly overpopulated, so that the average income is low and the poor are really poor. Not that they are miserable and starving, as in Greece or post-war Germany, but they are crowded and perpetually struggling for a decent living. The average Belgian worker today (like the French, the Dutch and the English) has a REAL income about one-quarter to one-third as much as the average American worker.

Onto this poverty and this class division have been heaped long years of the special problems of a Europe in decline: depression, unemployment, war, occupation, post-war disorganization of markets—and now for the Belgians, a reactionary government and a collaborator king!

Actually it was the Socialist politicians, the parliamentary and trade-union leaders, who led this action. They developed it, preparing the workers for it and conducting it in a rather disciplined way. At times and in places, the masses took the lead, but the Socialist politicians were clever enough to regain it quickly by again jumping ahead with revolutionary talk and threats.

SYMBOL OF REACTION

So the issue of the king was not so fantastic as it may at first appear. The best formulation of the political question which this correspondent has heard was furnished by a well-established professional woman, who is Flemish and claims to be a member of the Catholic party. I suggested to her that the Belgian workers were "still fighting the last war," trying in this belated way to hit back at German fascism and military occupation by venting their feelings on the poor king.

All this she denied. "They are fighting a very present political battle, here and now. They are against the king, because he is a fool, a fool, a fool! He fancies himself a man of power and wants to play a great role. He is dangerous. He is the symbol and the vehicle of reaction. The Flemish clerical reaction was on the point of setting up a majority dictatorship. It had to be stopped now, before it was consolidated. The workers won a real victory and it was a good thing for the country. Now the Catholic party is split and we can hope to get a balanced government."

The rock-bottom demand of labor should be for escalator clauses, with no freeze on them. If the government is serious about price controls and roll-backs, it can take care of the "inflationary danger" without a wage freeze and certainly without banning escalator increases. Any proposals to the contrary simply boil down to putting the burden of rearmanment on the shoulders of the wage earners.

POLICE HELPLESS

During the first week, as the general strike and street demonstration developed in Brussels, the crowds were confident and good-natured. These socialist and trade-union crowds looked young and well-dressed, with a large proportion of women. Brussels is a capital and the workers here are largely clerical and semi-professional. Great throngs marched through the town, in ranks, singing and shouting gaily. They sang an old-time, anti-clerical song: "A Bas les Calottes"; they sang the "Marseillaise"; and they sang the "International." They shouted "Abdication without conditions," "Sieg Heil" and "Leopold to the gallows." They blew whistles, they waved at the people in windows and balconies. They carried no banners nor identification. The weather was good and they had a good time.

But when they found a shop open or one of the rare street cars still running, they would break

To understand what happened in Belgium last week one has to look much deeper than party politics onto the tracks to stop the street car; the crowd would surge around and break a few windows. The armed police (riding every car) would beat a hurried retreat, or perhaps try to help some elderly passenger away. Then the crowd would form its procession again and be on its way. The police and conductors would come back and hang out the "To the Depot" sign.

All downtown stores were forced to close and the little shops on main streets kept their shutters drawn. But neighborhood food shops stayed open and were freely provisioned by truck. No one went hungry in this general strike! Private cars were allowed to circulate in Brussels, though not in the South country.

Had the government not massed troops and threatened to break the strike, it might have gone on peacefully for a long time. But the fact that mounted police were brought in to block the processions and airplanes were roaring overhead, the idea that they were not being allowed to oust the king by a peaceful shutdown, seemed to anger the crowds. On Saturday night, the government made a

show of force in the middle of Brussels and tried to stop the parades. This was an invitation to a showdown. The crowds got bigger and turned to violence.

THEY'RE STILL SINGING

The workers in the provinces, who had started their strike two days earlier, reached this sage much quicker. They were already preparing their "March on Brussels" even before the word came that three comrades had been killed by the police near Liege. By Sunday everyone agreed that there was danger of a civil war.

At this point the Catholic party split and the king was persuaded to resign. The Socialists had trouble holding the workers back long enough to allow the two or three days of parliamentary maneuvering necessary to re-establish equilibrium.

On Monday, with the first indication that the king was ready to retire, quieter crowds gathered in a questioning mood. The strike was now more complete than ever. The union shut down the railway. All of the noisy demonstration had subsided. By Tuesday morning, when the king's withdrawal was officially announced,

WORLD POLITICS

India and the Korean War: The Pressure Behind Nehru's Policy

By HENRY JUDD

The Security Council debate at the United Nations is about to enter its third-week performance of the farcical epic of our time, with brute-faced Malik versus flustered-blustering Austin. Malik, a faceless and voiceless totalitarian creature straight out of George Orwell's famous novel "1984," is giving the world a lesson in the cynical demagoguery of the Russian imperialism he represents.

More than that, his behavior, tactics and antics as president of the Council are an object lesson in the arrogant mentality and psychology of the Stalinist ruling class from whose vocabulary and thought the possibility of being "wrong" has been erased. To watch this creature silence the gallery which occasionally bursts into applause or some other spontaneous expression of its opinion is fascinating indeed: "We would silence you in Russia," is the tone of Malik's voice and the smash of his gavel.

Austin, inept and uncomprehending except when a prepared speech is at his disposal, cannot meet the issues posed since the only weapons in his hand are those of a hoped-for military superiority which may send the North Korean Stalinists back to their borders or further. Those of his arguments not couched in conservatism (we are the forces of law and order; the policeman putting out the fire in the house; or words to that effect) are thoroughly reactionary and contemptuous of the people involved in the struggle.

To state, for example, that the North Korean forces, authorities and supporting populace are simply "bandits" and "criminals" is not only incorrect, but blocks out in advance any possibility of grasping WHY Stalinism has had such success among the Asiatic people.

SP HEAD FOR "THIRD CAMP"

It is recognized by all that the often fantastic struggle at the UN sessions constitutes a propaganda forum of appeal to the world in general and the Asiatic masses in particular. Those who despair of the ineffectiveness of the American position generally blame this upon the technical inferiority of our propaganda and news machinery, which obviously does not have the coverage and spread that Stalinism, in occupation of a huge portion of Asia, does. This superficial observation denies the often-proved fact that truth and reality reach their ready listeners despite everything.

American imperialism does not reach the ear of the Asiatic masses (and never will) because it does not tell the truth or at best only one portion of the truth—namely, the clear and patent fact that Stalinist imperialism started the Korean war. But this comparatively unimportant fact and condemnation fades away beside the basic issues at stake. The test of this struggle for the truth has been India and we note with great satisfaction that BOTH sides in the struggle (Russia and America) have failed up to this point in convincing the Indian people that their respective partial truths are the whole truth and nothing but the truth.

Significant of this is the buried dispatch in the New York Times of August 10 to the effect that Jay-prakash Narayan, leader of the Socialist Party of India, at a meeting of his party and other political representatives of non-Stalinist Asiatic nations, urged the Asiatic people to launch a "Quit Asia"

RESENTMENT IN INDIA

In line with this a great struggle is taking place around the person of Nehru and his Congress government in India. As the last important nation capable of influencing events by a stand on one or the other side, both Malik and Austin are determined to impress Nehru's India with their respective lines. At the very least, Malik desires a completely neutral India, sympathetic to the Russian advance in Asia and ready for additional Russian pressure at a much later stage.

THE AMERICAN VIEWPOINT

The American viewpoint, on the other hand, steadily wavers between an attitude of utter contempt for India (which, after all, does not represent any military strength), and the last dying gasps of the former sympathetic attitude of the more liberal sections of the American bourgeoisie who desired to swing a sympathetic India behind America's Asiatic policy. Secretary of State Acheson, who had formulated this policy in his "San Francisco speech," himself appears to have abandoned it, his cynical and contemptuous rejection of Nehru's mediation proposals, in letters which aroused enormous resentment in India.

So drastic was the result of the Acheson note that Nehru, a man caught in a helpless dilemma if one ever was, was obliged to openly attack the nothing of Asiatic opinions or problems and reiterating the well-known fact that white imperialism is at an end. India's reluctant and cautious "support" of the UN decisions on Korea are far more outweighed by the hostility and antagonism aroused by the American approach to the issue. Whatever efforts are now being made in the UN sessions (chiefly by vulgar flattery of the susceptible and touchy Nehru) will be of no avail.

The truth of the matter is that England, India's bitter colonial exploiter of the past, and America, a would-be colonial exploiter of the future, both appear in the light of an outmoded imperialism to the great Asiatic masses. Nothing can change this any longer. The revival of Chiang Kai-shek and the open support of Bao Dai have cooked the American goose in Asia beyond redemption. The true formulators of Asiatic policy is not Owen Lattimore, not even Secretary of State Acheson! It is now General Douglas MacArthur, whose policy—political, social and military—may be summed up in the phrase: "Let the 'Gooks' have it!"

The MacArthur mentality considers that the belching guns and the advancing infantrymen are the sole and full prerequisites required for a complete victory in Asia. It will be a long, hard and tragic process for the masses of American people to learn the futility and bankruptcy of this way.

THURSDAY FORUM SERIES
Labor Action Hall, 114 W. 14th Street, New York City

August 24: CRISIS IN BRITAIN
Speaker: Gordon Haskell

August 31: A SOCIALIST VIEWS THE WAR
Speaker: Max Shachtman

The BEST recent book on the labor movement—
"The UAW and Walter Reuther"
by Irving Howe and B. J. Widick \$3.00
Random House

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

City

State

Tel.

YOU and SCIENCE

The "Zero-Zero" Plan for Atomic Control

By CARL DARTON

During the past several years some scientists have been talking eagerly about a "zero-zero" plan of atomic-energy control. It is not, as one might at first presume, a slogan expressing the utter lack of success in all such control attempts.

Rather it is a concept of an atomic-power moratorium—a proposal to control atomic energy by rationing the uranium ores in such small amounts as to make large-scale separation of fissionable isotopes impossible. Thus Russia would have "zero" material from which to construct atomic or hydrogen bombs and the United States would have an identical amount. But the "zero-zero" plan would also make it impossible for either country to develop nuclear power for peacetime purposes. These scientists, such as Cuthbert Daniel and Arthur Squires, claim feasibility for their plan on the ground that control can most easily be applied at the source, plus the supposition that nuclear power is not feasible now nor likely to be for the decade to come.

Our brief discussion of the "zero-zero" plan indicates that there are technical aspects of atomic-energy control which must be considered in drawing up any control plan. Of course, these technical aspects are almost insignificant compared to the political problems standing in the path of international atomic-energy control. But the technological problems do exist because there is no difference between nuclear fissionable material destined for the A- or H-bomb and that slated to be used for atomic power.

Perhaps Daniel and Squires seem a bit ridiculous because of their "throw the baby out with the bath" solution. But it is easy to pick out much more farcical incidents in the meetings of the politicians constituting the United Nations Atomic Energy Commission.

The United States (majority) proposal on the question of existing atomic weapons was mere "disposition." In a running interchange of polemics the Russian representative demanded "destruction." After two years of persistence in this dispute, the issue came before the General Assembly. Then the American delegate made a complete reversal and belittled the importance of "destruction" of atomic weapons. "What did this proposal mean?" he asked. "Did it mean the destruction of the metal containers of the nuclear fuel—or the destruction of the nuclear explosives? The destruction of the metal containers would mean nothing for they could be manufactured again without difficulty; as for the destruction of nuclear explosives, everybody [except our proponents of the "zero-zero" plan—C. D.] had agreed that these should be retained for peaceful purposes."

A glance at the timetable of the UN attempts at atomic-energy control can but sharpen the almost universal feeling of resentment at the post-war endeavors of the great powers. The "Atomic Age" opened with the operation of the first chain reacting atomic pile on December 2, 1942, and first displayed its destructive possibilities at Alamogordo, New Mexico, on July 16, 1945. On August 6 and 9 its mettle was tested against human flesh and blood. Late in 1945 the Big Three proposed a UN commission for atomic-energy control which was confirmed subsequently by the Council of Foreign Ministers at Moscow.

The UN Atomic Energy Commission was created in London on January 24, 1946. The first report of UNAEC was accepted by 10 votes, Russia and Poland abstaining. The second one, which sought security in minimizing stockpiles of atomic fuels and tight managerial controls, was accepted 10 to 1 on September 11, 1947. The final report on May 17, 1948, recommended suspending activity until the General Assembly could arrive at a political basis for agreement. The General Assembly passed the buck by ordering a Six Powers Report. An interim report was made October 13, 1949; then Russia (January 19, 1950) refused to attend further six-power talks so long as the Chiang regime represents China in the UN.

If one watches American and Russian proposals in the commission reports one is struck not by their differences but by their agreements. There are slight differences, deliberately magnified, on inspection, veto power and other administrative details. There are no fundamental differences, for both powers have available the same technical facts and have proceeded to draw up an atomic energy control program based on the tacit assumption that their respective governments will be the supra-national government which will administer the control. Since there is no room on earth for two supra-national political powers there never was a chance for agreement in the UNAEC.

The above is based upon information contained in *Minutes to Midnight—the International Control of Atomic Energy*, the 128-page booklet published in May, 1950, by the Educational Foundation for Nuclear Science, Inc., Chicago. *Minutes to Midnight* is a compilation of speeches, publications and reports of the United Nations Atomic Energy Commission and related material edited with commentary by Eugene Rabinowitch, editor of the Bulletin of Atomic Scientists. In the brief period elapsing since the publication dates, the "minutes" have shrunk to "seconds" and the A- and H-bomb threats mount daily. Politicians, not scientists, have given the people a zero-zero score on the promises of the atomic age—a zero on security and a zero on abundance for the workers and scientists of both Russia and the U. S.

THE YUGOSLAVS AND THE WAR IN KOREA

By HAL DRAPER

The Tito government's position on the Korean war remains a model of shifty doubletalk.

There were indications two weeks ago that it had decided to come clear. A N. Y. Times dispatch reported that Belgrade would soon make clear its stand against the Russian-sponsored invasion in Korea. The U. S. News & World Report printed a questions-and-answers interview with a "top official" of the Yugoslav government which, it said, had been discussed by the Tito cabinet. The answers clearly denounced Russian aggression in Korea and almost as clearly approved the U. S. intervention.

In quoting this interview in *LABOR ACTION*, July 31, we added: "If Belgrade's Tanjug Agency issues no denial, the interview can certainly be accepted as gospel. And if it does, I would myself regard it as a purely formal disclaimer."

The anticipated denial has materialized. What it means is that the Yugoslav government has decided to stand pat on its policy of evading any open position on Korea.

Incidentally, the form of the denial is peculiar, but exactly fits the policy of doubletalk. After referring to the U. S. News interview, it merely says: "Tanjug is authorized to deny this 'interview' as completely imaginary. The aforementioned magazine has no editors or correspondents in Yugoslavia and therefore an interview could not have been given them. U. S. News & World Report last had its correspondent in Yugoslavia in 1948."

BASIS FOR EVASION

This "proof" that the interview is "imaginary" is typical Stalinist hogwash. The magazine had not presented the interview as having been given to any editors, correspondents or representatives in Yugoslavia itself. It had stated that "the editors" of U. S. News & World Report submitted a set of questions to the government in Belgrade. The magazine has carried long-distance interviews before (answers to questions submitted by the editors). But in any case, what stands out in the "denial" is the rigorous absence of any comment on the content of the interview.

The circumstances surrounding the interview are of secondary concern, but our guess is that the answers may have been sent out before clearing highest channels and were then killed on top.

The fact is, however, as we stated two weeks ago, that the line of the interview does convey accurately the Titoists' real attitude on the war. If it did not, the Tanjug "denial" would have said so.

The press now announces "Marshal Tito's first definitive statement on Yugoslavia's attitude toward the Korean war." It is along the line of the U. S. News interview which was "denied," but still plays it cagey.

In an interview with an Indian pro-Titoist, Bernerji, Tito said that the "struggle of the Korean people for unification and independence would be unconditionally just, provided that the Korean people were solving it themselves. But what are the motives of today's struggle? Will the struggle of the North Korean people against the South Koreans lead to independence? I doubt it."

Pending receipt of the text of the interview, we point out that the question "Will the struggle of the North Korean people against the South Koreans lead to independence?" stacks the cards against the Russian invasion but avoids any statement on the U. S. intervention.

The Yugoslavs' policy of evasion is based on the desire to have their cake and eat it too. As we pointed out July 31:

(1) "They have been (quite justly) scared by the Russian-sponsored invasion in Korea. They see themselves in the cast of characters... [the Yugoslav "top official"] is stage-whispering, for the benefit of the American public, that he only hopes that, in event of a Russian attack, the U. S. will do as well by his marshal as for Syngman Rhee." Yet—

(2) "The Titoists cannot afford to give the Cominform radio too much material for its propaganda. The big Russian attack on Tito has been that Yugoslavia has gone over to the camp of Western imperialism. To this day, Yugoslav propaganda is as busy denying this line as it was a year ago."

TONGUE-TIED

The dilemma of the Titoists is obvious, once it is understood that their policy is decisively determined by their narrow national interests as seen through the spectacles of national-Stalinism, and has nothing in common with Marxism.

(1) To oppose and condemn the North-Korean-Stalinist side would be to grist to the Cominformist mill. (That is why it was not too hard to anticipate a Tanjug denial at this time.) To be sure, the Titoists' attitude on Korea does NOT mean that they have "gone over to the camp of Western imperialism." They are not pointed in this direction, for reasons we have explained before. But the Russians would make hay.

(2) To oppose and condemn the U. S.-UN side would alienate the United States, perhaps imperil its economic aid, present or future. N. Y. Times correspondent M. S. Handler (whose dispatches are generally liked in Belgrade) writes August 13: "In the field of foreign policy, the principal item on the agenda of the Yugoslav government is to obtain more financial and economic assistance from the

United States to insure the success of the Five Year Plan." But this is only half of the difficulty. Such a stand would in any case make it difficult or impossible for Yugoslavia to appeal to the UN in case of Russian attack on it. The entire formulation of Yugoslav foreign policy today, as presented by its leaders, explicitly revolves around the UN, and only the UN, as the safeguard of peace in the world.

(3) To take a "Third Camp" position—open opposition and condemnation of both sides in the imperialist war that has broken over Korea—is as difficult for the Titoists as (1) and (2) multiplied together. It would take a different international situation to make this possible for them even as sheer demagoguery.

The result is the tongue-tiedness of the Yugoslav leaders—whose claim to be the only "real Leninists" in the world is actually believed by some European Marxists and others—on the most important event in the world today. In the UN, they abstain or vote only on peripheral questions, with no declaration of where they stand on essentials. A war is on, and they have virtually nothing to say!

"OBJECTIVE" CHRONICLE

This is true not only of the Yugoslav government, and not only in the UN. It is just as true of the Yugoslav Communist Party and all of its transmission belts, and it is just as true within Yugoslavia itself.

The best example is the Yugoslav Review of International Affairs, published for world consumption under the auspices of the Federation of Yugoslav Journalists as a Titoist propaganda organ. One would imagine, from its title, that it would have something to say about Korea!

The first issue of this magazine after the outbreak of war (No. 3, July 5) did indeed have a lead editorial entitled "The UN and Events in Korea." Three-quarters of a page long, it consisted mostly of a simple chronicle of the events, obviously written to say as little as possible. As for its slant, the following illustrates:

"The same day, President Truman issued an order to the air and sea forces of the USA to 'give protection and support to the troops of the South Korean government.' This important political decision by the American government was accompanied by the declaration that the USA would take part in the defense of Formosa and Chiang Kai-shek was called upon to stop operations against the People's Republic of China, which he did immediately. Thus was Formosa placed under the protection of the American fleet."

Then follows some more chronicling, up to Russia's objection to the UN's acting in its absence.

"However, UN circles are talking about the complete unacceptability of the Soviet complaints since, from 1946 onward, the USSR has considered numerous [Security] Council decisions valid although one or more members abstained from voting on them."

"In this conflict, in which the desires of the Korean people for unity are doubtlessly being taken advantage of by the Soviet Union for the purposes of its hegemonistic policy, the military forces of the USA, Great Britain and other countries are taking increasing part."

And with this note the editorial ends!

NO VESTIGE OF PRINCIPLE

In the next issue (last to be received here) the only mention of Korea occurs in an article which mentions it only to make the point: the important question is not discussion about using the atom bomb (a slap at the Stockholm petition campaign of Moscow) but "the question of who is guilty of aggression in this conflict." (Emphasis in original.)

Well, who is guilty of aggression? No use—the article breaks off at this point to discuss something else, the Russian threat of aggression on Yugoslavia.

The Tanjug bulletins have been virtually as silent as the grave on the question.

For the pro-Titoists of the left who are claiming that the mantle of Lenin and Trotsky has descended upon the national-Stalinist dictator in Belgrade, all this should be—disconcerting. What is the most important test of politics today if not Korea?

Their ability not to be disconcerted by anything, however, is evidenced by the current Militant (orthodox-Trotskyist organ, August 7). Its writer refers to the persistent rumors "that Yugoslavia was preparing to switch its position from neutrality [sic] to support of the U.S.-UN war against the Korean people," and brilliantly comments that this shows how the American capitalists are putting pressure on Belgrade! This is one of the few things in the Militant on Yugoslavia which does not come straight out of the Tanjug bulletins.

Yugoslavia's "neutrality"—that is, its self-imposed gag—is merely the result of the pulls of opposing forces on the Tito regime's self-interest. The Yugoslavs supported (and continue to boast of this support) to the Stalinist conquest of China, the attempted Stalinist conquest of Greece, etc., even though Moscow's role in these drives was not essentially different from its role in Korea.

There is no vestige of principle in its different attitude in the Korean case. If and when Belgrade jumps off its fence, in any direction, it will only be as a consequence of a different evaluation of the pulls, and not on the basis of anything resembling internationalism or socialist considerations.

No Pro-Titoist Position Can Avoid This!

By HAL DRAPER

To complete the picture on the theoretical consequences of pro-Titoism—still using the Fourth International Trotskyists as our example—we have to examine the views of the second tendency in that group, those of Ernest Germain.

We saw last week what the Pablo (majority?) group deduced from its theory that "nationalization" equals "workers' state." A social revolution has been or is being made in the East European satellites by the bayonets of the Russian army—"by means of 'Stalinist action' (that is, military-bureaucratic action)."

This theory of the "bureaucratic socialist revolution" is what sticks in the gutlet of Germain and his friends. They cannot swallow it. But it follows from their own view of Russia and Stalinism also! They therefore set about to reinterpret these views.

WANTED—for Germain: a theory which will have the following conclusions:

(1) Russia remains always a workers' state. This is On the Books and Untouchable.

(2) The East Europe satellites, however, even though socially identical with Russia or fast becoming so, must not be labeled workers' states. Since the only other kind of state on the books is the capitalist state, these satellites must be capitalist states.

(3) But Yugoslavia must be an exception to point 2, since Germain agrees that Tito's regime is a workers' state.

Indeed, the recipe for concocting Germain's theory must be even more complicated than that, insofar as it touches Yugoslavia. For Germain is the unfortunate fellow who thought up and wrote down the resolutions of the Fourth International up to June, 1948, in which it is written that Yugoslavia, like the rest of East Europe, is state-capitalist. Point 3 should read: Yugoslavia must be labeled "state-capitalist" up to the Cominform break, and "workers' state" only thereafter.

Where Was the Revolution?

The way in which Germain (followed by a majority of the Socialist Workers Party in the U. S.) works his way through this labyrinth belongs in a different (and more entertaining) article than this. For our present purpose, the following will do. Germain's theory runs in brief:

A workers' state is one with virtually complete nationalization of economy which is the product of a revolution. No revolution took place in the satellites; therefore, no workers' states. A revolution once took place in Russia; therefore, it is a workers' state.

(But this revolution in Russia, what's left of it?)—Only the nationalization of economy.—But I thought you said nationalized economy was not enough by itself to define a workers' state?—Russia's nationalized economy was the product of a revolution.—Ah, I see, something like the smile on the Cheshire cat after the cat has vanished...)

This ad hoc workers' state theory of Germain's makes no more sense, in truth, than Pablo's. But it was not devised to make sense. It was devised as an escape from the theory of the "bureaucratic socialist revolution." It does that anyway, doesn't it?

Not quite. The victim is struggling, but the swamp sucks him down.

For Pablo, the new theory of the "bureaucratic socialist revolution" would hold even without Titoism, since all the other East European countries are virtually workers' states. For Germain—precisely for Germain, who is so anxious to avoid this theory—it is Titoism alone which pushes him back into the swamp he is struggling to escape from.

When he comes to explain why Yugoslavia is now a workers' state, he has to find a revolution there. Remember this! Was it perhaps the 1944-45 liberation and the subsequent stalfication?

Unfortunately Germain had already recorded himself on this. In

COME TO THE WISCONSIN SUMMER CAMP-SCHOOL!

The Socialist Youth League and the Independent Socialist League are sponsoring for the benefit of their comrades and friends a national camp and school during the week of September 7-17. The encampment is being held at the Workman's Benefit Fund's Recreation Camp at Genoa City, located in picturesque Southern Wisconsin, 55 miles northwest of Chicago.

The camp itself covers an area of 235 acres of woodland, farm area, fields, and camp sites. The living quarters are ample and pleasant, with clean private rooms and modern toilet facilities. Choice foods that are excellently prepared in "old German style" are served in cafeteria fashion in a large dining hall.

Among the camp's attractive features are bowling alleys, dance hall with juke box, a cold-water swimming pond, baseball diamond, indoor and outdoor facilities for holding classes, rathskeller serving the best Milwaukee brews, and the broad expanses in which to enjoy the healthful Wisconsin climate.

Our educational program as it is tentatively set up will consist of a series of five lectures by Hal Draper on contemporary critics of Marxism (including Hook and John Dewey) and a series of five lectures by Max Shachtman including: America in Europe and Social Democracy in Power. A debate will take place between Shachtman and Draper on political-action policy.

A thorough recreational and sports program is now being worked out. It will include various sports activities such as baseball, touch football, volleyball, swimming, etc. We also intend to have some social activity each evening—camp fires—weenie roast and folk songs.

Why not make this your summer vacation? Fill out the enclosed application blank (including whatever communications, questions and/or suggestions you may have) and mail it with a five dollar deposit to:

Socialist Youth League
Post Office Box No. 8112
Chicago, Illinois

The deposit will enable us to make a down payment on the total expense to the owners of the camp. The cost per individual for the entire encampment will be \$40 (including your deposit). \$5 per day will be the cost for seven days or less.

Come up for one of the week-ends if you cannot make the full ten days.

detail, before the Cominform break. But almost a year after the break, in April, 1949, one of his resolutions (adopted by the Fourth International) had pointed to

"the revolutionary upsurge which developed in some of these countries parallel with the conclusion of the war (Yugoslavia...)" and to the subsequent

"canalization (Yugoslavia, Bulgaria) or the strangulation (Poland, Czechoslovakia) of this upsurge by the Russian army or by the native Stalinist parties or by a combination of the two."

The bourgeoisie was

"liquidated step by step by the Stalinists through 'cold' means, without any broad mobilization of the masses being required."

Later in this same resolution (this is after the Cominform break, after all) the document notes the special role of "mass action" in Yugoslavia, but notes it only to reassert that this makes Yugoslavia only

"one extremity of the spectrum composed of all the nuances differentiating the situation in each one of the buffer countries."

Arguing against Pablo later, Germain insists that "mass action" ceased to play a role after 1945. The revolutionary upsurge had been bureaucratized, canalized, arrested.

In order to demonstrate that the Yugoslav state is a workers' state," he actually wrote, "it does not at all suffice to explain that the masses destroyed the old bourgeois state; it is necessary to prove that the new state apparatus built in 1944-45 was an apparatus of a workers' state."

Seeking valiantly to escape from the theory of the "bureaucratic socialist revolution," Germain proves that in 1945-48 no workers' state had yet been created in Yugoslavia; no revolution had taken root. "Stopped before achieving its aims, the movement of the masses remained dormant up to 1948... The CP in power did not appeal to the masses at any time before the split with the Kremlin."

During this period, Germain now discovers in retrospect, Yugoslavia was not yet a workers' state but still not a capitalist state. It was a "workers' and peasants' government" in "transition toward the dictatorship of the proletariat."

Another Route to the Same Swamp

What then was the turning point in the class nature of this peculiar state? Twisting and turning, the answer comes out: it was the break with the Cominform!

As we reported some time ago, Germain put this into motion form in his international committee, when they decided to baptize Yugoslavia a workers' state. The majority declared "that the victory of the proletarian revolution there was completed in 1946-48," i.e., through the process of nationalization. Germain's motion was "that the transformation of the Yugoslav workers' and peasants' government into a dictatorship of the proletariat was completed after the break with the Cominform."

This is the conclusion of the man who, unlike Pablo, was so desperate to escape from the theory of the "bureaucratic socialist revolution!"

This turning point, the break with the Cominform, came out of a seeming clear blue sky (especially for Germain with his Yugoslav state-capitalism!). The masses were not involved. They did not even know anything was happening! Not only the masses—not even the members of the CP itself! Only the tops of the top bureaucrats of the bureaucracy of the CP knew anything was afoot!

This turning point between one kind of class state and another (a social revolution, by definition) took place in the upper reaches of the bureaucracy, secretly, behind the backs of the working masses. It was the Cominform that took the initiative in the break. Alongside this "revolution" of Germain's in Yugoslavia, even Pablo's "bureaucratic socialist revolutions" in the other satellites were popular uprisings in comparison!

Maybe "mass action" followed this turning point? Nowhere visible to the naked eye, of course. The people cheered the break, certainly. A congress of the Tito CP was held where selected "representatives" of the masses yelled "Hero Tito!" and "Tito—Party! Party—Tito!" This was the broadest "mass action" unleashed by Germain's turning point.

Instead of Pablo's "bureaucratic socialist revolution" through the "military-bureaucratic action" of the Russians and their quislings, Germain substitutes the "bureaucratic socialist revolution"—through the top bureaucracy of the CP!

Organic Change Through Bureaucracy?

No pro-Titoist position can avoid the concept of "bureaucratic socialist revolution" in one way or another. It is directly implicit in any variety of pro-Titoism today. For if Yugoslavia has become a workers' state or is on the road, etc, it is the work of the Tito bureaucracy (again, the very tops at that).

From Stalinist police regime to "socialist democracy"—if this change has taken place, it has been a peaceful, organic change in Yugoslavia, organically led through by the same bureaucratic apparatus from start to finish, with the masses on the sidelines as cheering section.

Perhaps our pro-Titoists will say: "Yes, but they were yielding to the pressure of the revolutionary masses!" Unthinkingly they would be ceding our point.

Inchoate "pressure" can do many things (for example, as we shall see, induce the Titoists to make all sorts of speeches). But Marxism never before counted on a social revolution made at and by the top in response to "pressure." For Marxists, the emancipation of the working class is the task of the working class itself, led by its vanguard. If Titoism has proved that this heart and soul of Marxism is outmoded, the immediate consequences far overshadow the question of Titoism itself.

And what is this startling new amendment based on? Primarily on ecstatic greetings for the speeches being made about "democracy" by the Yugoslav leaders.

"With the bureaucracy itself, in whose hands the power and wealth are concentrated, wish to grow peacefully into socialism?" wrote Trotsky in *The Revolution Betrayed*. "As to this, doubts are certainly permissible. In any case, it would be imprudent to take the word of the bureaucracy itself."

Still, as we stated at the beginning, all this proves nothing about the specific claims of the pro-Titoists, which, they tell us, are based on The Stubborn Facts. To such facts about Tito-Yugoslavia our succeeding articles will be devoted.

(Next week: The central question on the nature of Titoism)



LABOR ACTION

Independent Socialist Weekly

Vol. 14, No. 34

August 21, 1950

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

Subscription rate: \$2.00 a year; \$1.00 for six months. (\$2.25 and \$1.15 for Canada and Foreign.) Re-entered as second-class matter May 24, 1940, at the Post Office at New York, N. Y., under the act of March 3, 1879.

Editor: HAL DRAPER

Assistant Editors: MARY BELL and L. G. SMITH

Business Manager: L. G. SMITH

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

3 Letters: Critics Take the Floor on Korea

"The Doctrine of the Lesser Evil Has a Potency..."

To the Editor:

Allow me to express disagreement with the front-page statement on Korea in the issue of July 10. You say (and rightly so) that the extension of the slave power of Stalinism over the whole territory of Korea would be "a disastrous blow to the people of Korea and the cause of democracy and socialism everywhere else." Why, then, not choose the lesser evil?

I know your objections. I am familiar with the facts you cite about the reactionary nature of U. S. capitalism and the regime of President Rhee. But these are not ALL the facts.

The regime in South Korea permits of multi-party elections. The popular hatred of Rhee compelled him, with a little urging from the United States, to call for new elections last May. The result of the election was a complete upset of the Legislature, with 120 out of 210 seats going to anti-Rhee factions. Since the Legislature elects the president in South Korea, this created the possibility of Rhee's defeat for re-election.

Thus, even under the conditions prevailing (controlled by the U. S.), South Koreans have a chance to engage in political activity, to learn something of the processes of democracy, to develop their parties, etc. No such possibility exists for the people of the Russian puppet state in North Korea. Are not these facts to be given full weight against the weight of a Stalinist victory, which you yourself say would be "a disastrous blow," etc., etc.?

DOCTRINE OF "LESSER EVIL"

You say that labor should "renounce all responsibility for the course of either camp in the Korean war"; that "it should adopt an independent policy of its own, based upon militant opposition to all imperialism and an aggressive championing of a genuine democratic policy all over the world." Such a conclusion amounts to an evasion of the issue; under the present conditions it gives aid and comfort to the Stalinists. For labor is not politically aware enough to have a policy of its own. So it must choose between the two regimes. It knows that its chances of existence and continued development would end with the victory of Stalinism in the world.

What other choice does the labor movement have than to align itself against Stalinism and with those who fight it, even if for different reasons than its own? In doing so the labor movement does not have to assume a passive attitude. It must use its power to prevent the heavy hand of military dictatorship from descending, continuing its fight for labor's interests and for democratic processes. It can also offer a program for national unification of North and South Korea, for democratic institutions in that country, for proper social reforms.

Socialists should acknowledge that the life and future of organized labor depend on the defeat of Stalinism, and offer a program within limits set by historical events. I know it is a hard pill to swallow, but conditions have changed in the last two decades. The doctrine of the lesser evil has a potency in the present crisis.

A FRIEND

Our correspondent's remarks on the last election in South Korea are inaccurate. Besides referring him to the articles by Jack Brad in LABOR ACTION on the Rhee regime, we mention the following briefly:

No opposition parties ran candidates in the May, 1950, election in South Korea (which "A Friend" calls multipartite). Anti-Rhee candidates had to run as independents. The over-all political atmosphere was one of police terror.

In particular the Youth Corps, a quasi-military organization dedicated to maintaining landlordism, effectively controlled many local elections. Scores of independent candidates were arrested at various times during the campaign, as were their supporters. Anti-Rhee literature and meetings were punished by police action.

The "little urging from the U. S." on Rhee to hold an election consisted of the threat (by Acheson in January) to withhold further ECA funds if the election were not held on schedule. Rhee had attempted to put it off indefinitely.

Comrade Brad's articles have discussed why anti-Rhee elements were elected in spite of Rhee's terror. It was, in fact, a sign that the country was on the verge of civil war and in a state of political disintegration.

Comrade Brad had also stressed the reason why the Rhee regime was not effective even in repressing all opposition to it, try as it might. It was too corrupt and decrepit even for that purpose—there is an instructive parallel

here with the state of the Russian czarist autocracy. THIS is precisely one of the important differences between the Rhee regime and Stalinism, which is a MODERN totalitarianism.

Another way of expressing this important difference is that it would be easier for the Korean people to overthrow Rhee than to get rid of the Stalinist totalitarian masters. It is easy to see from this that those benighted people who support the Stalinist conquest in the name of Korean unity and independence are adopting a criminal policy. But it cuts another way too. It throws a light on the nature of the "lesser evil" choice which our correspondent advocates.

This choice, on the South Korean plane, was not "democracy versus totalitarianism," but a corruption-riddled landlord police regime versus Stalinism. This does not by itself debar anyone from making a "lesser evil" choice even between these two. After a third world war or a fourth, let us take the three on this page may get to be written in order to justify support of a "mild" Stalin-type totalitarianism against an ultimate totalitarianism depicted in Orwell's "1984." If our correspondents feel that this projection is unjust, we beg them to try to remember what they would have felt ten years ago if their present letters had been shown to them.

In any case, to expect the Korean people to sacrifice their lives in order to defend a Rhee regime backed by a foreign power's guns is to reduce practical politics to dreams. We are fully aware that

We devote a portion of LABOR ACTION this week to a discussion with readers who have written in against the stand on the Korean war taken by the ISL statement on the war which appeared on the first page of our issue of July 10. We have prepared this discussion for presentation here not only because it is our policy to give reasonable space to dissenting views, but also because the question raised is, in fact, the most important reason for pro-war trends among elements who were previously "unilaterally" opposed to imperialism.

This is, of course, the question of supporting the "lesser evil" in the present struggle for the world. Our own views on this central question are represented in this issue by Mary Bell, discussing the three letters published on this page. Further articles on the question will follow.

One other dissenting letter, by Susan Green, has been received and is scheduled for publication in the issue after next. Two of the letters published in this issue raise side-points not taken up by Comrade Bell. It should be understood that the editorial comments which follow these letters are limited to these points while the main question is discussed by Comrade Bell.

itarianism against an ultimate totalitarianism depicted in Orwell's "1984." If our correspondents feel that this projection is unjust, we beg them to try to remember what they would have felt ten years ago if their present letters had been shown to them.

In any case, to expect the Korean people to sacrifice their lives in order to defend a Rhee regime backed by a foreign power's guns is to reduce practical politics to dreams. We are fully aware that

our correspondents like to consider themselves as "realistic" and "practical" in making their choice between the war camps. If this is practicality, Don Quixote was a hardheaded realist. Stalinism is in process of expanding over the world through feeding on such "practicality." It can be stopped only through a force which does NOT offer capitalism and the status quo as the alternative to it. Our task is to do our bit to help build such a movement.—Ed.

"There Is No Real 'Third Alternative'.... The Choice... Is Clear..."

To the Editor:

In the ISL statement on the Korean war, in LABOR ACTION of July 10, most of what is said about the undemocratic character of American foreign policy and of the South Korean regime is perfectly true. So, of course, is the declaration that the United States has now been "committed... fully to an undeclared war"—that is, World War III. The conclusion is that American labor should "proclaim its complete independence from the imperialist policy of the American government, as it has already rightly proclaimed its complete hostility to the policy of the Stalinist regime...."

But here, and in the repeated use of such phrases as "the two rival imperialist blocs," etc., the ISL and LABOR ACTION avoid the crucial question: Are American and Russian imperialism equally reactionary, whether in the same or in different senses? Does it make no difference to the people of the world which bloc triumphs in World War III? Are the social and political differences between capitalist democracy and Stalinist totalitarianism of such a nature that they have no consequences in the formation of socialist policy in World War III?

The slogan of the "Third Camp" is conspicuously absent from the ISL statement, suggesting that the ISL recognizes that this slogan no longer has much meaning. Instead, there is the far more negative proposal (it is too vague to be called a slogan) that American labor "renounce all responsibility for the course of either camp in the Korean war."

CHOOSE BETWEEN CAMPS

Privately, indeed, many ISL members become rather indignant if accused of making no distinction between capitalist democracy, as we know it in America, and Stalinist totalitarianism. But the ISL and LABOR ACTION continue to uphold the sacred dogma that the workers cannot and must not make any choice between the two camps. LABOR ACTION, in the past several years, has consistently refused to draw any political conclusions, with respect to socialist policy, from the distinction between the social characters of the two camps which some of its writers, at least, could not avoid acknowledging as socially and politically significant, even though the acknowledgment has generally been made without apparent awareness of its implications. An independent policy for the labor

and socialist movements is absolutely necessary; but this independence can be only within the framework of the real choices imposed by the brutal realities of the present world situation. Only blind political sectarianism, or pacifists—whose policy is determined by other-worldly considerations, can propose any other kind of independence.

Some ISL members attempt to sidestep the dilemma by advancing, with an air of theoretical profundity, the idea that socialists can only concern themselves with promoting the class-struggle in the most direct sense; occasionally, this takes the childish form of the dictum that socialists haven't "time" for anything else! But are not the class interests of the workers involved in a conflict between two systems, one of which permits a free labor movement to exist, while the other crushes the labor movement? The problems of socialist policy in time of war are immensely complicated, and the American socialist movement is too feeble to do more than grapple with them in a purely theoretical sense. But the ISL is not making its contribution.

NO ALTERNATIVE

I say that the ISL and LABOR ACTION avoid the crucial question; and this is a much milder criticism than to draw the plain conclusion that the bald phrases about the "two imperialist rivals," etc., suggest. One of my reasons for feeling that the ISL is hedging in this matter is the inexplicable omission of the logical demand that which the entire ISL statement builds up: "Immediate Withdrawal of All U. S. Troops from Korea!"

Here is a far more concrete and effective slogan than anything offered in the statement. It is a slogan, moreover, which already has great popular support, as anyone who reads the letters to the daily press is aware. It is a slogan rooted in the indigenous isolationism of the American people. Obviously, considerations other than those stated by the ISL have prevented the use of this slogan, a slogan of a kind which has a long and honorable tradition in the socialist movement, as a logical summing-up of the ISL position on the Korean war. I am glad, of course, that the ISL did not take this final step, which would have placed the organization in a highly, equivocal position with relation to Stalinism.

The historical background of Trotskyism, together with the ISL's willingness, only a few years ago, to "loyally" defend the Soviet Union along with Cannon and Co., make it imperative that there be no ambiguity in the present position of the organization, with respect to Russia.

Socialists cannot assume political responsibility for the specific forms that the global conflict between American and Russia, between capitalist democracy and Stalinist totalitarianism, will take. But a basic condition for the elaboration of socialist policy is the unequivocal recognition that there is no real "third alternative" at this time, and that socialist independence must be independence within the democratic camp, as long as the choice between the two camps is clear. It is unfortunate that there is no simple formula that will answer all questions. It

"Direct All Fire Against Stalin, Enemy No. 1..."

By A. RUDZIENSKI

The Korean events have really marked the beginning of the Third World War, if not its decisive phase, in the direct armed conflict between the two imperialist powers, Russia and the United States. Perhaps Korea will play the role of an Asiatic Spain in the Third World War, a kind of proving ground for modern weapons; or perhaps it will be a Czechoslovakia or a Poland of Asia; the next events will tell. The important matter is that the cold war has already degenerated into a hot war, an armed clash, if for the moment an indirect one, of two world powers.

For the Polish working class course of history moved by the

and, we suppose, for that of all of Eastern Europe occupied by the Russians, this event has a fundamental significance: the imperialist powers which have enslaved Europe, partitioned Poland for the fourth time, delivered her into the talons of Stalinist barbarism, are in conflict.

The promises of peace in a world divided between two spheres of influence, a peace armed to the teeth, a sepulchral peace for the independent workers' movement in Russian and Eastern Europe, could not be realized. The two imperialist systems cannot coexist peacefully, cannot continue living in a divided world. The mastery of world reaction, headed by Stalin, Roosevelt and Churchill in the

infamous Potsdam agreement cannot be prolonged. The productive forces clamor for A SINGLE WORLD, a new social and economic system, a new economic organization. In the gigantic conflict which is beginning, powerful historical tendencies are expressed which rock the world of reaction created in Yalta and Potsdam, foretelling either the complete destruction of our civilization or its rebirth and regeneration in the new socialist form.

THEY ARE "DEFEATISTS"

The Polish workers face the new world conflict in realistic form, although they know well that they can do very little to change the

(Turn to last page)

THE INDEPENDENT SOCIALIST VIEW

A Reply to Pro-War Critics

By MARY BELL

To one degree or another, with one emphasis or another, our three correspondents share the idea that the theory of the "lesser evil" should be adopted by revolutionary socialists in the conflict between the United States and Russia. This proposal did not come before the actual outbreak of the hot war in Korea, but only after Truman, without benefit of constitutional blessing, ordered U. S. troops to Korea when it was evident that the U. S.-sponsored South Korean regime could not defend itself against the Kremlin-inspired North. Like all classic proponents of the "lesser evil" theory, the present ones are presumably for the "third alternative," that is, defense of the interests of the working class and the struggle for socialism, in time of peace. Once the war breaks out, one is forced to choose—

The theory of the "lesser evil" as applied to social and political questions, and particularly as applied to imperialist wars, has a long and ignoble history. We cite this history first not for the purpose of any hard-and-fast analogy—history by and large does not work by strict analogy—but to illuminate the differences and developments that have taken place.

The classic example occurred during the first world imperialist war of 1914-18. Prior to the outbreak of the war, the vast Second International, with large socialist movements in every country of importance, proclaimed in international conference after conference, its abhorrence of and opposition to the coming war. As is universally acknowledged, the Second International broke on the shoals of the "lesser evil" theory when the war took place—German socialists voting war credits in support of the kaiser against the "greater evil" of the czar, French socialists supporting the czar against the kaiser, etc. Prominent among the arguments given for supporting the war by the socialists was precisely the size and weight of the various national socialist movements, which had to be defended in each case against the possible victory of a reactionary foreign power.

We assume that the socialistic proponents of the "lesser evil" theory today condemn, with us, the nationalistic degeneration of the Second International parties and recognize that their support of their respective governments in the war retarded rather than advanced the interests of socialism, and aided and prolonged the first conditions for the advent of the first modern fascist of our modern imperialist wars, which in turn was to lay totalitarianism and also the foundations for the second world war.

We also know that our opponents (so much of the argumentation is implied, rather than stated) will discern any analogy with the course of the socialist movement in World War I and that which is now shaping up; there are "new conditions," the rise of a new totalitarianism, Stalinism, the lack of a socialist movement, etc., Good.

The point we should like to establish is rather the reactionary and imperialist character of the first world war which endeavored to solve the social crisis of capitalism by a revision of the world, and guaranteed the reactionary character of the second world war which in turn sought a solution to the endless social crises in the same manner.

"Lesser Evil" in World War II

Perhaps our critics find a closer comparison in the war concluded five years ago, fought under the slogan of "democracy against fascism." Here, at any rate, the argument employed by the advocates of the "lesser evil" was similar: socialists must choose the lesser evil, even though we admit capitalism is bad, because fascism is worse. The "posers" were similar. "Would you rather live in the United States or Germany? Which side would you rather have win? Does it make no difference who is victorious?" Recall for a moment the early days of the blitzkrieg, the rapid fall of France to the panzer divisions, the days of Dunkirk, buzz-bomb showers over England. Recall later the horrible confirmations of the Nazi treatment of the Jews, Poles, etc., the opening of Buchenwald and Auschwitz. Here indeed was a "greater evil."

We were told then that no analogies with the first world war were valid. The socialists who supported that war were wrong. But a new phenomenon had to be considered today, the rise of fascism. This was a new, totalitarian evil. First it must be defeated and then the struggle for socialism could be resumed. There was no "third alternative." There was no organized socialist movement. Because the socialist forces were small, this time, we should fight for the victory of the democratic camp. Hitler's first act after taking power had been to destroy the socialist and labor movements. He was a conscious reactionary; he came to power on the promise to destroy Bolshevism. If Hitler won, the socialist and labor movements would therefore be non-existent. If the Allies were victorious, the socialists and labor movement would be free to carry on their activities. The pressures on socialists at this time to support the "lesser evil" were exceedingly strong. The arguments were not much different.

But let us recall our analysis of the second world war. We placed the historic responsibility for fascism and for the war on declining capitalism and on inter-imperialist rivalries. Hitler arose out of the expansionist necessities of German capitalism, which had been stripped by its victorious rivals in World War I, and also as a result of the failure of the German working class parties to replace capitalism with socialism in the period of that country's capitalist collapse. It was a case of the "have" and the "have-not" nations struggling over the colonial areas for the right to exploit them, and to dominate the world market. We could answer yes to the whole catechism of questions beginning with "Would Hitler's victory be worse than the victory of the Allies?"

But, as socialists, we had to take cognizance of the nature of modern imperialist wars, to recognize that re-

sponsibility for them fell on all the exploiting powers of the world, and to point out that the war itself was a question of such overriding social importance—in its material, social, political and economic destructiveness—that the question of who would be victor was of second importance in relation to the barbarization that would be produced by the war.

A further argument against the intent of the Allied powers to fight for democracy against fascism stemmed from their very alliance with other totalitarian powers—the power of Stalinism, which figures so large in current considerations. Let us not forget that one of the partners in that camp of "lesser evil" was the Chiang Kai-shek gang. Additionally, we said that the conduct of the war by the ruling classes could lead only to military victory, but the war itself, their imperialist war, could only "hurl back" historical progress. Our task, as socialists, was to represent the interests of the working class and the interests of socialism to struggle against war and for the replacement of the old, exploiting systems with the new.

Fascism was smashing defeated—by military force. Did the labor movement, the socialist movement and the democratic forces of the world which, in their vast majority lent their support to the Allies in that war, thereby contribute to the progress of mankind? Or did the victory of the Allied forces—Russian and Western—form the matrix of World War III, and reinforce the tendencies toward social decay?

Can We Democratize the War?

There are some Johnny-come-lately proponents of the "lesser evil" theory today who, in order to justify their switch, re-analyze the last war and say they support in retrospect the Allied powers. Others argue that the lessons of World War II again have no meaning for us today. True, they say, a similar constellation of powers is involved—the democratic capitalist countries versus a totalitarian power. But, and here they attempt to score, this is a new, different and more powerful totalitarianism. Stalinism is not an old-fashioned, familiar, fascist type of totalitarianism, which nevertheless remained capitalism based on private property. This society—the Independent Socialist League has analyzed it more closely and profoundly than anyone—is a new bureaucratic-collectivist type. It is qualitatively different from capitalism. It knows how to exploit the weaknesses of capitalism, because it has a dynamic, plebeian and anti-capitalist appeal, even though it is anti-socialist. It is able to take over and corrupt the disaffected elements in the capitalist countries through its Communist Parties, more potent and bigger than Hitler's "fifth columns." Its imperialism is worse than capitalist imperialism. No, they argue, we cannot accept any analogy. This is a still "greater evil."

There is implicit in this concept the idea that we, we above all because we understand Stalinism better than anyone, should lend ourselves to the support of the current war. There is also implicit, it seems to us, an almost frenetic fear that the Western powers cannot struggle successfully against Stalinism and that the victory, as in the past, will be achieved by superiority of arms. There is something back-handedly flattering and ridiculous in our small League's being asked to support this war. It is as though, within the democratic camp," as one of our opponents puts it, we could have some influence on the conduct of the war, democratize it, as it were, or give it a "socialistic" tinge.

The untenable contradictions of such a position are exemplified by Norman Thomas, representative of the type of socialist whose anti-war sentiments are confined to peacetime. During the last war, he urged "precision bombing" for the lesser evil he was supporting as against "indiscriminate bombing." In this war, he deplores the fact that the U. S. was again caught unprepared in Korea and also complains that force alone is not enough. Among the ideas he specifically inveighs against (N. Y. Times, Aug. 6) is his effort to arm ideologically the Western powers is "Lenin's theory of imperialism [which] has apparently obtained wide acceptance in non-Communist circles in Western Europe and even in Britain. Under this theory, American capitalism is driven as its last chance for survival to imperial adventure of which Marshall Plan aid is an expression. We help Europe because we have to help ourselves."

The Means Go With the End

We do not believe that the vulnerability of Norman Thomas' arguments derives wholly from personal vagaries. If one commits oneself to the support of the war, to "preparing the victory of one camp," then if one is a politician at all it is necessary to convince others to do likewise. Hence the neutrals must be brought into the war camp. Neutrality cannot aid the victory; it "plays into the hands of the Stalinists," because, you see, there is no "third alternative."

Would that it were true that Lenin's theory of imperialism had obtained as wide acceptance as the benighted Thomas thinks. What he undoubtedly refers to is the widespread sentiment in Western Europe against a third world war which is based on a recognition of the evil consequences for the peoples of Europe, Western Europe, faced with the real possibility of being a battleground for a third time, cannot afford both guns and butter. And many Western Europeans are a little less sanguine than Norman Thomas about American altruism in the Marshall Plan and the program of "containment of communism."

Once committed to the support of an imperialist war, one must take many of the means along with the end. In the case of A. Rudzienski we are presented with a kind of diabolic view of the war, as though it were a magic crucible in which the socialist revolution would automatically take place. "Victory of world socialism through a war against Stalinism," he urges. Rudzienski appears to argue that since revolutions sometimes accom-

pany wars, this war should be supported, since it will inevitably produce a revolution of the Poles and other Eastern Europeans against the Russians. We think the correlation between war and revolution was correctly met when the problem was once posed to Trotsky, at that time in relation to the opportunity for a socialist revolution in France and Germany if a war were to take place between those countries. Trotsky replied:

"The revolution is not an automatic machine. The revolution is made by living people, conducted by certain organizations under certain slogans, and so on. If the party of the proletariat is not on a level corresponding to the necessities of the revolution, then the war between Germany and France will finish with the victory of fascism in France and the material destruction of Germany for twenty or thirty years, without any perspective for socialism." He compared being favorable to war as being favorable to "cholera and other epidemics." Further, "War can accelerate the revolution, but this acceleration can be unfavorable to the proletariat if it is not prepared for revolution."

If Labor Is Not Aware—

In the concrete situation today we see nothing to indicate that the conduct of the war by the camp in which Rudzienski places his hopes will accelerate the prospects for a democratic overturn in the Iron Curtain countries, European or Asiatic. We have only to examine the manner in which it is being carried out.

The United States jointly with Russia determined the fresh division of the world at Tehran and Yalta. It participated in the division of Korea at the famous 38th Parallel. While the Russians Stalinized the North, the United States foisted the murderous Rhee regime on the South. "A Friend" maintains that since we grant the disastrous effects of a Stalinist victory in Korea we should therefore support the lesser evil. He says the labor movement can "offer a program for national unification of North and South Korea, for democratic institutions in that country, for proper social reforms." Everyone knows that the United States must police or occupy Korea indefinitely if it is to be held against Stalinism. If the labor movement continues its support of imperialism, it can only acquiesce in such a policy. Can the U. S. jump out of its political skin, proclaim and abet a democratic revolution in Korea and all of Asia—which would be the only means of politically defeating Stalinism?

"A Friend" thinks the labor movement could offer such a program at the same time that it supported American victory. He chides us for urging a program of militant opposition to imperialism and independence for the labor movement because it is "not politically aware enough to have a program of its own." How, then, is this politically unaware labor movement to enforce a democratic policy in Korea? The act of proposing a democratic policy in Korea would be a declaration of independence. It is certain to be met with the same criticism from the bourgeoisie as is made of our policy: playing into the hands of the Stalinists.

The United States officially supports the tool of French imperialism in Indo-China, Bao Dai, whose war against the nationalist-Stalinist forces takes half of France's Marshall Plan dollars.

The U. S. Seventh Fleet is poised to defend the last outpost of the discredited Chiang Kai-shek in Formosa. Overture after overture, by American businessmen and the Senate, has been made to that outstanding partisan of Western democracy, the fascist Franco, as a potential ally in the camp of "lesser evil."

Is it not rather the bourgeois leaders who give aid and comfort to the Stalinists, rather than we who point out that Stalinism cannot be defeated politically by such measures?

Two Faces of Capitalism

There are some who murmur their concern over the political defeats handed the United States by Russia. They are aware that Jacob Malik scored on the issue of admission of the Stalinist Chinese delegate to the United Nations, whereas the United States stood pat on the Chinese Nationalist delegate and plumped for the admission of the South Korean representative. They recognize that even Nehru supported Truman's action in Korea reluctantly and was forced to make a severe criticism of the United States' conduct in Asia. They recognize the United States' complicity with Russia in the partition of the world. But these factors do not prevent the preponderant weight of reaction in determining U. S. foreign policy.

MacArthur visits the discredited Chiang in the midst of the Korean war. The Seventh Fleet is ready. General Van Fleet prescribes the formula, "Any nation with good and adequate manpower can build an effective machine against Red aggression. Give them the tools and you will have an effective machine." He is the leader of U. S. forces in Greece who just declared that the trouble there was that too much civil liberty was permitted!

Coleman also objects to the use of the "bald phrases about the two imperialist rivals." And since we did not use the slogan popular with the Stalinists, "Immediate withdrawal of all troops from Korea!" this would seem to be left-handed evidence that we really accord to Stalinist imperialism the role of greater evil.

But this argument ignores the fact that democratic capitalism shows its democratic face mainly at home where, however increasingly hedged in, the labor movement still has a relative freedom, a relative prosperity, to be left-handed evidence that we really accord to Stalinism the role of greater evil.

(Continued on page 8)

U. S. World Policy Leans on Reaction --

(Continued from page 1)

out to thousands of peasants in the villages."

That kind of thing, it would seem, is likely to make a profound effect on the minds of the land-starved peasants. But why can't the same tactic be used by American public-relations experts? The answer is simple. Throughout Asia, America is necessarily allied with those social groups which OPPOSE land reform.

To these reactionary landlords it would appear dangerous if the Americans tried to counter such propaganda by issuing pamphlets which praise the portion of American farming which is done by small independent farmers. And they would consider any pamphlet which combined complimentary references to the American family-size farm with advocacy of radical land reform as the sheerest revolutionary and "Communist" propaganda, even if the covers were plastered with American flags.

COUNSEL OF DESPAIR

With refreshing frankness the same article continues:

"The Russians have only to get

the word out to a comparatively few of the faithful who will spread it to a large audience. The United States has no such disciplined, highly organized nucleus of supporters among the common people of Asia. On the contrary, in countries such as China, Indo-China and the Philippines, the men who are our most fervent supporters are not popular with the masses."

That is no accident. And it is not confined to Asia. Even in Europe, where there are mass movements which oppose Stalinism and all its works, these mass movements are not "pro-American" in the sense that the Stalinists everywhere are "pro-Russian." Most of them which have real influence among the workers of Europe are pro-socialist.

They do not advocate American capitalism as a better way of life for themselves. At most they feel that American capitalism is the "lesser evil" as against Stalinism. They understand very well that the kind of economic system which they want for their own countries is hated and opposed by those who control American foreign and domestic policy.

They know that where their own

countries are concerned, the Americans support their domestic political enemies. They line up with the American camp in the struggle only because they despairingly hope that the victory of America will somehow make it possible for them to continue to struggle for their own ideas, because they are convinced that the victory of Stalinism will crush them and all their hopes completely, and because they have no confidence in a "Third Camp" struggle by the people.

CAN'T SELL IT

But such an attitude cannot inspire the confidence and aggressiveness and tenacity that Stalinism inspires in its all-out supporters and in the deluded masses who follow it. They cannot and do not preach the "American way" as an alternative to Stalinism. For they know that though they may get Marshall Plan food and equipment and arms to bolster them against Stalinism, no American politician proposes to export the American standard of living to Asia or to Europe.

These are the fundamental reasons why the Voice of America and all the public information li-

braries in the non-Stalinist world cannot build up a movement which will grip the minds and souls of men. And that would be true even if all these means of telling the "American side" in the conflict were increased a million-fold.

It is possible to expand the sale of one brand of toothpaste or cigarettes at the expense of another through a clever advertising campaign. But a way of life for millions of people can be sold to them only if they feel in their bones that behind the words stands an ideology which offers them a new hope.

And they can be made to feel this only if the ideology is directed AGAINST their known oppressors; AGAINST classes and institutions which have exploited them and kept them in misery and poverty; AGAINST governments which have legalized their exploitation; AGAINST the policemen who have imprisoned them when they protested and sought redress of their grievances.

The American government cannot make it clear to its own soldiers why they have to fight, and cannot gain the adherence of the

masses of Asia, precisely because it supports and arms the governments hated by the masses.

Armament will not bring peace. The only thing which can really stay the hands of the warmakers in both camps is a sweeping defeat on a world scale of the IDEOLOGY of Stalinism.

The ideology of Stalinism can be defeated only by an ideology which can arouse the passionate support of the workers and peasants of all lands. Such an ideology must be directed against their present oppressors on the one hand, AND against the minions of Stalinism who hope to oppress them on the other. Such an ideology must appeal to them to get rid of their present oppressors and offer them full support in building for themselves a social structure and a life which is in all ways superior to the one which they now hate and despise.

WAY TO PEACE

The essence of any ideology which is capable of winning the masses in Europe and Asia from Stalinism is anti-capitalist. That is why the American government cannot use it. That is why it is bound to lose the ideological struggle and can therefore hope to win only through the sheer weight of productive and military superiority.

And that is why every American who wants peace must be deeply concerned with the ideological struggle which is now going on, and should seek to explain to his fellow Americans that to support the present policies is to doom us to a war of utmost destruction.

The present capitalist ideology of the American government cannot win that struggle. It must be replaced by an ideology which can. But it cannot be replaced as long as the labor movement supports the bipartisan architects of American policy, as well as the social system and ideology which they represent. That is why the Independent Socialist League has set as their primary task in America a constant education and propaganda directed above all to the workers in the labor movement, urging them to put an end to this futile and disastrous support, and to form a political party of their own which will be able to win the ideological war against Stalinism.

To work for that is, in fact, the only way to work for peace. That is the way to work to build the "Third Camp" against war, instead of supporting either side in the present war of imperialist rivalry.

"All Fire Against Stalin, Enemy No. 1 --"

(Continued from page 6)

tendencies of modern capitalist economy. On the other hand, enslaved by Stalinist totalitarianism they have very little possibility of free action. The elementary thought of the Polish workers, their wish and their desire is: a change in the actual situation, a probability of the destruction of the Stalinist regime, the social and national liberation of Poland and of all the peoples locked in the Stalinist prison of the nations. The worst nightmare for the Polish workers would be a compromise between its Stalinist executioners and the North Americas, a "peaceful" redivision of the world, an agreement of the two imperialisms which would perpetuate and make permanent, the social and national slavery of the peoples of Europe.

This does not mean that the Polish workers greet the war with national enthusiasm in the manner of the German Social-Democracy; the Polish workers do not embrace a chauvinist nationalism, nor will they defend the country; on the contrary, they are defeatists towards the Muscovite hangman and their lieutenants in Warsaw. The Polish workers desire the defeat of the Stalinist regime in Russia and in all Europe, they desire the complete destruction of the Stalinist regime in Poland, a liquidation of the Stalinist empire in Europe and Asia, not merely as the only means of their liberation, but because as a result, the hateful totalitarian tyranny of the Stalinist counter-revolution, which sprouts on the ruins of the European revolution, will fall.

NOT FOR U. S.

And I can say confidently and with complete responsibility that this defeatist emotion is held by not only the social-democratic majority of the Polish workers but also by the anti-Stalinist, revolutionary oppositionist minority, whose centers exist both inside and outside the governing Stalinist party. Only the narrow strata of the government bureaucracy, moored in positions of power and privilege, will help the Russian Stalinist regime in the war against the United States. The defeatism of the Polish proletariat has nothing in common with nationalism, still less with support of capitalism, nor with the traffic of war; it is an essentially socialist, profoundly revolutionary defeatism; directed towards a destruction of the Stalinist regime and toward a new social revolution in Europe.

This does not mean that the Polish proletariat will play the role of agent of United States imperialism, that it will make an armed insurrection for the profits of American monopolies; the Poles, especially the workers, learned a

fine lesson in the post war from their Western "allies." Their capital was left in ruins thanks to the headmen of Hitler and Stalin. Their country was divided in two and handed over to Russia. Thousands of Poles had to abandon their farms in the eastern part of Poland in order to be transported to Silesia and Pomerania. Workers' organizations, underground armies, workers' militias were abandoned to the mercy of the GPU. The lesson taught by Roosevelt and Churchill, by Truman and Attlee, will never be forgotten by the Poles. And there will never be an armed insurrection in Poland against Russia for the benefit of the Americans.

ANTI-STALINISTS' GOALS

What do the workers of Poland and, I might add, of all Eastern Europe expect as a result of the third imperialist war? They expect a realization of desires frustrated by the Stalinist counter-revolution, a consummation of the old socialist program which was unrealizable in the defeat of the European revolution and the victory of Stalinism. When the historical tendencies cannot find their authentic expression in the social revolution, they seek other, circuitous ways in order to find their just realization. The defeat of the social revolution in Europe was the cause of the victory of totalitarianism and the subsequent world wars. Nevertheless, the Third World War must end with the victory of world socialism.

The elementary goals of the Polish workers' movement are:

- (1) Complete destruction of the Stalinist regime as a result of the war; the destruction of the Russian empire and its repartition among the oppressed nations.
- (2) The unity and emancipation of all the peoples of Europe through the socialist United States of Europe.
- (3) The exhaustion and defeat of capitalism as a result of a long war against Russia.
- (4) The victory of socialism in the U. S. and the formation of a workers' government in the United States, which would signify the triumph of world socialism.

THROUGH WAR

The Polish workers sympathize with the program of the "socialist alternative," propagated by the Independent Socialist League of the United States and with its opposition to the new world war. Nevertheless, in view of the defeat of revolutionary socialism by Stalinism, and the weakness of the proletariat enslaved on one hand by capitalism and on the other by Stalinism, the opposition to the

war has no probability of even distant success. The socialist alternative lacks all reality while there exist the two world imperialisms and the impotence of the revolutionary camp. Given the actual situation, the clash of the two imperialisms is unavoidable and the only hope of the proletariat is in the destruction of the Stalinist regime, in the exhaustion of American imperialism by means of the war and in the abolition of the present repartition of the world.

Only the destruction of Stalinism will make practicable and real the socialist alternative to capitalism by liberating the enormous social forces and energies now enchained, through the socialist transformation of the world.

For these reasons the Polish workers recommend for their American comrades the policy of war without truce on Stalinism, let happen what may. Victory of world socialism through a war against Stalinism!

We socialists and workers of Poland understand the fear of the United States revolutionists of a crushing victory of American imperialism which would dominate the entire world, introducing a new totalitarianism all over the

globe. But such an eventuality is hardly probable. The war with Russia will be long, grievous and exhausting. Without being a military technician it is easy to foresee that the atomic bombs will not have the decisive character and will not by themselves alone resolve the war. The fear that the adversary will use them against New York and other vulnerable industrial centers of America will restrain the use of the bomb until the decisive final actions. American capitalism will not have an easy task. Its task is to destroy the Stalinist regime and perish. Its heritage will be that of the American workers. Without this historical perspective socialism and the fight for it would have no meaning.

The task of the weak revolutionary socialist forces is not to expose themselves to a cross-fire from both sides by quixotically posing their pacifist policy for the benefit of Russia; on the contrary, it is necessary to direct all fire against Stalin, enemy No. 1 of the revolution, then to proceed to the struggle for the socialist alternative when capitalism is exhausted.

This seems to us to be the only way possible to bring about the socialist victory in the U. S. and the entire world.

War and the 'Lesser Evil': A Reply --

(Continued from page 7)

does not discriminate between democratic and totalitarian representatives; in the interests of its rivalry with Stalinism and the upholding of the Atlantic Pact, it rests on the reactionary, discredited compradores, colonial and European. It is precisely on the weak periphery of world capitalism, the colonies, the semi-colonies, the weaker European countries, that Stalinism is best able to undermine its major adversary. It feeds and grows on the weaknesses of capitalism.

In underscoring "democratic" camp, the point of view for the lesser evil also ignores the dynamics of political development within this camp. The United States did not become totalitarian in the last war, did it? However, the United States entered the war later and its civilian population escaped entirely. The situation is entirely otherwise today. There is an accompanying change in the entire political atmosphere of the United States. In many ways, civil liberties have been reduced in the peace interval below their level during the Second World War. The decision of Judge Learned Hand on the CP leaders and his interpretation of the Smith Act brings

official doctrine close to that of the late Tojo government. No, it is not quite so bad; we are still permitted "dangerous thoughts." But we are close to not being permitted to utter them aloud or in print. The U. S. finds it necessary to jail Bridges and the CP leaders. We are on the verge of seeing legislation passed to outlaw the Communist Party and along with it any dissenting voices genuinely socialist or non-conformist. But it is giving way to guns in the political field.

"But would not the victory of the democratic camp be superior for the interests of socialism?" Aside from the rapid changes in the sphere of civil rights which we have indicated, this question supposes an assurance we cannot share of what the victory will look like. It ignores the new factors in modern war—that it is total, that the new weapons are more destructive, that the United States is more vulnerable. There is an almost universal sigh of relief that the employment of atomic bombs is not "strategically" indicated in Korea. The opposite sentiment has also been voiced: one atomic bomb could end the Korean war.

Will our critics oppose the use of atom bombs by the democratic camp? But that would play into

the hands of the enemy. Will you limit yourselves to the "timing" and "placing" of the bombs? Are you for atomic secrecy? Which would you prefer, posers of dilemmas: democratic or totalitarian atomization?

We do not see how socialists can consistently support an imperialist war and consistently carry on the struggle for socialism and the interests of the people. During the last war, the position of the Independent Socialist League made possible, if in a limited way, its vigorous and effective propaganda on behalf of the masses, against the profiteers, the no-strike pledge, the iniquitous War Labor Board, inflation, the black market, for a labor party, etc. Above all, it made possible the continuity of the ideas of international socialism, the program for the construction of a society of human brotherhood. We held and continue to hold opposition to war not as a "sacred dogma" but as a principle in the struggle to resurrect civilization.

We have no delusions of grandeur about our role: to form a connecting link between the glorious past of socialism and its more glorious future, that will be sufficient. To give in to the lesser evil would be to hold an inquest over socialism.