

# LABOR ACTION

Independent Socialist Weekly

JANUARY 22, 1951

FIVE CENTS

**25 LIBERALS ON THE WAR:**  
*The 'Nation' Symposium on Peace*

... page 6

**Slave Labor in Stalinland: New Data**

... page 3

**The CIO's New Railroad Union**

... page 2

**On Withdrawal from Korea**

... page 4

## U. S., Under Pressure, Backs Down on China

By MARY BELL

Diplomacy is ever the servant of military power. The latest illustration of this is the third peace offer, assertedly the "one final appeal," that the United Nations Security Council has made to Stalinist China in the Korean war. While falling short of the Chinese ultimatum for accession to their demands first and cease-fire second, this proposal embodies several concessions to the Chinese government since Wu Hsi Chuan walked out of the UN and the subsequent peace offers.

The current offer still retains the priority of cease-fire over discussions, but makes the huge concession—for the United States—that Stalinist China will be one of the countries represented on the UN body established to effect the peace negotiations, with the implicit understanding that once recognized as the de facto government, official recognition in the UN would not be long in coming. The proposals call for safeguards that a cease-fire would not, as charged by the Stalinists, be a cover for a new offensive. They state explicitly that the settlement of Far Eastern problems by the UN body, which would also include Britain, Russia and the United States, would embrace Formosa and the question of a UN seat for China.

All foreign troops are then to be withdrawn in stages and all-Korea elections are to be held.

The United States position formerly has been to have China condemned as an aggressor by the UN, to withdraw recognition of her by UN participants and to employ an economic boycott or some type of sanctions against her. U. S. representatives have staked the position of the UN as an effective international body on such actions.

### TWO PRESSURES

U. S. delegate Warren Austin claims that the new position is no departure for the United States but that she is in principle agreement with these ideas. No one is fooled, however, by such face-saving pronouncements.

The backing down of the U. S. is dictated by two factors. The first is the obvious rout, to what extent and at the cost of how many casualties the newspapers have not been able to divulge, of U. S. forces by the Chinese.

The second, and more important reason, are differences within the Western bloc. The meeting in London of the prime ministers of the British Commonwealth of Nations, occurring at the height of the impasse in U. S.-Chinese military-diplomatic relations, was primarily concerned with the Korean war, and the new proposal emanated from them. The British had

### China's New Exploiter



MAO TSE-TUNG

previously opposed the U. S. view on sanctions against China, and the branding of China as an aggressor for fear that such a course would increase the chances of a world-wide war. India, Israel and other countries in the Allied bloc exercised their moderating effect. Four of the governments represented in London had already recognized Stalinist China. Above all, in the case of the less privileged

(Turn to last page)

## Truman's Plan to Freeze Wages, Hike Taxes, Mocks 'Equality of Sacrifice'

By LARRY O'CONNOR

President Truman's economic and budget messages submitted to the Congress on January 12 and 15 respectively indicate clearly that the government plans to put the economic burden of the armament program on the backs of the working people of the country.

As usual in times when the government is operating on a crisis basis, this is to be done under the slogan "equality of sacrifice." What the government really proposes is that the workers will make a real and tremendous sacrifice in their standard of living, while the owners of the great banks and industries will "sacrifice" nothing but the potentiality of increasing their billions of dollars in profits—if that.

The expenditures for military purposes will increase from a rate of about \$20 billion a year to \$45 or \$55 billion by the end of 1951, with even higher figures for the year after. This will mean that, whereas during the past year about 7 per cent of production was diverted from the civilian economy to war purposes, by the end of this year about 18 per

cent of all the things produced by the workers and farmers of the country will be absorbed by the war machine.

Actually, this does not give a true picture of the degree to which the standard of living of the people will be reduced. In many industries the percentages will be so much higher as to divert most or all of what they are

(Turn to last page)

### THE KOCH CASE

A German court has convicted and sentenced the notorious Ilse Koch to hard labor for life for atrocities committed by her as the wife of the Nazi commander of the Buchenwald concentration camp.

Few people have any doubt that she richly deserved the maximum penalty. But although an American court had given her the same sentence in 1947, it was the then U. S. military governor, General Clay, who reduced it to four years.

The difference is not only pointed in itself as regards the way in which the U. S. occupation has reflected "denazification," but applies on the opinion of many Americans that the German people (being Nazis at heart if not by blood) want to protect the Nazi war criminals.

## Auto Workers Fear Unemployment In Detroit Despite Boom

By WALTER JASON

DETROIT, Jan. 14—As the full impact of inflation and the inevitable dislocations of a kind of "mixed economy"—neither war nor peace—combine to disturb the normalcy of this auto production center, the tensions among the unemployed and the men in the shops provide a different and far more bitter atmosphere than that noted in 1940-41.

Behind all the chaos and unemployment in the automotive industry in the early days of the last world war was the knowledge that sooner or later Detroit would become a center of the war boom and that a war boom meant steady work and plenty of overtime.

Today the auto industry already has an estimated \$4 billion in war orders, but the bulk is scheduled for production outside of this area. Meanwhile, 100,000 unemployed auto workers find their ranks swollen by an incredible influx of workers from everywhere, especially from the South, who

have come to Detroit to get the "war work" that doesn't exist here.

The situation has been aggravated by the deliberate policy of at least one important car producer, Hudson, which admitted last week it had sent agents to the South and brought up bus loads of labor recruits for whom there are no jobs.

This scandal was sufficiently large to force two employers' associations to denounce Hudson's tactics. After all, production cut-backs are already big enough to furnish a handy surplus of labor for the companies.

As might be expected, the shortage of parts is forcing production schedule changes which aggravate the usual model-changeover layoffs, and this has become a real point among the auto workers. Short work weeks in a time of daily price increases in food and other vital cost of living items are very hard to take.

Nor is this feeling of futility and insecurity helped by reading

the reports in daily newspapers on how the auto companies are building new war plants in safer areas, less likely targets of atom bombs.

### REACT TO THREAT

Unable to influence these events in the least, the United Auto Workers (CIO) concentrates in its campaign to keep the Truman administration from destroying the escalator and annual improvement-factor clauses in its contracts with the overwhelming bulk of the industry.

In the recent public and behind-the-scenes skirmishes in Washington over a wage-price policy, it took the blunt threat of a nation-wide auto shutdown by the UAW leaders to cancel a prepared order against the UAW contracts.

However, only today Washington reports again stress that C. E. Wilson is preparing a wage-freeze order, with the escalator clause in doubt. All this emphasis of the government on wage freezing at a time when food prices are jump-

ing upwards everyday has not endeared the Truman administration to the men in the shops.

Reports from many shops tell of the intense bitterness among the auto workers. One of its main manifestations is the way the rank and file plague the secondary leaders of the union to do something. It is this feeling that the union should be raising hell, while it seems to be quietly acquiescing in the impact of inflation that causes the ranks to give the secondary leaders such a hard time.

At the recent Washington hearings, auto industry spokesmen in off-the-record suggestions agreed with the contention of President Walter P. Reuther of the UAW that any breaking of the escalator clause by the government would mean trouble in the shops. After all, management is closer to the men in the shops than the politicians in Washington.

What was true before is doubly true today. The breaking point in the temper of the auto workers is near. Especially if the auto companies' "insurance" against too much trouble—the escalator clause—is taken away.

# Dewey Still Mired In Hanley Scandal

A new version of "Button, button, who's got the button" is being played these days. The missing button is the rather sizable debt of \$150,000 supposedly owed by former Lieut. Governor Joe R. Hanley of New York.

Hanley's debts first gained public prominence during the election campaign last fall when a letter by him about them was "accidentally" made public. This letter revealed that Hanley had yielded the Republican nomination for New York governor to Thomas E. Dewey in exchange for a promise that Dewey would see that his debts were taken care of.

The subsequent hue and cry finally reached the ears of the Senate subcommittee on elections and investigators attempted to verify the existence of this supposed debt of honor resulting from some bank stock left to Hanley by his father. Several interesting facts have come to light so far. The subcommittee's investigators made photostatic copies of what appeared to be a canceled promissory note, made out to the order of C. C. Hagerman, dated July 1, 1939, at Muscatine, Iowa. The amount involved was \$150,000.

The one and only C. C. Hagerman found in the vicinity of Muscatine, Iowa, a schoolmate of Hanley, denied all knowledge of the note and firmly declared that he had never loaned Hanley any money nor had Hanley paid him any money of any kind. Who then had initiated the note as paid? To whom then was the note given? What connection has this note with the supposed debt of honor which Hanley had assumed on his father's death? No answers are forthcoming to any of these questions so far.

## HANLEY CLAMS UP

Since this entire debt was inherited from his father in the form of bank stock, the investigators poked into that angle also. But power here in the whole state of Iowa could any record be found of any bank stock owned by Hanley's father, issued by any bank that had failed.

Former Lieut. Governor Hanley was asked to shed some light on these disturbing discoveries. Were his debts the result of a bank failure in Iowa in which his parents were stockholders? His answer: "I have nothing further to say." Asked to comment on the \$150,000 note from him to C. C. Hagerman of Iowa, which Hagerman had denied ever making, Hanley replied: "I will not discuss that at all."

When reporters reminded him that during the election campaign the bank story and Hanley's honorable assumption of his father's obligation had been the main explanation given, Hanley remarked, "A lot of things were said without any authority from me." More recently, Hanley told a reporter for the N. Y. Post that he was "protecting someone" but later denied making the statement.

Perhaps the greatest cheek was displayed by Governor Dewey himself. During the election campaign, Dewey had rushed to the defense of Hanley as a noble and self-sacrificing American who had gone into heavy debt to protect the widows and orphans of Iowa. In effect, Dewey had assured Hanley that he would subsidize him if only he would turn down the gubernatorial nomination and clear the way for Dewey to run again. More specifically, Dewey had promised him, in the same scandalous letter, a job with the state that would relieve him of financial pressure.

In the light of this background, and with a cynical disregard for the truth appalling even for pro- nor or his office never had any

professional liars, Dewey's office issued the following statement on the unsavory mess: "The government knowledge of Mr. Hanley's private affairs."

## PORK IN SPARTA

This statement stands in stark contrast with Dewey's action in delivering on his promise to relieve Hanley of further financial worries. This was one promise—give credit where it is due—that Dewey made during the election campaign and kept. Dewey had Hanley appointed consultant to the State Division of Veterans Affairs, at an annual retainer of \$16,000 a year, shortly before his term as lieutenant governor expired.

This political plum has a particularly juicy angle. Since this is a contract job, Hanley can also collect his state pension of about \$4,000 a year, making a grand total of \$20,000 for past services rendered as a Republican politician.

It was shortly after this appointment that Dewey went to the people of New York State with his message demanding economy, economy, and more economy in government and appealing for a "Spartan" spirit of sacrifice to live the cold war, as well as submitting a proposal for a virtual one-man dictatorship in Albany to carry through civil defense. Everything will be under "Spartan" controls except pork-barrels.

# Philly Meetings Hear Shachtman

By FRANK HARPER

PHILADELPHIA, Jan. 11 — In a meeting held last night in Labor Action Hall here, Max Shachtman likened the decadent social systems of Stalinism and capitalism to two parasites living on each other. The national chairman of the Independent Socialist League held the close attention of his audience with a blistering attack on the ideological bankruptcy of the competing aspirants for world domination in the rapidly developing war.

Comrade Shachtman spoke on the topic "The Socialist Movement in the Period of Global Wars," under the auspices of the Philadelphia branch of the ISL. In the afternoon he had been guest speaker at a meeting of the Temple University Socialist Club.

An examination was made of the inability of the capitalist governments to combat Stalinism effectively. Shachtman said that those who saw only the trimmings of nationalism, militarism, and totalitarianism and were ignorant of the economic and social basis and historical development of Stalinism could not defeat it. While bureaucratic collectivism first arose in Russia it can arise wherever the capitalist class cannot solve the crisis of capitalist society and the working class is not yet strong nor conscious enough to build a new socialist order.

## ISL WELCOME

Comrade Shachtman stated that socialists have confidence in the indestructibility and viability of the working class. He was certain that the Russian dictatorship will be smashed from within. He showed that other modern dictators have passed away literally overnight and without leaving a trace. When beset by external difficulties and internal discontents the top layers of the bureaucracy split into groups with a "hard" and "soft" policy. When the split spreads into the lower bureaucracy the discontented and oppressed people burst through and sweep away the old social order.

# LABOR SCOPE

## The CIO's New Union for Railroad Workers—and Porkchoppers

By GORDON HASKELL

During the past week the newspapers have announced the formation by the CIO of a "new" union to organize non-operating workers on the railroads.

Actually, there is nothing new either about the attempt of the CIO to get into the railroad field nor, unfortunately, is there anything new about the method by which the CIO leadership is organizing the attempt. It is sad but true that in all likelihood the only thing which will be accomplished by this new union is to provide some jobs for a number of CIO officials who have failed in other fields.

The history of the CIO's work on the railroads is a bit involved and goes back a number of years. But boiled down to its main points, it is something like this:

On the Santa Fe, the maintenance-of-way workers had been represented up till 1944 or 1945 by a company union. The officers of the union were dissatisfied, and approached the AFL and CIO.

Philip Murray appointed a broken-down and thoroughly incompetent former Steel Workers' organizer, one A. B. Martin, to negotiate the deal and form the new union. The workers voted to take their company union into the CIO.

Martin then transferred his activities to the Pennsylvania Railroad where all the shop crafts

were in a company union. The AFL shop-craft unions, which represent the railroad shop workers in most of the country, had never been able to crack the tough Pennsy-company union tie-up.

## GUERRILLA ACTION

Over the years a number of collective-bargaining elections took place, in each case the fight being between the AFL, CIO and remnants of the company union. The Railway Labor Act is written in such a way that each craft votes separately in a collective-bargaining election. On the Pennsy the elections resulted in a division of the crafts, some going CIO, some AFL, and others remaining in the company-union set-up.

A. B. Martin had big ideas. Wherever a group of railroad workers would approach his United Railroad Workers of America (CIO) with complaints against their AFL or independent unions, he would offer to organize them. At no time, however, did he have the funds necessary to carry on a battle against the established AFL unions, nor did the CIO at any time openly come out with a policy of raiding the AFL on the railroads.

## PORKCHOPS FOR GREEN

This led to considerable strife inside the new union. The ship locals felt that they had lost control over their own organization through an influx of workers from an industry which has no direct connection with shipbuilding. John Green, president of the union, also took in a number of locals of the Mine, Mill and Smelter Workers which were trying to get out from under the Stalinist control of their international.

In short, the union became a sort of "District 50" outfit which would take in any group of workers they could get.

The strife became so hot that Local 1, one of the largest shipyard locals, left the union. At the last convention John Green was dumped from the presidency, and as a result also lost his job as vice-president of the CIO.

Now it appears that Phil Murray is taking care of his old friend, John Green, by once more setting up the railroad union as an independent organization under his leadership.

Of course, the railroad workers are the chief sufferers. Many of the most militant railroad unionists are strong for an industrial type of organization. There is probably no other industry in the country in which the workers are so constantly and actively dissatisfied with their unions. Over the years at least half a dozen movements have arisen among railroad workers which had as their objective the formation of an industrial union, usually to be achieved by amalgamating their present craft organizations.

It is easy to understand why many of these militants leap at the chance to join or try to build a CIO union. On the railroad the CIO stands for industrial unionism and militancy. The workers hear that it is organizing the railroads, they visualize a large-scale organizing campaign, backed by the whole power and prestige of the CIO, like the ones which broke the resistance of the automobile industry. Many of them are willing to risk their jobs in such an effort.

What they do not realize is that the "drive" to organize the railroad workers into the CIO is a horse of an entirely different color. There are no large-scale funds behind it; the organizers are few and scattered far too thin; there is no attempt to mobilize the strength of the CIO internationals behind a real crusade to bring industrial unionism to the rails. It is just a little irresponsible maneuver which takes advantage of the progressive sentiments of the workers to provide jobs for men like John Green who have been rejected by their own memberships.

Shachtman pointed out to the audience, the semester's largest for the club, that the coming war is a "futile, useless, fruitless, senseless war in which the U. S. (with its reactionary allies) has no attraction for the masses." He said that the resourcefulness and reserves of the people had not yet been tapped and that in revolutionary resurgence, in rebellion against the old order, an alternative to both capitalism and Stalinism could be found.

In pointing out how America's leaders had failed to comprehend Stalinism, Shachtman analyzed the rise of the Russian bureaucracy very carefully, to the discomfiture of a number of campus Stalinists in attendance. He showed how Russia's system was a "reactionary, uncontrolled and uncontrollable, self-perpetuating bureaucracy, a new barbarism."

## By MARTY MARTEL

PHILADELPHIA, Jan. 15 — Max Shachtman addressed 35 people at Temple University last Wednesday under the sponsorship of the Temple Socialist Club.

Shachtman, speaking on "The Third Force in World Politics," indicated both sides in the present world conflict. He showed how the present propaganda campaign is exactly the opposite of that given the world's peoples a few years ago. At that time, he said, our opponents were painted as democrats and today they are painted as a vicious imperialism. The same thing is true of propaganda on the U. S. in Russia, he added.

which the increased power of industrial unionism would make possible for them. Instead, except for small groups of workers which here or there were able to win a collective-bargaining election against the AFL, the country became speckled with little locals of workers who had cut themselves off from the AFL unions by working for the CIO without any prospect of getting the backing they would need to actually win a collective-bargaining election. This was a policy which can only be called irresponsible.

In the meantime, the CIO shipyard workers union had lost a large part of its membership when the wartime ship boom collapsed. In order to cut down the overhead expenses of the CIO (the URRWA had been subsidized continually out of the national CIO treasury), and to give the unemployed shipworker officials a way of continuing to get their porkchops, the railroad union was "amalgamated" with the shipyard organization.

The first witness was Dr. Rainer Hildebrandt, director of the Kampfgruppe Gegen Unmenschlichkeit of Germany (League of Struggle Against Inhumanity) in West Berlin, a group which has been working to aid refugees from the concentration camps in Eastern Germany and collecting available information on them. He told the commission:

When the Russians occupied their sector of Germany, there came a wave of "denunciations" of "anti-Soviet" elements by men trying to curry favor with the new masters or simply desiring to take over the accused person's housing.

It appears that the Russian commandants in each district were given a quota for arrests in their territory; if suitable suspects were not readily found they jailed anyone handy. Hildebrandt's group knew this to be

## FIGURES CITED

True for several districts but, he added, he had no direct proof for the system as a whole. If a prisoner escaped, a replacement for him (in the quota, it seems) was likely to be picked up at random on the street.

Otherwise, the regular GPU methods were used: night arrests, etc.

All figures given at the hearing were estimates and approximations, and while they will be set down in this article in round numbers it should be understood that the witnesses gave them with much hesitation and qualification. For East Germany, Hildebrandt estimated that 185,000 had passed through the Stalinist camps since the war. Of these, 37,000 were deported to Russia; of the rest 96,000 died in the camps.

The Russians began by taking over the Nazi concentration camps (Buchenwald et al.) but later closed their 13 operating camps—their very names were a stench in the land—and began setting up a new network of prisons. At present, Hildebrandt said, there were a large number of political prisoners: in one district alone (Weimar) in one month 400 political had been sentenced—without lawyers, without witnesses, by administrative courts. The average sentence in

# New Sidelights on Slave Labor in Russia And Satellites Told at Commission Hearing

New information and sidelights on slave labor in Stalinland—much of it of special interest—were brought out for the first time at the hearing on that subject held January 9 by the Commission of Inquiry into Forced Labor.

The commission, sponsored by but independent of the Workers Defense League, has in the past period devoted much of its attention to forced labor in the United States (in the form of peonage affecting farm labor). In turning the spotlight on slave labor behind the Iron Curtain the group is doing an equally good job.

In spite of the fact that the revelations of the commission and the WDL might be considered congenial to the propaganda aims of the U. S. at this time—a fact which in any case lessens neither their truth nor their importance to workers—the press has given the commission's hearing the cold shoulder; the January 9 hearing was virtually boycotted. It is to be presumed that the big newspapers and press associations do not like the auspices under which the expose is being made.

The testimony presented was not from research workers or second-hand sources. Almost all of the men who testified at the hearing were themselves refugees from the Kremlin's slave camps. Here are some of the highlights of the evidence which held the audience's attention for several hours.

The first witness was Dr. Rainer Hildebrandt, director of the Kampfgruppe Gegen Unmenschlichkeit of Germany (League of Struggle Against Inhumanity) in West Berlin, a group which has been working to aid refugees from the concentration camps in Eastern Germany and collecting available information on them. He told the commission:

When the Russians occupied their sector of Germany, there came a wave of "denunciations" of "anti-Soviet" elements by men trying to curry favor with the new masters or simply desiring to take over the accused person's housing.

## FIGURES CITED

It appears that the Russian commandants in each district were given a quota for arrests in their territory; if suitable suspects were not readily found they jailed anyone handy. Hildebrandt's group knew this to be

## RAPE OF A REPUBLIC

Following is an eyewitness account (name withheld by the Commission of Inquiry) on the liquidation of the Chechen-Ingush Republic of the USSR:

"In 1943 I arrived at Grozny. . . . The city of Grozny [former capital of Chechen-Ingush Autonomous Republic] had not suffered much during the war. Its population was about 220,000 mostly Russians and Armenians. There were still some Jews, Chechens, Ingushs, Dagestanians, and Azerbaidjanians. The whole amount of the Chechens and Ingushs in the Republic was about 500,000. . . .

"At the end of 1943 there were rumors in the city that the Chechens and Ingushs were to be resettled, but it was told very secretly. At the end of February 1944 special troops of the NKVD arrived in Grozny in American-made Studebakers. In the papers it was announced: 'Let's help our dear and lovely Red Army to execute the training exercises in highland conditions.' The troops moved into mountains and little by little all the Chechen villages were occupied by military garrisons.

"On Red Army Day—February 23—the soldiers lit the fires in the squares of the villages and started singing and dancing. Seeing nothing suspicious the population of the villages assembled in order to see what is going on. Suddenly, when the majority of the population was assembled in the squares, all men were captured. Some of the Chechens had arms and at some places shooting began but it was liquidated in a few minutes. All men who were captured in the squares were enclosed in cattedsheds. At the same time the soldiers arrested those who had not come out from the houses. The whole operation lasted 2-3 hours. The women were not arrested but they were ordered to pack the things and together with the children to be ready for leaving early in the morning.

"At the same time in Grozny the mobilization of students and housewives took place. . . . On February 24 when we arrived we were astonished by the silence all around in the village. Men arrested the day before were loaded onto the trucks together with their wives and children. They were brought to the railroad echelons near Grozny which were prepared beforehand. Chechens and Ingushs were deported completely. The Dagestanians were not disturbed. In our village 7-8 of them were left. . . .

"In highland villages this operation was made in a different way. Everything that could be taken away was confiscated and all villages were burnt down in order to liquidate the base for existence of 'bandits.'

"A long time afterwards fire was seen in the mountains. At the same time an amnesty was announced for all those who stayed in the mountains in case they surrendered. And in fact many of them began to surrender. All of them were deported to Central Asia."

case of deportees to Russia was 15 years.

Another witness, Dr. Karl Garyk, had been a leading labor youth functionary in Czechoslovakia and a prisoner of the Nazis during the war. After the 1948 Stalinist coup he escaped to Germany, where he daily talked to refugees who were streaming in from the Kremlin's new domain, particularly Czechs. The picture he gave was similar to that of other East European countries.

## DEATH BY URANIUM

Concentration camps were legally and openly established in Czechoslovakia by a decree of October 25, 1948; their existence was thus deliberately publicized to intimidate the people. The camp system set up was decentralized—no huge camps were established. Located mostly in the industrial areas, 30-40 bigger camps were set up, plus 80-100 smaller ones.

Garyk estimated 300,000 prisoners. Two special camps for "political personalities" were built on the border facing Russia, one for purged CPers and one for non-CP political opponents. There were a large number of workers sent to the camps as well as many peasants—not only ex-bourgeois elements.

One of the biggest groups of camps was erected in the uranium-mine area under the direct control of Russians. In 3-4 camps in this region, 30,000 workers toiled in the mines, where the rate of death through the effects of radiation (lung cancer, for example) reached appalling heights—thousands per month.

Two other witnesses gave details on the relatively new slave-labor systems in Rumania and Hungary. In Rumania—stated Charles Davila, ex-minister to the U. S. from that country, on the basis of reports from inside as well as gleanings from the Rumanian press—large slave-labor forces are being used mainly on strategic projects demanded by the Russians, airports, fortifications among the Black Sea coast, etc. There are about 150,000 political prisoners—70,000 for the Black Sea-Danube canal alone.

Besides the slave-labor camps, "voluntary labor brigades" were also set up for operation in the prisoners own home localities. Such labor brigades, Davila said, were used on at least one occasion to break a work stoppage of bricklayers demanding higher wages.

## FROM RUSSIA

A Catholic priest, Bela Varga, spoke on Hungary. Varga had been active in the Budapest underground against the Nazis, had been sentenced to death by them, and was paid a similar compliment by the Stalinists when Russia took over. He left Hungary in 1947. More than 80,000 are interned in the country, he estimated, and to this number must be added those deported to Russia, not included in the above figure. Twenty concentration camps are known now and 60 new camps are being erected.

The rest of the panel of witnesses came from slave-labor camps in Russia itself. It is unfortunate that time for these witnesses was shortened because of the lateness of the hour; they had special sidelights on the well-known GPU camp system to relate.

Herschel Himmelbarb, a lifetime member of the Polish Bund, had been arrested in Vilna in September 1939 by Russian police and was later charged with "counter-revolutionary" activities. After a "career" through several jails and camps he would



up in a camp in the Karaganda region (Kazakhstan, Siberia) where, though 52 years old, he was required to fulfil a norm which, he said, could have been filled only 50-60 per cent by an able-bodied young man. There were about two and a half million slave-laborers in the vicinity of Karaganda.

Nicholas Didenko, a Ukrainian railroad engineer, arrested in 1937, was sent to the noted Irkutsk prison camp for scientists, specialists and intellectuals. There he saw huge scientific laboratories (and a scientific library) more elaborate than any he had run across in civilian life—staffed by slave-labor scientists and technicians. (He himself was given the task of doing research work on railroad capacity for war mobilization.)

These prisoners were better fed than other slave-laborers—they actually got some meat—and, interestingly enough, no ef-

## THE DEPORTATION OF THE BALKARS

Following is the sworn statement presented to the Commission of Inquiry by Yuriy Dywnych, a Ukrainian agronomist and former inmate of Russian concentration camps:

"At the end of 1940, the forced resettlement of Balkars from the Caucasus mountains to the plains of the North Caucasus steppes (kardaba) took place. The tribe was moved from the peaks of Dykh-Tau and Elbrus into the valleys of Malka and the Terek Rivers. The distance to the resettlement area was only 100-150 miles, but the geographical and climatic conditions were equivalent to removal for thousands of miles. The Balkars, a mountain tribe of about 50,000 persons, had inhabited the mountains for thousands of years.

"The official reason given for resettlement was the poverty of economic resources in the mountains and the unlimited economic perspective in the half uninhabited steppe. The officials said that they wanted to liberate the Balkars from poverty. However, because I was at that time the agronomist stationed in Balkaria, I knew very well that the real reason for the forced resettlement was the shortage of the labor force and the failure of the harvest in the kolkhozes on the Kardaba steppe. . . .

"The Balkars were settled in several Kabardian villages on the Terek River together with Kabardian families. It created an unbearable living arrangement for the deportees as well as for the Kabardians. Without giving the Balkars any time for organizing their lives, the authorities sent them into the fields in order to harvest the half-rotten crops. Because of the new climate and living conditions, disease broke out and the mortality rate was high. In a few months almost all of the survivors ran back to their mountains having lost all their belongings and livestock. . . ."

Yuriy DYWNYCH

## They Need Your Help!

Local New York of the Independent Socialist League has been regularly mailing packages of food and clothing to needy workers in Europe. The relief committee has especially urgent need for clean, wearable clothing for children of school age, particularly in the 12-14 age group. Please bring or send your contributions to the city center of the ISL, at 114 West 14 Street, 3rd floor, New York City.

# The ISL Program in Brief

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

### INTERESTED?

Get acquainted with the Independent Socialist League—

114 W. 14th Street  
New York 11, N. Y.

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

I want to join the ISL.

Name .....  
Address .....  
City ..... Zone .....  
State ..... Tel. ....

## Youth Student Corner

### The Draft's Class Bias Works Automatically

By JULIUS FALK

The inability of poorer families to obtain a college education for their children is a graphic illustration of the inequities of capitalist society. This is particularly true in the United States with its much-vaunted high standard of living. Scholarships and tuition-free schools are negligible in this rich and powerful country as compared with the potential student population. While this has always been a serious problem for the nation's youth, today inability to attend school may involve personal tragedy.

A college education is becoming, literally, a matter of life or death! We are referring, of course, to the policy of draft boards on students. Upper classmen are receiving 6 months to 1 year dispensations, and more extended deferments for "superior" students are being considered. Thus the economically less fortunate youth of the country are made to feel a double burden: they are prevented from acquiring a college education for reasons beyond their control and are now to be penalized for it—for it is obvious that for every student who is deferred, another youth, most likely a worker, will be drafted.

The announcement of the draft policy on students met with almost universal hostility. Interviews with the "man in the street" were published in New York papers with virtually all objecting to the government policy, pointing out how such policies would discriminate against poorer youth who had no opportunity for a college education.

### Problem Is Equality of Opportunity

It would be unfortunate if the reaction against this draft policy took the form of resentment against the students, themselves. That would be a misdirected opposition stemming from a legitimate grievance.

The real issue is not the deferment of students. The problem is that all young people are not afforded the same opportunity for a college career and thereby, in the present crisis, are not given the same opportunity for deferment. For the overwhelming majority of American families the college tariff remains high—protectionist. The college classroom remains inaccessible, far beyond the reach of average family income.

The manner in which the draft policy operates against the economically depressed can only be regarded as another example of how a war economy in America will bring to the fore, intensify, and clearly demonstrate the undemocratic nature of capitalism even in "normal" times.

The Korean war, the threat of world war and uncertainty as to their own status are having disastrous effects on the morale of students. The war has failed to arouse any significant chauvinist or super-patriotic feeling on campus. It is only natural, therefore, that students who have no enthusiasm for the war will react abnormally to the vagueness of their draft status. Some have become absolutely indifferent to their studies, filled with a sense of hopelessness and futility.

As one college educator put it: "The attitude of some students is 'What's the use of studying if we've got to go into the army at any time?' Some feel that in enlisting they are getting something over with." (N. Y. Times, Jan. 15.)

### War Jitters on the Campus

This is but one harmful consequence of the draft policy. Another negative effect from an educational point of view is an unhealthy competitiveness among some students. The special draft consideration for students with better grades can only make for personal friction between students and provides an unhealthy stimulus for improving grades. On the other hand, students who are far down in the class rank scale have become despondent, and it is among these students that a feeling of hopelessness reigns supreme. They are doubly insecure and have in effect abandoned their studies.

Another educator was quoted in the same issue of the N. Y. Times complaining that "Many of the weaker students—those in the lower half of their class—definitely are studying less. After all, they've lost their incentive because of the present draft laws."

The demoralization of the student body reached a high point several weeks ago at Columbia University. This staid and dignified institution was victimized by student vandalism. Students ran riot in one of the dormitories, opening faucets and ruining school property—not to mention the university's reputation. The college newspaper attributed this senseless and destructive action to "war jitters."

The demoralization of the student body and such unsympathetic acts as the Columbia episode reflect a deep pessimism upon the part not only of students but of the population as a whole. Many socialists thought that the impending war would be popular. But quite the opposite is proving to be the case. The jingo propaganda is not having its desired effect. It is an encouraging sign.

**LABOR ACTION**  
Independent Socialist Weekly

Vol. 15, No. 4      January 22, 1951

Published weekly by the Labor Action Publishing Company, 114 West 14 Street, New York City 11, N. Y. Send all communications to general editorial and business offices of LABOR ACTION at that address. Telephone: WAtkins 4-4222.

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

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

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

## Reading from Left to Right

THE FRENCH CP AT EBB TIDE, by David J. Dallin. (New Leader, Jan. 15.)

"By 1946-47, membership in the French CP had reached a million. No figures have been released recently either in France or by the Cominform, but competent observers place the total at no more than 300,000 to 400,000. L'Humanité, the central Communist organ, boasted a circulation of 820,000 at its peak several years ago; today it sells a scant 240,000 copies. Most important of all is the decline of the Communist-dominated General Confederation of Labor, which has served as an obedient tool of Moscow in staging mass demonstrations. In the absence of any published figures, the CGT's membership is estimated to have dropped from

6,000,000 to less than 2,000,000.

"Of the millions of CGT defectors, only a few have joined other trade-union federations, such as the Catholic groups or the pro-Socialist Force Ouvrière. The let-down after the first post-war upsurge of pro-Communist enthusiasm has caused widespread disillusionment and passivity among French workers, many of whom have simply turned their backs on trade-union activity altogether.

"Many of these workers still vote Communist at election-time, because they know of no better alternative. Casting their ballots for the party, however, is all they are prepared to do for the Communist cause. The number of real party militants has probably shrunk to only a few thousands."

## WORLD POLITICS

### ON THE WITHDRAWAL OF AMERICAN TROOPS FROM KOREA

By PHILIP COBEN

It's about time the United States pulled its troops out of Korea. The Korean intervention has done enough damage.

We don't mean military damage at this point—though it is true enough that the U. S., other UN troops, North Korean Stalinists and Chinese invaders have been doing their best to make the country unfit to live in for the victimized people they are all "liberating."

We don't mean damage to Washington's prestige and influence in the world—though it is true enough that the political and military consequences of the intervention won't do it any good.

We mean political damage to the cause of fighting against Stalinist expansion in the world.

That damage was done before the U. S. met its disastrous military reverses. The Korean intervention and the accompanying U. S. policy deepened the line of antagonism between it and the Asian people. It gave the masses of Asia another push toward the unreluctant arms of Stalinism. Since the Korean intervention, the Viet-Minh leader in Indo-China, Ho Chi Minh, drew closer to Stalinist China and Russia, not farther.

It gave Mao Tse-tung the opportunity to swing his weight in Korea, to the extent that even the U. S. is now obliged to reverse its policy against treating with him, raising "the world power of Chinese Stalinism. To have recognized Stalinist China before the Korean war, as the British proposed, would have been one thing; the U. S. is giving it de facto recognition under duress—and that is another thing.

The point is: from every angle the influence of Stalinism in Asia has been increased, not "contained." Stalinism has fed on the consequences of U. S. imperialism's course. That is the reality.

### TO SAVE ASIA

Independent socialists were opposed to sending troops to Korea in the first place, and if the troops had no business there to begin with, they had considerably less in the face of the threatened spread of the war to China and in view of the fact that further prosecution of the war could only mean adding useless slaughter to an already irresponsible adventure.

Withdrawal of the troops is no solution for Korea. It is an elementary necessity, after the damage has already been done, in order not to make bad worse. For Korea, there is no present solution.

Would it be better to advocate withdrawal of the troops of both sides and not "unilateral" withdrawal? We did and do, of course, advocate the withdrawal of both sides, but it is a naive illusion to counterpose this to the imperative necessity for the U. S. to get out. Even if the Chinese troops got out too, the North Korean Stalinist troops would still be at home; their guerrillas would still be in South Korea; it should surprise no one, after all that has taken place, if a reasonably free all-Korean election would give the Stalinists or their political allies and fronts control over North and South. For the fundamental tragedy of Korea is that the people have been given no alternative to the rule of the Stalinists or of the hated Syngman Rhee regime, and there is no effective independent force opposed to both.

Korea is lost and cannot be saved for this period. Not only lost to Washington—that is their grief—but lost to the potential forces of Asia which might build a Third Camp against both war blocs.

The problem today is not how to save Korea. It will mean little even if, after some fancy horse-trading with Mao, the U. S. retains formal control over South Korea.

The problem is how to save the rest of Asia from Stalinism.

The demand that the U. S. cut short its Korean

adventure is not a solution to this either: it is merely a pre-condition for a solution. That is why it has its importance.

### FOR AN INDEPENDENT SOUTH ASIA

The road to a solution rests with the anti-imperialist forces in the Asian countries themselves. As long as Asia faces the choice from both sides of the cold war—"Line up with us, or else!"—Stalinist expansionism and Western imperialism will continue to feed on each other over its prostrate body. The people will be polarized between the two world antagonists, and we have seen that in such cases the tendency is for the Stalinists to capture the masses in active support or passive toleration, while the West "captures" the reactionary strata, not to speak of those sections that are pushed into or held in apathetic despair.

Non-Stalinist Asia must find its own road independently of the two colossi. There is such a road, the beginning of such a road at any rate. It is to take the necessary steps toward an Independent South Asian federation of the non-Stalinist countries.

That idea has present currency throughout the region. It was raised some time back in discussion articles in LABOR ACTION. We view it in the same light as our proposal for an Independent Western Union in Europe and in an analogous political context. Its creation by the South Asian countries themselves and not as an appendage of the United Nations could be an important step toward creating a rallying center, a magnetic pole of force, in Asia which could bar the advance of Stalinism, by no longer leaving Stalinism as the only alternative to Western imperialist domination.

It is in the light of this proposal that the mass Socialist Party of India, its direction of development and its politics, has world importance. It could be a vanguard in raising the dykes against Stalinism. It can be that insofar as it maintains and further clarifies its Third Camp position in the world today and orients itself in the direction we have discussed.

For World Politics—  
Read the socialist press abroad!

**La Batalla**  
Bi-Weekly Newspaper of the Spanish POU

**The Socialist Leader**  
Weekly Organ of the British ILP

**Vpered**  
Voice of the Ukrainian Anti-Stalinist Underground

**Janata**  
Organ of the Socialist Party of India

For information and subscriptions, write to  
LABOR ACTION BOOK SERVICE  
114 West 14 Street      New York 11, N. Y.

The British Political Scene  
Is Portrayed Each Week in—

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

Yearly subscription: \$3.00  
Shorter periods pro-rata

Order from: Socialist Leader  
318 Regents Park Road  
Finchley, London, N.3, England

### BOOKS and Ideas THE NEW BOOK ON THE FBI—5

## The FBI and Its Businessman's Mentality

By SAM ADAMS

The FBI has always fought efforts to control its activities or to establish any kind of supervision over them. That is why J. Edgar Hoover has always fought vigorously against placing his agents under civil service.

One of Hoover's main arguments against it was that it would reduce the "caliber" of his agents. "Members of law-enforcement agencies, in my estimation," he said, "cannot be properly selected through a mere stereotyped examination. Particularly that is true in the FBI." Other federal detective forces are under civil service and their records in fighting crime are at least as successful as Hoover and his operatives, and more often superior.

Hoover's resistance to civil-service control is supported by Congress and he remains complete boss of his employees, controlled by no one, and is as autocratic a bureaucrat as can be found in government service.

The FBI, it has been asserted, has a reputation far beyond merit as a fighter against general crime. Hoover's yearly reports record its great successes, yet in an effort to gain greater appropriations he always announces a vast increase in crime and criminals with figures which are astounding, astronomical and contradictory.

Within a period of a little more than a year, he has declared in different speeches that there were 3 million active criminals, that "the criminal standing army of American" numbered 500,000, "a whole half million of armed thugs, murderers, thieves, firebugs, assassins, robbers and holdup men," that there were 3 1/2 million criminals and million and a half crimes committed, that there were 4,300,000 assorted criminals in the country, and at another time he stated that "one out of every twenty-five persons in the United States of America has at least had his brush with law-enforcement agencies and is inclined toward criminality."

### FBI Graduates

In the same address (April 23, 1936) just mentioned, he claimed that there were 150,000 murderers roaming the country; yet the FBI's own publication, *Uniform Crime Reports*, in a survey of 987 cities with a population of more than 35 million, recorded that there were "only 3,582 cases of criminal homicide, and, of these, 2,936 or 81.9 per cent had, according to the police, been cleared by arrest."

Newman Baker, secretary of the American Institute of Criminal Law and Criminology, said that as the FBI chief became "more and more famous . . . his statements became wider and wilder." And Lowenthal adds: "The figures show that of all the arrests effected and convictions secured by all law-enforcement agencies in the United States, the FBI's detectives contribute approximately one per cent."

But if other law-enforcement agencies have better records in fighting crime than the FBI, none has a superior publicity apparatus. So great is the reputation of the FBI that a great many of its agents have resigned their posts with Hoover and taken high-paying jobs in private industries. They often concentrate in the field of labor relations for the big corporations because this is, as *Business Week* once pointed out, a "natural for old grads" of the FBI.

## MURDER IN MEXICO

### The Assassination of Leon Trotsky

by General Sanchez Salazar  
in collaboration with Julian Gorkin

The story of the assassination of Trotsky written by the ex-Chief of the Secret Service of the Mexican police who was in charge of the investigation.

235 pages      \$2.50

Order from: LABOR ACTION BOOK SERVICE  
114 W. 14th St.      New York 11, N. Y.  
(Orders must be accompanied by payment)

A brilliant study of the labor movement—  
A vivid insight into a great union—

### "The UAW and Walter Reuther"

by Irving Howe and B. J. Widick

A Random House Book  
\$3.00  
Order from: LABOR ACTION BOOK SERVICE  
114 West 14 Street, New York

The outstanding example of this is John S. Bugas, for many years head of the Detroit branch of the FBI. He joined the Ford Motor Company as chief of its labor-relations department. *Business Week* added that he was successful in employing the "subtle tactics" taught him by the FBI against the United Auto Workers. Other FBI men have gone to work for employers' associations, such as the Waterfront Employers Association of San Francisco and the Association of American Railroads.

Knowing what the "education" of an agent consists of, it is easy to understand why employers' associations and large corporations will employ FBI agents. They come with special knowledge in dealing with labor and with a mental index of union militants, or "trouble-makers" as they are usually referred to by the FBI.

In this way, men join the FBI as a stepping stone to careers in business. The police mind and the police tradition thus marches into the industrial world, and the FBI, in turn, has its "friends" throughout industry making its industrial espionage work much simpler.

### Anthropology Suspect

But these are all minor aspects of the phenomenon known as the FBI. These activities are subsidiary to its role as defender of the social status quo and the enemy of progressive movements. That is why so much of its activities are in the realm of combating ideas, hunting out unpopular opinions, setting up a card-index system, keeping surveillance over organizations, movements, individuals, papers, magazines and books. It sets itself up as an ideological force, enjoying an independence that no other government bureau has.

To the FBI and its chief, J. Edgar Hoover, radical and subversive are equivalent. What is a radical? A liberal? A progressive? Whatever Hoover and his aides deem it to be, and should any movement or individual utter views which violate the concepts and precepts of the bureau's chief, such a movement and individual become immediately suspect. In our final installment of this review of Lowenthal's book, we shall deal directly with Hoover himself, but we can at least indicate what we mean by the following incident.

A House committee headed by Congressman Howard W. Smith of Virginia learned of one type of report which the bureau submitted in the investigation of opinions held by federal employees. The report which came before this committee was in the form of a letter written by Hoover to the National Labor Relations Board about one of its St. Louis branch office employees. Hoover informed the board that it is "reported that [the employee] has studied anthropology. . . . According to Lowenthal, Hoover set forth "one or two other items of a similar degree of relevance" and concluded: "The above information is submitted for your consideration and whatever action you deem appropriate."

What was Mr. Hoover's intention? Is anthropology suspect? subversive? radical? Did he think that the mere citing of this fact would add to the information of the NLRB about one of its employees? Or was it a not so subtle hint by Hoover in his know-nothing temper that the NLRB should get rid of the man or at least watch him with suspicion?

One thing is certain, it reflects Hoover's bias against anything intellectual, or any subject concerned with ideas, abstractions and generalizations. It reflects a pathological hatred of any field of investigation which deals with the societal development of mankind in which the truth of men's growth and development runs counter to the commonplace, the cliché, the bureaucrat's concept of life, people and social aims.

(Continued next week)

## Not in the Headlines

### They Won't Stay In Their Place

A report by the London Colonial Office complains that colonial students at British schools coming from "British territories in Africa are not studying subjects like agriculture but rather subjects like law and social science.

It would seem that the African students are seeking to learn from the British how to get rid of them.

So we learn from a review of the book by Stephen Naft in the *New Leader*.

### Ignoramus At Large

Apparently anyone can get a book published if it's a denunciation of communism. You don't even have to know anything.

Dutton has published *How to Win an Argument with a Communist* by a business publicity expert, Ray W. Sherman, who has compiled real stickers. One of them is the crusher that highly skilled workers in Russia are paid no more than less-skilled workers: the expert never even heard of the fact that Stalinism is characterized by a greater disparity in income levels than capitalism, nor of Stakhanovism.

Another is the claim that there are no churches in Russia: he does not know that the Kremlin uses the church as part of the apparatus of the state. And most

"I hated to use these words at the burial of some young man who was blown to pieces on the battlefield."

### Survey

A study published in the *American Political Science Review* for December comes up with the information that 10.3 per cent of the population is "very active" politically, and 72.9 per cent are either "inactive" (34.6 per cent) or "very inactive" (38.3 per cent).

# 25 Liberals and the War Crisis:

By HAL DRAPER

In a valuable special issue of *The Nation*, we have spread before us a panorama of programs and viewpoints on the present war situation and foreign policy, providing a cross-section of liberal opinion on this most important of issues of the day.

*The Nation* published it as its 85th anniversary number on December 16; a book-length symposium of 25 articles (plus an additional belated article in the following number) and 120 magazine pages.

The table of contents is impressive. Represented are Harold R. Isaacs, Owen Lattimore, Archibald MacLeish, R. H. S. Crossman, Fritz Sternberg, Freda Kirchwey, James P. Warburg, J. A. Del Vayo, Vera Micheles Dean, Isaac Deutscher, Grenville Clark, and Jean-Paul Sartre among others.

**It is a challenge to anyone's viewpoint. What do these prominent liberals have to say? What does liberalism have to offer in the world crisis of today?**

One's attention is naturally fixed on their positive programmatic and policy proposals—what they think should be done—and so is the attention of the magazine. The title of the symposium is indeed: "Peace with Russia—Can It Be Negotiated?" But their suggested remedies are preceded by diagnoses, and though we shall devote most space to the former, it is in regard to the latter that the articles are most often interesting.

Interesting it is that only one of the articles is specifically written within the framework of a defense of Washington's going foreign policy. Others among the participants in the symposium may also support it—it is sometimes hard to tell from what they write—but only H. Stuart Hughes, a professor at the Harvard Russian Research Center and author of *An Essay for Our Times*, goes out of his way to say so.

## Unique Test for "Lesser Evil"

Hughes presents three arguments in favor of his thesis that "the containment policy has proved itself." They are also his replies to the "original doubts" about this policy (the Truman Doctrine).

First, he argues, the containment policy has been able to keep Russia "contained." The date-line plays a trick on Hughes here, though the reader may rub his eyes. At the time he wrote the article, the Korean war was "hanging in the balance," and so he chalks it up to neither side. But China!

Hughes brushes away the Stalinist victory in the great land mass of Asia. He writes: "we leave aside the case of China—where the possibility of a non-Communist solution was already irretrievably lost at the time the containment policy was proclaimed. . . ." He gives no indication of how the containment policy would have or could have operated, if put into effect in time, to keep China off the Stalinist rolls. By military operations in China, as in Korea? It is well for his thesis that he leaves it aside. He is then able

to claim victory in the case of Greece and the Berlin airlift, and conclude that "the Western coalition has held its own during the last four years."

**His second point deserves to be framed. He takes up the "original doubt" that containment would "antagonize other peoples." It is enough to quote the heart of his rebuttal:**

**"Here the most relevant question to ask is this: which has antagonized more people—the policy of the United States or the policy of the Soviet Union?"**

It is a positive gem. In view of the question it is not very important to consider the answer. A liberal should be satisfied if his country beats fewer people over the head than the other fellow. As a formulation of the "lesser evil" viewpoint, it tells the story in a phrase.

## "Revolution, Please!"

But, as we said, Hughes is not typical of the *Nation* symposium; the predominant tone is one of criticism of U. S. foreign policy. The main line of criticism, sometimes stressed, sometimes merely mentioned or implied, does indeed go to the heart of the question. They point the finger at U. S. support of reactionary forces in all the hot spots of Asia and Europe; they show that the U. S. has failed to offer any political appeal to the peoples of the world to counter the Stalinist dynamic; it offers them nothing to fight for except "anti-Communism"; it is bucking, not backing, the Asian revolution, etc.

**Freda Kirchwey: "The meaning of it all boils down to this: In the present stage of American political development we seem almost incapable of doing what needs to be done in countries ripe for revolution. Where drastic reforms groove smoothly into the policy aims of Russia, they cut across the grain of normal American thinking and interests. To force the rapid expropriation of land, to oust a corrupt, oppressive ruling class, to give power to popular leaders; this would seem reckless, immoral, a surrender to the enemy. And behind these inhibitions is the most damaging one of all—the idea that small brown or yellow people are objects of contempt or, at best, humorous benevolence; in a word, Gooks."**

MacLeish puts it most vigorously and the emphasis in the following is his: we must recognize that "force is not the sole solution; that the effective answer to communism is military preparedness and an imaginative, courageous and vigorous American participation in the world revolution. . . ."

It is also the outstanding theme of one of the best contributions to the symposium, that of Isaacs.

## Crumbs for Hope

It would seem inevitable that anyone who has thought his way through to this point must ask the next questions: *Why* is it that the U. S. is a bastion of reaction in the world and not a friend of revolutionary strivings? What right is there to believe that it can become the latter, thus basically changing its entire social outlook and foreign policy?

Is it lack of imagination and courage, as MacLeish might be understood to imply? This is simply not politics. Kirchwey even says that "drastic reforms . . . cut across the grain of normal American thinking and interests." How a word can be used to obscure a thought!

**What is "normal" in the U. S. are the ideas and interests of a ruling capitalist class which is the only flourishing specimen of a social system which is decadent and falling apart in most of the world. It takes a deal of "imagination" to base one's program on an appeal to such a class to transform itself into a vanguard of revolution, when its preoccupation is how to maintain its very existence against popular strivings.**

Only Isaacs, of the writers who stress this theme, even undertakes to discern rays of hope that such a fantastic transformation is realistically possible. "American policy-makers have moved a little way" in that direction, he thinks: "Dean Acheson has spoken several times of identifying this country with the Asian revolutions. President Truman has told us that at Wake he undertook to impress upon General MacArthur that Asia is 'more than a military problem,' and at San Francisco he said again that what the United States wanted to do was to help Asians raise their standard of living."

It would be unkind to say more about this "evidence" than Isaacs adds himself—"our trouble is not the words; it is the actions to suit them"—and to note that Isaacs can find no actions to point to. One must say also, however, that even in the realm of words, notoriously cheap as they are, the paltry few and vague generalizations that give Isaacs a crumb of hope are remarkable mainly for their scarcity. Here indeed, in the realm of words, the administration's lack of imagination is relevant: a more imaginative leadership of American imperialism would be less chary with its verbal bouquets to the aspirations of the peoples of the world.

The Kirchwey-MacLeish-Isaacs criticism of U. S. foreign policy which we are noting is the most intelligent writing in the symposium. It is the *beginning* of a foreign policy, of a program to solve the world crisis. In their hands, it flounders away into a bare appeal to the ruling powers to change their spots. It becomes a utopian dream, unrealistic, starry-eyed, visionary, impractical and out of touch with reality. Not because its sponsors are out of touch with reality but because their self-imposed but unexpressed limitation is: how to beat Stalinism on the basis of supporting capitalism in the West.

## To Live with Stalinism

It is capitalism that the overwhelming majority of the peoples have known and grown to hate. The source of Stalinism's dynamism is that it is able to make an anti-capitalist appeal in words and action: it is anti-socialist and a new reactionary exploiting society, and therefore we must crush it; but it is also anti-capitalist, and therefore it can appeal to the peoples, who may not find out that it is also their enemy until they have had experience under its heel. Its victory is not inevitable, but it is not capitalism that will be accepted as an alternative to it. The peoples of Asia and Europe can be stirred to active resistance against Stalinism only on the basis of fighting for a world which is neither capitalist nor Stalinist, a world of socialist democracy.

But at least the Kirchwey-MacLeish-Isaacs articles (among the participants in the *Nation* symposium) raise the question of *how to beat Stalinism*. This is not the policy orientation of the majority of the contributors. It is not the question to which they direct their articles. And more's the pity.

**The preoccupation of most of the contributors is: How to live with Stalinism, in effect how to make a deal with it.**

In the interests of peace, of course. There is only one article which is pro-Stalinist in tone and thinking—that by *The Nation's* foreign editor, Del Vayo, who urbanely whitewashes Russia's role in the cold war. (Isaac Deutscher's article might be added by some as another.) But the piteousness of the positive liberal thinking on the war crisis, as represented in this symposium, is concentrated in its whole approach to the problem as being one of how to *negotiate* a peace deal with the Kremlin.

## The "Deal" Delusion

It is *The Nation* itself that set this theme, of course, as indicated by its formulation of the subject. And if Kirchwey, the editor of *The Nation*, and MacLeish are two of those who even raised the question of how to beat Stalinism, it is also these two who present, as their conclusion for action, a negotiated deal.

Harold Isaacs alone rejects this solution, and his passage on it stands as an unrefuted commentary on the sotheadedness of the main body of the contributors:

**"In the present state of the power struggle there is nothing realistic about seeking 'cooperation' from Russia or a settlement that can be negotiated across a conference table. To begin with, there is no such thing as an abstractly reasonable settlement of a power conflict. In the nature of it, there can only be shifts in the relationship of force. 'Deals' in this situation are necessarily fragile and are usually at the expense of other peoples who in this day and age are disconcertingly unwilling to bear the cost."**

In another place, he makes an elementary point which—alas—is so pointedly absent throughout the others' pages: "It is not a matter of what Russians and Americans can agree on, but of what the Asian peoples themselves need and of what they need to do. It is not a matter

# The 'Nation' Symposium on Peace

of defining the terms and boundaries of a new Russian-American balance of power, but of advancing the cause of a new global balance in human affairs. . . ."

Negotiated deals can only be one aspect, one method, one stage of the cold war—as I write, the U. S. has plumped for a negotiated deal with China as a result of its disaster in Korea; it has nothing to do with a program to solve the war crisis of our times. It is even false to think of negotiated deals as a means of postponing the war; the relationship is the other way around: the need by both U. S. and Russian imperialism to postpone the showdown is what makes possible negotiated deals, to organize the delay.

Above all, no real liberal, let alone socialist, can take any responsibility for any deal between the Big Two over the backs of the peoples, the only kind of deal which is possible. Demanding that the United Nations be the broker to patch up the deal adds nothing to the respectability of the project.

## The "Fear" Theory

**Article after article in the *Nation* symposium demands a negotiated peace, and not one raises the question of WHAT deal, with what give-and-take, what quid-pro-quo, would mean "peace with honor" for the liberal adviser.**

This is understandable on the part of those who do, in fact, view a negotiated deal as only an aspect of an unresolved cold war. As Hughes writes, "preparation for war and preparation for negotiation are essentially the same thing"—that is, any negotiation takes place as a demarcation of the then existing state of military strength, and is not worth a penny when the latter changes; meanwhile, each party to the deal frantically arms to the teeth in order to change the relationship of forces which underlay the deal. . . .

It is also understandable on the part of those who do not have even a glimmering of what the cold war is being fought over, and who think that the present imbrogio is merely an unfortunate misunderstanding. This, for example, is true of the world-federalists in general and of James P. Warburg's article in particular. Their diagnosis is simple: there is a cold war going on because the U. S. and Russia are afraid of each other; it is fear psychosis, nothing deeper; the only thing we have to fear is fear itself; the solution is to reassure all parties concerned.

The existing world-federalist movement (the United World Federalist tendency, represented in the symposium by both Warburg and Grenville Clark) has converted the great idea of world-federalism into a mere grandiose scheme to provide an organization framework for a negotiated deal. Their program depends upon that. Russia must be included in a world state, they say, or else the whole scheme is not only useless but dangerous; there is no reason they know of why Stalin should not be willing to give up national sovereignty, once his jitters are calmed down.

## Naiveté and Illusions

The world-federalists are forced into this childish naiveté since they are organized to bring about world government through the existing governments.

**"To say that such a transformation of the United Nations [into a world government] would be vetoed by Russia," writes Warburg, "is no answer to the challenge which confronts us." That is very true; it merely shows that Warburg has no answer to the challenge that confronts us.**

Vera Micheles Dean closes her article with the sentence: "The objective of world government can be achieved, but only after experience has demonstrated to the great powers that they cannot control the apparatus of international organization for their own ends, no matter how praiseworthy these ends might be."

Thus far, however, the U. S. has been reasonably successful in getting what it wants from the UN; where is there any indication of contrary experience?

The advocates of world-federalism are, therefore, able to view a negotiated deal as a *solution* to the world crisis *only* because of their naive view of what the crisis is about. That excuse, if it is one, can hardly be made for a Claude Bourdet, whose article puts forward the theory of

the "scared men in the Kremlin," scared and irritated by Western encirclement, to whom the Atlantic Pact is a "provocation."

If negotiated deals are to be viewed as a *solution*, it can only be on the basis of the view that, in spite of their antagonisms, it is possible for Western capitalism and Stalinism to coexist peacefully in the same world, indefinitely. This theory is specifically argued for by Isaac Deutscher and R. H. S. Crossman, the British Labor Party "left-winger."

## Fabianism Upside-Down

Crossman's argumentation, what there is of it, for the possibility of peaceful coexistence is curious: "Our brand of socialism, compounded of practical Fabianism and Christian principle, has always been skeptical of Marxist dialecticians eager to prove that there is an inherent contradiction in capitalism and that gradualism is impossible. . . . We are not likely, therefore, to take the ex-Communists [Burnham and Koestler] very seriously when they turn Marx upside down and 'prove' the inevitability of war and the inherent impossibility of Communist and non-Communist states existing alongside one another."

Fabianism, turned upside down by Crossman, thereupon becomes belief in the inevitability of gradualness of *self-reform of the Russian regime*. And meanwhile?

**Meanwhile the cold war is not altogether to be regretted: "The cold war, in fact, is not only a menace but a creative force. If the Fair Dealer and the Socialist understand their job, the cold war will enable us to reconstruct the non-Communist world in a way that would have been totally impossible had the Russians been willing to work with us peacefully in 1945. Russian collaboration at that time would certainly have precipitated a world slump and removed any possibility of the American aid which has provided so many of the physical resources for the British Socialist experiment."**

Crossman's dateline is also unfortunate: Fair Dealer Truman clearly does not understand his job, for his latest message to Congress virtually dumps the Fair Deal down a gun barrel. Or perhaps it is Crossman who does not understand the Fair Dealers.

In any case, Crossman looks forward to a wonderful world with a practically permanent cold war—"We have got to realize that the cold war will outlast our lifetime, and may become even more intense as the forces of liberalism grow stronger in the West"—so that American capitalism will continue to finance British "so-

cialism." He does not expect any general settlement for a long, long time, though he advocates limited deals every now and then. We have every right to say, on the basis of his article, that he would be a mightily chagrined man if real peace were to break out suddenly.

Isaac Deutscher also makes a plea for peaceful coexistence. He does not mean *very* peaceful coexistence, however; he looks to a permanent state of armed peace:

**"Armed peace, however, is not war. It is not even cold war. It implies settlement of differences among the powers by negotiation, even if the negotiators have to parley with atomic bombs in their hands."**

It is unclear to me whether Deutscher is arguing that such a state of armed peace can last indefinitely, or merely that it is a possibility for a period ahead. He seems to be saying, as a matter of fact, that if only it can be maintained (precariously, what with the negotiators juggling the atomic bombs in their hands as they gesture) for some sufficient period, it could then last indefinitely—because it would lead to the self-reform of Russian totalitarianism and perhaps even to a progressive change in U. S. imperialism. Deutscher's illusions about Stalinism are clearer in his well-known biography of Stalin. He views negotiated peace as a *solution* to the world crisis only because of such illusions.

## The Common Denominator

This is what the liberal panel convoked by *The Nation* has to offer. We venture the opinion that, on grounds of sheer realism and practicality alone, the Independent Socialist program to stop both Stalinism and war stands out like a beacon in comparison.

It has, of course, a fatal defect in the eyes of liberal thinkers such as those *The Nation* has presented. These liberals have a vivid imagination, but one which goes only just so far. Some of them find no difficulty in imagining that American capitalism can so far change its soul as to become the vanguard of the world revolution—no less. Others just as vividly imagine a democratic transformation on the part of the totalitarian despots who rule Russia.

**None of them, however, can imagine the people rising on their own to take their fate in their own hands, without waiting for the blessed transfiguration to take place—taking their fate into their own hands as against both capitalism and Stalinism. It is their common denominator. They turn for their solutions to the powers-that-be, not to the power that will be the people's in that hour.**

YOU CAN'T AFFORD TO MISS

## The NEW INTERNATIONAL

The Leading Marxist Magazine in the United States

A few of the important articles that appeared in *The New International* during 1950:

Is Russia a Socialist Community?—*Debate between Earl Browder and Max Shachtman.*  
The Diary of Victor Serge.  
Four Portraits of Stalinism: Duranty, Shub, Wolfe and Deutscher, by *Max Shachtman.*  
"1984"—Utopia Reversed, by *Irving Howe.*  
Verdict on the Moscow Trials, by *Albert Gates.*  
Asia Enters World History, by *Jack Brad and Henry Judd.*

Korea and U. S. Foreign Policy, by *J. M. Fenwick.*

The Political War for Korea, by *Jack Brad.*  
The Scientist in a Time of Terror, by *Carl Barton.*  
Trotsky in Paris: World War I, by *Alfred Rosmer.*  
The Nature of Titoism, by *Hal Draper and H. F.*  
After Korea—What? by *T. N. Vance.*  
The Constituent Assembly in Russia, by *Saul Berg.*  
The January-February 1951 issue will be out soon. Be sure to get it by subscribing at—

ONLY \$2.00 A YEAR

## If You're—

- Against capitalism
- Against Stalinism
- For a Socialist Democracy

You belong with the—

INDEPENDENT  
SOCIALIST LEAGUE

You should read—

Max Shachtman's  
"THE FIGHT FOR  
SOCIALISM"

For information and literature, write to:  
Independent Socialist League  
114 West 14 St. New York 11, N. Y.

# Truman Plan and 'Equality' --

(Continued from page 1)

capable of making to military purposes. This will be particularly true of the durable consumer-goods industries like household appliances, automobiles, etc.

Your standard of living will be cut down by several methods.

First, if Congress carries out Truman's proposals, your taxes will rise considerably higher than they were during the peak of the last war. At the present tax rate it is estimated that a deficit of almost sixteen and a half billion dollars would remain. The president proposes to increase taxes further to cover this deficit, and to go as high as \$20 billion over the present figures if necessary. Most of this increase in money will come from the middle- and low-income groups.

### SIPHONING OFF

Secondly: Your wages will be frozen. And from all indications, ways and means will be sought to siphon off into savings whatever increases in income you may earn through longer hours of work. From the vague phrases on this score contained in the economic and budget messages it is quite likely that some form of compulsory savings is being considered (such as increased social-security deductions or payroll deductions for government bonds).

Thirdly: With whatever money you have left after your taxes and "savings" have been taken off the top you will be able to buy fewer goods and poorer goods than you could buy now for the same money.

An armament program of the size proposed would inevitably lower the standard of living of the nation, regardless of the kind of government which carried it out. Independent socialists regard the foreign policy of the government as fundamentally reactionary. By this we mean that it seeks to maintain throughout the world the outlived system of capitalism. In its life-and-death struggle with the new exploiting totalitarian system of Stalinism it can make no effective social appeal to the masses of people in the world, and hence can only seek to win through preparation for a purely military victory in World War III.

### QUESTION OF LABOR

As the labor movement supports the government's foreign policy of containing Stalinism primarily through military means, it cannot avoid support for the armament program and hence for the lowering of the standard of living of the workers. Yet given this support, the question still remains: Will the labor movement put up a fight for the maximum protection of the interests of the workers within the context of the armament program?

The government's price policy has already taken a tremendous cut out of the standard of living of the workers. Ever since the war started in Korea, the labor movement has been calling more or less loudly for price controls. The 81st Congress passed a law which linked wage controls to price controls so closely that the

labor movement lost much of its fervor for price controls.

The result of the government's failure to impose a price freeze immediately has been a rapid rise in retail prices, and a veritable avalanche of wholesale price increases which are already beginning to move into the retail field. In the face of the continued failure to freeze prices, while demanding that the inflation be stopped through heavy taxation and a future wage and price freeze, the government has made it possible for the owners of capital to take a big fall out of the rest of the population before the struggle for "equality of sacrifice" has been officially declared open.

### ONE-SIDED INCENTIVES

In the economic message the president speaks in general terms of the necessity for each section of the population to accept sacrifices. For the capitalists this means: "While profits should not be taxed to the extent which would jeopardize production or destroy incentives, businessmen cannot expect to retain profits on the scale which would be expected during normal peacetime prosperity."

With the memory of the last war still fresh, few people will believe that profit limitations will be a serious obstacle to the capitalists. The government is already offering "incentives" to the capitalists in the form of tax rebates and inflated depreciation charges. This will be followed by cost-plus contracts and all the other methods of milking the public treasury which our patriotic businessmen demand before they will permit a single gun or a tank to be made in their factories for the government.

As for the workers, they are supposed to produce without "incentives" . . . as usual: "Workers . . . must seek the jobs which need doing . . . instead of the jobs which may be most pleasant in the locations which are most convenient. They must accept restraints and controls upon wages, designed to prevent wage increases which would be attainable if more goods were being produced for wage earners to buy. While the right to bargain collectively will be preserved, workers—along with management—must find ways to settle disputes without stopping essential production."

What will the labor movement do in this situation? These proposals to shackle labor are being made not by the Republicans, but by their "friends" in politics, the administration. The failure to freeze prices is not a product of Republican conservatism but of the Democratic administration which labor supports.

### SOCIAL MEASURES

Along with the businessmen's mobilization which the government is carrying out, the president's message proposes a number of social measures which are fundamentally progressive. These sections of the budget message have come under attack, as was to be expected, by the Republican and Dixiecratic factions in Congress.

The president urges the formation of a fair employment



practices commission to combat discrimination in employment against minority groups. He proposed a compulsory medical-insurance program; an expanded system of nursery schools to care for the children of working mothers, and the adoption of some form of the Brannan plan which is designed to maintain farm subsidies which will not increase food prices.

All of these proposals are good. Yet labor will not get them by "backing the president" any more than the workers will be able to resist the lowering of their standard of living or will achieve "equality of sacrifice" by backing the present administration.

These demands will be achieved only if labor puts up a real economic-political fight for them. In the struggle against discrimination Congress can be made to act only if it becomes clear that the Negro people and significant sections of the labor movement will not be fooled by demands for "national unity" into further sacrificing their democratic rights. This applies equally to the whole struggle against the capitalists who would enrich themselves while the living standards of the workers continue to drop; to the struggle against rent increases; against the speedup—in general against the attempt to break down the hard-won rights of the workers under the false slogan of "equality of sacrifice."

In the mouths of the government and of the employers this slogan is false. If the labor movement is not to betray its very reason for existence, it must fight for its rights all along the line, with the clear understanding that both its "friends" and its enemies in Congress will be arrayed against it.

# U. S. Backs Down --

(Continued from page 1)

nations in the Western bloc, there is a smaller stake in and a greater reluctance to risk a third world war.

Hence the considered opinion of the more serious journalists is that the U. S. backed down in consideration of the necessity of unity in its own camp.

### MAO RIDES HIGH

There is no guarantee that Mao, especially in his present favorable position, will agree even to the watered-down proposals. It will depend upon how much a seat in the UN—and the undoubted political and moral victory attached thereto—is worth to him. He may bargain over a removal of the Seventh Fleet from Formosa as a condition of acceptance.

Whatever the outcome, the United States has lost the first round militarily, and what is overwhelmingly more important, has suffered a political defeat in its intervention in Korea. It must indeed give heart to many Asians—the long-despised "yellow races" and victims of the "white man's burden"—to see the giant of the West, inheritor and arch-representative of all the old imperialisms, brought to bay by the quilted armies of Mao.

This victory will certainly give more than a filip to the world fortunes of Stalinism! It is already reported that one of the motivations for a speedy conclusion of a peace treaty on the part of the United States with Japan is to forestall any sympathetic leanings among the Japanese governing circles for the Chinese. If the

Chinese drive the U. S.-UN forces into the sea and spur the Stalinist Viet-Minh forces to victory over the French in Indo-China, Chinese Stalinism will be a truly formidable continental bastion against the Western powers.

As the cease-fire proposals of the UN become more moderated and the defeat becomes a rout, the Stalinist shouts of victory become louder. For the Asians, their victory means only the replacement of an old exploiter by a new one.

### You're Invited

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

By LEON TROTSKY

## Marxism in the United States

35 Cents . . . . . Order from Independent Socialist Press 114 West 14 Street New York 11, N. Y.

### Get Acquainted!

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

- I want more information about the Socialist Youth League.
- I want to join the Socialist Youth League.

NAME.....

ADDRESS.....

CITY.....ZONE.....STATE.....

SCHOOL (IF STUDENT).....