

LABOR ACTION

Independent Socialist Weekly

APRIL 16, 1951

FIVE CENTS

MACARTHUR MELODRAMA

... page 2

UAW CONVENTION: NEW TRENDS

... page 6

Yugoslavia Slips Into U. S. Bloc

... page 5

An Open Letter "To Our Friends in Asia"



MAX SHACHTMAN

Nineteen Americans who, "although connected with different political groups or parties in the United States, are democratic socialists by conviction," have addressed an appeal "To Our Friends in Asia," which is reproduced for discussion in the February 11, 1951, issue of *Janata*, the newspaper of the Socialist Party of India. The signers include such old, as well as recent, converts to "democratic socialism" as August Claessens, William Bohn, Harry Laidler, Clarence Senior, Norman Thomas, J. B. S. Hardman, and, in their latest incarnations, of course, Upton Sinclair, Sidney Hook and James T. Farrell.

It is not their intention, they say at the outset, "to discuss war in Korea and the crisis in the Far East comprehensively," except to "testify that, in the minds of the American people, our intervention in Korea in support of the UN and its beginning of world law against military aggression in no way was a drive for imperialist profit or power." We would go further, at the outset, and add that no war, as The Nineteen so imprudently call Truman's "police actions," has been so unpopular and so unsupported in modern times by the American people who were no more consulted in the launching of it than was their Congress or the United Nations itself. But for the moment we will not dwell on the delicate question of Korea either, although for different reasons than those of The Nineteen. They are concerned with other matters.

U. S. Capitalism Is Not Imperialist

"World peace and an understanding of its problems are unnecessarily complicated by the honest but mistaken opinion which we have so often heard to the effect that American imperialism may at the moment be less objectionable in its methods than Soviet imperialism, but that imperialism is imperialism, and true lovers of peace and freedom should stand clear of both forms of it. This theory may seem plausible in the light of the history of imperialism and the obvious and undeniable faults of our imperfect American democracy. Yet it is, we submit, incorrect in the light of the facts. The outstanding conflict today is between democracy with all its human and capitalist imperfections, and totalitarian despotism."

These words sum up the contentions and purpose of the writers of the appeal. The purpose, at any rate, is clear: it is to enlist the true lovers of peace and freedom, of whom there are so many in India in particular, on the side of the imperfect American democracy in its cold and soon-not-so-cold war with Stalinist Russia, by disabusing them of the honest but decidedly mistaken idea that they "should stand clear"—that is, remain as independent as the Indians want to be—of both sides. Why mistaken? Because while it is true that Stalinism is despotic and imperialistic (on this score The Nineteen are right) in light of the facts, it seems, American capitalism, though it has its blemishes, mind you, is democratic and, what is more important, it is not imperialistic. These are such good tidings in these harsh times that they deserve the added publicity we can give them!

"The development of American capitalism has not led to imperialism; it does not fulfil Lenin's theory of imperialism."

By
MAX SHACHTMAN

An open letter, entitled "To Our Friends in Asia," from nineteen Americans was published in the February 11 issue of *Janata*, official organ of the Socialist Party of India. The issues and arguments presented in this letter are of first-rate importance, as they touch on the core of socialist strategy in the world today. The following article by Max Shachtman, chairman of the Independent Socialist League, is a reply to the letter of The Nineteen.

The following signed the letter to *Janata*: Daniel Bell, Lewis Corey, James T. Farrell, J. B. S. Hardman, Pyrrus Hopkins, Sol Levitas, Reinhold Niebuhr, Clarence Senior, Tucker Smith, Norman Thomas, William Bohn, August Claessens, Harry Fleischman, Sidney Hook, Harry W. Laidler, Aaron Levenstein, A. Phillip Randolph, Upton Sinclair, and Mark Starr.—Ed.

ism as the inevitable last stage of capitalism. The greatest bloc in the way of greater and more fraternal American cooperation in a world-wide war against want is born not of an imperialist drive for profit but of the old isolationism. The Marshall Plan was not a project of capitalists who see in it a necessary condition of the survival of their system. On the contrary, the most reactionary capitalist groups, like the National Association of Manufacturers and the interests for which the powerful *Chicago Tribune* speaks, were luke-warm or hostile to the plan. The Republican Party leaders who most vigorously champion capitalism today do not seek imperial expansion through forced investments, but are generally opposed to any great extension of American economic aid abroad."

And we are reminded that "as far back as the administration of the very conservative Republican president, Calvin Coolidge, (Americans) began to discover that imperialism, including dollar diplomacy backed by U. S. Marines, didn't pay." And further, that "Dwight Morrow, who had been a member of the famous banking House of Morgan, reversed the policy of aggressive support of American investment." And a little more of the same.

America, America!

Blessed, happy land! Tender, noble land! Just and generous land! That is our United States. What else can we call a land that has so long been free from the greatest curse of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries—imperialism—the curse that drove other lands, but not ours, to fatten on the blood, toil and tears of hundreds of millions? And by "ours," we mean not only ourselves. Free from the curse is Truman; is the Democratic Party, (plus or minus the "democratic socialists by conviction"); is even the Republican Party, the most vigorous champion of capitalism today; is even the *Chicago Tribune* and Col. McCormick, who cannot be made to stir an inch outside of Cook County, let alone the frontiers of the U. S. A.; is even the National Association of Manufacturers and the House of Morgan, to say nothing of the saintly Coolidge.

Not only is it a land that takes nothing from other peoples. Better yet: it gives freely of its substance. "It is a matter of record that the U. S. government has spent on relief and rehabilitation in Europe and Asia since the war \$36,500,000,000 . . . this expenditure, for which no economic or political concessions were exacted, is completely out of line with the Leninist theory of imperialism."

And what makes possible this triumphant defiance of Lenin's theory? This:

"Countries like Great Britain, France, Belgium, The Netherlands, and Germany, were in their home territories limited in extent and lacked a great many of the natural resources necessary for capitalist development. They were thus far more strongly impelled than the U. S. to seek in industrially backward regions sources of supply of raw materials and opportunities for profitable investment. The U. S. had a great internal free trade market and such enormous natural resources that today she is an exporter of raw materials as well as of manufactured goods. The economic facts of life in America were and are very different from the facts in Europe which led Lenin to formulate his theory of imperialism."

That being that, it obviously behooves the lovers of peace and freedom in India to range themselves on the side of the United States in the war with Stalinist Russia and stop this mistaken and nonsensical business of standing clear of both. It is hard to imagine a stronger appeal to the Indian people by the State Department or, for that matter, by the National Association of Manufacturers, even though they are both indifferent, if not downright hostile, to imperialism.

Let us be serious now with the statement of The Nineteen. It is not easy, but we will try. A serious try means, first of all, to ignore their scholarly references to Lenin's theory of imperialism. The few who read it a long time ago have forgotten what it said, to say nothing of what they themselves once said. The others, not having read it, had nothing to forget.

Lenin indicated that there were different types of capitalist imperialism, British colonial imperialism being one, what he called the usury imperialism of France being another, and the imperialism of Germany, which had virtually no colonies, being a third type. American capitalism has indeed had a unique evolution, due to its specific geographical, material and historical circumstances, but that has only meant that its imperialism is of still another type—differing from the others not in its fundamental nature but only in the forms it has taken, just as the forms themselves have differed from stage to stage.

U. S. Imperialism Is Different

American imperialism appeared on the scene as a dominant world power not when Britain, France, Holland and Belgium did, but only in comparatively recent times. Socialists interested in contributing to a real understanding of American capitalism would analyze its rise precisely in relation to these times. U. S. imperialism rose to power in a period when the Russian Revolution removed one-sixth of the world from the field of capitalist exploitation and expansion, thereby dealing the old world of capitalist imperialism its first crippling blow; when the rest of the capitalist world emerged from the first world war in a state of impoverishment, exhaustion and even collapse, leaving the U. S. A. as the only victor in the war, the only one to come out of it stronger economically and politically and in a position to place and keep the other capitalist nations on their knees; when the traditional lands of colonial oppression and exploitation began their political awakening and self-emancipation which, by now, in 1951, has made the restoration and maintenance of the old capitalist empires in Asia, Africa and Latin America extraordinarily difficult and in some cases utterly impossible; when the social-revolutionary struggle of the working class in Europe continues intermittently but irrepressibly to prevent the establishment of a capitalist equilibrium anywhere in the world.

These circumstances do more to determine the form of American imperialism than any of the superficialities (Turn to last page)

The MacArthur Melodrama: Both Parties Evade Real Issue in U. S. Foreign Policy

By Mary BELL

Underneath the storm of political passion over the dismissal of General Douglas MacArthur, the punditry of editorialists and radio commentators, the enraged cries of "appeaser!" or "aggressor!" the parades, the swirling ticker-tape, the rise and fall of sympathy for the deposed hero, is the issue: *peace or war.*

There are other issues, some important, some unimportant, some genuine, some false. But the overriding one in the United States, Asia and Europe is war itself.

The recommendation for an extension of the war on the part of MacArthur in the fatal letter read by Republican leader Joseph Martin was an aspect of this issue. Having been out of line with the administration many times previously in the course of the Korean war, MacArthur called for a new foreign policy by the United States: the opening of a second front on the Chinese mainland by Chiang Kai-shek's Formosa troops and United States concentration in Asia rather than in Europe. This was the final straw that broke the General.

DEMOCRATIC ISSUE

Aside from the policy dispute, there is an important question of democracy at stake, the question of the subordination of the military to the civilian authority. One is not concerned here with a mere constitutional formula but with a real, democratic principle. The making of policy by the military, rather than the civilian authority, is antithetical to democracy, even if that authority is a capitalist one.

The MacArthur personality is important only in a minor sense. (We cannot refrain from quoting a remark attributed by the *New York Times* to one of MacArthur's aides when the dismissal notice giving the General authority to issue orders necessary to travel to the place of his selection was read. The aide said bitterly, "Why didn't Truman say 'To Elba'?") The strutting, the posturing, the attempts to be the modern-day proconsul undoubtedly led to the independence from the administration, the state department and the Pentagon. MacArthur's entire career, from West Point high honor student through the firing on the bonus marchers and the supreme commandship of Japan, is marked with military megalomania. Yet Truman, up to the present time, let him play his independent role in Korea, recommend the use of Formosa as an American base, complain about the "enormous handicap, without precedent in military history," of not being able to bomb Manchurian bases, etc.

An indication of the MacArthur petulance and the direction of his political emphasis is contained in part of the Joe Martin letter:

"It seems strangely difficult for some to realize that here in Asia is where the Communist conspirators have elected to make their play for global conquest, and that we have joined the issue thus raised on the battlefield; that here we fight Europe's war with arms while the diplomats there still fight with words. . . ." (*New York Times*, April 15.)

HUNGER FOR OFFICE

So far as the political content of the dispute between Democrat and Republican, there is more than a little suspicion that the Republicans have latched on to the MacArthur incident. Many of their yelps against administration policy are strictly from hunger . . . for office. The Republican Party today is a strange medley, including the "internationalist" wing which differs in no essential from the Democrats, the midwestern isolationists and their allies,

the Wherry-Capehart-Dirkens know-nothings, the Luce interests which look upon Asia as the "wave of the future" and the Taft opportunists with their isolationist roots. Senator Hubert Humphrey remarked appropriately that it was an " . . . attempt to be isolationist in Europe and internationalist in Asia."

Taft's enthusiasm for MacArthur has been tempered with the caution of a potentially rival office-seeker. He defended Truman's "right" to fire MacArthur, but challenged his wisdom. He clarified his Yale speech to make certain that the public understood that in carrying the war into China he was for the use of Chiang's Chinese troops, not "our boys."

Up till yesterday, despite all the hue and cry from the Republicans about "appeasement" in China, none had come forth with a resolution for a declaration of war on China. The Democrats threatened to call their bluff by submitting one of their own, and thus force the Republicans to show their hand. They were saved the trouble by Republican Senator Cain of Washington who, in a moment of extreme enthusiasm, honesty, or perhaps, as the *New York Post* suggests, on account of the heat of the TV floodlamps, said he would propose a declaration of war by the United States against China. The Republicans are still trying to explain him away. Cain, in spite of himself, succeeded in taking the measure of Republican seriousness

Democracy is Issue in Reading USW Local

The seven-week-old strike of American Chain and Cable Co. workers, members of Local 2715, United Steel Workers of America (CIO), was ended on February 18, 1951 under the pressure of a virtual dictatorial command given by George Medrick, District Director, who repeated his 1946 performance of intervening to compel the workers to return to the job under humiliating circumstances and with little substance of real victory.

Without the elementary vision of co-ordinating the struggles of all the workers employed by the American Chain and Cable Company in various cities, the international leadership, through its district staff, has sacrificed the interests of the Reading local on numerous occasions, with the result that the workers in the Reading plant have missed out on 2 general wage increases.

FORCED BACK TO WORK

Now, after weeks of grueling strike action, the local has been forced to return to work under the terms of a settlement that they could have obtained without any strike at all. Most workers agree that had the strike been prolonged much better terms could have been wrested from the company. Furthermore, an extension of the strike would have found the company running to Washington, begging that the superior terms so gained be approved by the Wage Stabilization Director immediately, so that production could be started.

As matters stand now, the Wage Stabilization Board is asked to approve a 16 1/2 cent an hour increase and 6 paid holidays. The auxiliary question of a restudy of the burning bay welders was settled by the union agreeing to such a restudy. The unit piece work system in operation in this plant is based upon 60 units per hour for day work rates. The burning bay welders were guaranteed 96 units per hour whether produced or not. This was equivalent to guaranteeing them 96 units as an hourly rate.

about its Asian program and its fight against the Truman administration.

There can be no doubt of the hypocrisy and opportunism of the Republicans on this issue. But the Democrats, too, are engaging in a bit of hypocrisy of their own when they now try to palm themselves off as the "party of peace."

POT AND KETTLE

For—the United States is fighting in Asia, at least in the Korean sector, and this is a Democratic dilemma, as well as a Republican one. The Republicans try to saddle the Democrats with the responsibility for the Korean fiasco and play with urging an extension of the war to bring about the defeat of Stalinism. The Democrats reply that the "police action" was a necessary lesson for Stalinism and urge a "limited war" and an "honorable peace."

It happens to be a fact that the administration embarked on the war in response to the North Korean-Stalinist aggression in an area which the administration had written off as being outside the American sphere of influence.

Both parties argue that their program is the way to defeat Stalinism. The Republicans would risk a Third World War if their extension of the war were carried out, aside from involving the United States troops in a war of unpredictable length and outcome with China. They would risk the intervention of Russia at a time when the United States has not reached the height of its stock-

piling and war preparations.

Yet, the real question, as we said at the outset, is the issue of peace or war. How to end the war in Korea? Neither Truman nor MacArthur proposes anything that is remotely like a solution. The Operation Meatgrinder in Korea could continue indefinitely. That is, the "limited war" of Truman could continue snuffing out Chinese and American lives, as well as those of their allies, at the same steady rate. It could gradually slough over into World War III.

The domestic political controversy over foreign affairs which momentarily revolves around different military tactics and objectives, exposes the fundamental weakness of the whole of American policy toward Stalinism. Why the North Korean aggression in the first place? Why the intervention by the troops of Mao Tse-Tung? Why the ease with which the Kremlin master-minds the entire Iron Curtain empire? And, in Europe, why the sentiment for peace, the neutralism, the applause when MacArthur was removed?

CAPITALIST BLINDNESS

Capitalism cannot see that it is fighting an adversary which gains allegiance and strength precisely because it is anti-capitalist at a time when capitalism is out-moded and doomed everywhere. It is chauvinistic blindness of the ruling class and its spokesmen that cause them to think this is the weakness of Stalinism. Be-

cause it cannot see this, its program against Stalinism is incapable of combatting it effectively on other grounds, except military. The most poignant instance today of this blindness is the grain famine in India. Nehru reported recently on the famine-stricken people in the State of Bihar. One million tons of grain are needed immediately. Yet the House Rules Committee in this country has again shelved the grain-to-India bill. Meanwhile, China and Russia are offering grain to India, on a barter basis which India can ill afford. What a magnificent opportunity for the United States to win a friend in need, except that India's foreign policy is not to American liking.

Yes, the Truman administration wants to win the "limited war" in the Far East, wants to prevent further involvement of the Chinese. This it proposes to do—as an ally of the indescribably corrupt Chiang Kai-shek, who was booted out and replaced by the totalitarian puppet, Mao. Unfortunately, the Chinese masses preferred to flee to evils that they know not of rather than cling to the one they know so well.

So, the "Great Debate" into which has stepped the figure of MacArthur rages on the surface only, and only reflects the fundamental anxiety of the people of the country over the war. With a government based on the outlived artifice of the two-party system, the arguments can only juggle back and forth without expressing the popular desire for peace.

fire and flood and have very few desertions.

But what is the real record of the officers of Local 2715? The Executive Board sits as a permanent censorship and disciplinary body over the local, ready to strike down anything that doesn't fit into the corners of their smug, suspicious minds. Instead of promoting and encouraging the activities of the various committees of the local, it threatens them with censorship and thus prevents any creative activity.

The Educational Committee is a glaring example. It found very little sympathetic co-operation, and was harassed at every point with obstacle upon obstacle placed in the way of its promising possibilities. Finally, finding it intolerable to operate under repressive conditions, some of the leading members of the Educational Committee resigned, thus ending for the present, any possibility that this committee will be able to perform a real service to the members of the local.

WORKERS KEPT IN DARK

When the suggestion was made a number of months ago that all the details of the negotiations in progress should be written up by the Educational Committee for circularization of the membership to inform them and prepare them for eventual action, the officers of the local rejected this proposal. Their excuse was that this publicity would reveal the hand of the union to management. That the lack of such publicity would in actuality only help to conceal the situation from the membership, keep them ignorant of the proceedings, and thus weaken the union's position—this the Board of Censors could not be expected to understand. Of course, management knew what was going on all the time; only the workers were kept in the dark.

A recent instance of frowning on and interfering with democratic procedure in the local was the occasion of electing a recording secretary, made necessary by the resignation of the previous

secretary. A motion was made that a referendum vote of the local be held to elect the new officer, especially since night shift men would not have much of an opportunity for voting at the regular membership meetings. For good democratic procedure not all questions need be taken to a referendum. But for a matter of the election of a new officer this procedure seems elementary. This was rejected and the new secretary was elected by a vote of 19 to 9 in a local with a membership of over 1000 members!

DEMOCRACY MADE DIFFICULT

The chairman's attitude is very narrow minded and smug: "If the nightshift wants to vote, let them come for a ballot." Don't make democracy easy, don't encourage it, don't facilitate it, don't try to fashion the local in the structure and practice and tradition of democracy—but make it as difficult as possible for the membership to function in the local, this is the way to build a union, or so apparently thinks the chief censor officer.

No, this group of officers will bring only future defeats on the local. It is high time that a new leadership with a new program be created in Local 2715. This is, of course, true in general, throughout the country. But it is so important especially for Local 2715 because its traditions, the caliber of its basic core, have prepared it to lead the way in this area for introducing a fighting program for adoption by the union movement. With the call for the formation of an independent labor party topping such a program, new life and a real perspective can be introduced in the labor movement enabling it to strike powerful blows at its corporation enemies who have grown strong economically and politically in the past period. (To be continued)

Read THE NEW INTERNATIONAL

Stop U. S. Aid to Franco! Release Political Prisoners!

UNITED DEMONSTRATIONS AGAINST FRANCO

LOS ANGELES

By L. THOMPSON

Six socialist organizations united to form an anti-Franco picket line held for two hours on Saturday morning, April 14th, in front of the Spanish consulate in downtown Los Angeles. The six groups—the Independent Socialist League, the Libertarian Socialist League, the Socialist Party, the Socialist Youth League, the Westwood Socialist Club, and the Young People's Socialist League—came together in response to the call of the Spanish workers party, POU, for international support of the recent Barcelona general strike and for support of the demand that no American aid be sent to bolster Franco's fascist regime.

In addition to these specific issues, the demonstration had a general anti-totalitarian character through use of such slogans, which were both shouted and carried on placards, as: "Against Dictators on Both Sides of the Iron Curtain," "Down with Dictators Franco, Stalin, Rhee," "Against Tyrants Franco and Stalin," and "For Democracy Everywhere."

Thirty sign-carrying pickets and a constantly shifting crowd of sympathetic bystanders numbering at least several hundred at all times proved of sufficient significance to cause the *Herald Express* to carry a 5" x 8" photo of the line and to quote the local Spanish consul who belittled the demonstration as support to "a small general strike in Barcelona, Spain, three weeks ago which lasted only two or three hours." The mood of the gathered crowd was such as to give the dozen or so fascists from the Wesley Swift and G. L. K. Smith groups no chance to commit any provocative acts and to oblige them to remain completely quiet.

The picket line was a success from several standpoints. It forced the local Spanish consul to publicly admit that the Franco regime has been recently shaken internally. As a joint demonstration, the picketing served to underline for all participants the value of combined socialist action for a common aim. And most important, this organized, public protest struck a blow against the McCarthyist repression which is especially strong in Southern California. Furthermore, the public response to the picket line and its slogans has served to renew the belief of democratic socialists that their public activities could gain a sympathetic response from the general public.

The purpose of this street meeting was to bring the facts about the Barcelona general strike to the attention of the students and to collect money to send to the POU. The meeting was organized around the slogans: No Aid To Franco! Demand That Washington Break With the Franco Dictatorship! Release the 5,000 Arrested Strikers! Express Your Solidarity With the Spanish Socialist Underground (POU)!

Attempts were made earlier in the morning to prevent leaflets from being passed out for this meeting, but after a scuffle in which the attacking party suffered injuries, the distribution continued and a successful meeting was held.

Speaking for the Socialist Youth League, Bob Martinson outlined the events leading up to the great strike of March 12 and 13. He pointed out that Stalinism had little influence among the

Spanish workers and that Cominform propaganda to the contrary was so much bluster and wind.

Martinson predicted that General Francisco Franco would not die in bed, and analyzed this great movement by the Spanish people as the prelude to the Spanish revolution. The speaker ended by saying that a great opportunity lies before the POU and asked the students to support this organization and its underground in Spain.

Don Thomas, speaking for the Berkeley Socialist Club, then analyzed the evolution of American foreign policy from the phony "neutrality" period, through the "anti-Franco" period of the UN, to the pro-Franco attitude of today. He compared the State Department's attitude toward Spain with its refusal to send sorely needed wheat to the democratic government of India.

Although the speeches were well received by the students, the presence of police, FBI agents and various varieties of stool-pigeons frightened many people who would otherwise have con-

ISL FUND DRIVE

By ALBERT GATES

Fund Drive Director

In one of the best weeks of the ISL 1951 Fund Drive, with contributions of over \$177 sent in, the campaign goes into the stretch period with every possibility of success. Streater and the SYL still remain at the top, but they were joined by Boston and General which are now over 100 per cent too.

The biggest jump was made by the General category, with a payment of \$578. This gives it a percentage of 109. Streater made another payment of \$5 and continues a few percentage points above the SYL, but the latter promises to pass them within another week. If you want to know how Streater did it, read the letter from our veteran Comrade Schaefer, which we reprint on this page.

Not far behind is Chicago. It made a big spurt this week with \$317, jumping far ahead of New York and reaching almost 80 per cent of its goal. It can go over its quota with just a little push. Buffalo passed New York, too, with a payment of \$200. This ought to be a warning to Gotham

CONTRIBUTE to the ISL FUND DRIVE!

(It isn't very often that we print letters of the kind we just received from Comrade J. L. Schaefer of Streater, Illinois. But if you know him, you would understand why we are doing so now, in connection with the ISL Fund Drive. J. L. S. writes for all our friends in Streater, you can be sure.)

Streater, Ill.
April 12, 1951

Dear Comrades:

Attached here with please find Money Order amounting to \$5.00 for the Fund Drive. I am putting all the steam that I have left in me behind this drive. As you probably know, I was 76 on my last birthday. I do hope and trust that every branch will use every effort and get behind this drive 100 per cent and make their quota, because the Independent Socialist League cannot live without having good leaders and good teachers. We are only a handful but we are the best and we must support our program. They and we are working hard to pull this world out of its muddle and that will be a hard struggle. Again, I say, comrades, please get behind this drive!

Comradely yours,
J. L. SCHAEFER

ASKS SUPPORT FOR POU

Speaking for the Socialist Youth League, Bob Martinson outlined the events leading up to the great strike of March 12 and 13. He pointed out that Stalinism had little influence among the

For living Marxism—read THE NEW INTERNATIONAL

tributed heavily. The total collection was: around seven dollars which will be sent directly to the POU as a token of international solidarity.

PHILADELPHIA

By MARTY MARTEL

PHILADELPHIA, April 14—The Philadelphia Branch, Socialist Party, today sponsored a picket action at the Spanish consulate to protest the arrest of 5,000 Barcelona workers in the recent general strike.

A dozen persons participated, including individuals from the ISL, Libertarian Socialist League, YPSL, and Internes in Industry (AFSC). The Socialist Party refused to open the action to the participation of other groups on an official basis and the small number of pickets resulted from this policy.

DEMAND STRIKERS' RELEASE

The picketing lasted two and one-half hours. Signed demanding

the release of the Spanish strikers, calling attention to the fact that both Stalin and Franco ban strikes and calling for "liberty for the Spanish people" were featured. Leaflets explaining the reasons for the action were distributed to passers-by. They were signed only by the SP. The Spanish consul came outside and took notes on the picket slogans.

The move was planned in conjunction with a recent appeal for action on the part of world labor and socialists by the Spanish underground socialist group POU.

A liberation student brought the appeal to the attention of several groups, and the SP called an Executive Committee meeting at which plans were laid for the action. (A week earlier socialist groups not including the SP carried out similar actions in New York and Chicago.)

The leaflet passed out by pickets asked Philadelphians to write the Spanish ambassador and the

U. S. State Department and demand the release of the strikers.

SP PLAYS SOLO The peculiarity of the picket action lies in the attitude of the Socialist Party. In both New York and Chicago the SP refused to participate in similar actions with other groups. Here the party refused to allow other groups to join it. If action had been initiated by another group here, as well might have happened had not their executive committee acted as quickly as it did, it is not at all doubted that the SP would have refused to join. Giving the official excuse of "trouble in the past" did not hide the fact that the SP's sole motive was in gaining the glory for itself. Joint action on an official basis would have resulted in a much more successful picket line.

On as broad an issue as aid to Spanish workers such an attitude is inexcusable. Unified socialist action elsewhere on this issue shows only that the SP has again failed to comprehend the basic socialist principle of cooperation among comrades.

Fund Drive Box Score

	Quota	Paid	Per Cent
TOTAL	\$12,500	\$8060.95	64.4
Streater	25	33.00	132
Soc. Youth League..	500	646.20	129
Chicago 264.50, New York 183.95, Detroit 70.00, Berkeley 70.50, St. Louis 18.00, Buffalo 25.00,			
Boston	50	55.00	110
General	975	1063.50	109
Chicago	1800	1424.00	78.9
Buffalo	850	600.00	70
New York City	4200	2670.00	63.5
Youngstown	100	60.00	60
St. Louis	50	30.00	60
Cleveland	300	176.50	58.8
Seattle	300	175.00	58.3
Detroit	800	406.00	50.7
Newark	300	122.00	40.6
Los Angeles	550	208.25	37.8
Pittsburgh	150	53.00	35.3
Oakland	650	206.00	31.6
Indiana	100	25.00	25
Philadelphia	450	95.00	21
Oregon	50	10.00	20
Reading	100	3.00	.03
Akron	100	0	0
Baltimore	50	0	0
Connecticut	50	0	0
Minnesota	10	0	0



LABOR ACTION

Independent Socialist Weekly

Vol. 15, No. 17 April 23, 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, 1874.

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

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

U. of Chicago Students Hear ISL Leaders on War

DRAPER

CHICAGO, April 8—This afternoon Hal Draper, editor of LABOR ACTION, currently on a midwest speaking tour, spoke before a University of Chicago audience on "Liberalism and the Cold War." The meeting was held as one of the regular weekly forums of the Socialist Youth League on that campus. It came as the last of five lectures, four in Chicago and one in Madison, given by Draper during his five-day stop-over here.

In his discussion Draper raised the question of the validity of liberalism in meeting the present crisis in the struggle between the imperialism of America and Russia for world supremacy. The controversies on U. S. foreign policy have produced divisions in the currents of liberalism so diverse that one might ask not only "what validity any contains, but whether there exists anything in their doctrine that unites them and determines their character as a "liberal" one.

THE SPLIT-IN LIBERALISM

The Truman-Acheson foreign policy is about the frankest possible expression of the objective of American imperialism to crush Russian Stalinism, its world rival. Phrased in terms of "the containment of Communism," it means the support of reactionary dictators and puppet regimes against popular opposition. It has relieved itself of any political weapons, a serious failure in light of the Stalinists' capacity for turning to their own uses the social aspirations of the afflicted peoples of Asia, and relies entirely upon military force for its struggles.

Draper cited two different liberal currents, which, while supporting U. S. foreign policy in a general sense, differ in their formulation of the goals and strategy they would like to see implemented. The first, ADA, writes splendid resolutions denouncing aid to Franco, Bao Dai, and others, and opposes the use of Marshall Plan aid to further U. S. designs for the mobilization of the Atlantic Pact nations. They favor beating Stalin to a position of dominance in Asia by carrying out the necessary popular reforms before he does. Strangely enough their resolutions fail to note that not the McCarthyites but their own Truman-Acheson administration carries out the program they condemn.

Any failures in American government policy can be explained by ADAers only by calling them "mistakes," or attributing them to the pressures of Dixiecrats or other evil reactionary influences. This inability, to which Draper returned again in his discussion, to discover any deeper social currents underlying government policy than the conflict between well intentioned democrats and bad reactionaries is characteristic of all liberal tendencies and lies at the root of their failure to meet contemporary problems with a sufficient solution.

LIVE WITH STALINISM?

The second view, as represented in *The Nation*, states the goal of American policy to be "learning to live with Stalinism." The immediate concern is for peace, and this is considered possible only through negotiation by the powers. This view contradicts the whole liberal tradition of defending the right of self-determination and rising in opposition to undemocratic and totalitarian regimes wherever they may be. It represents, Draper noted, a rather recent development in liberal political thought, a development connected with the rise of the New Deal and changes in liberal thinking about individual free-

SHACHTMAN

By CHARLES DIRK

Max Shachtman spoke to an audience of thirty-five students at the University of Chicago Friday, April 13, on "The Failure of American Foreign Policy." His speech consisted in a severe attack on American foreign policy not only from the point of view of international socialism but also from any possible sane point of view of the American bourgeoisie themselves. He traced the incapacity of the American capitalists to have a progressive foreign policy to their social and economic interests which are in irreconcilable contradiction to any sort of democratic foreign policy.

In connection with U. S. policy in the Far East, Shachtman commented that MacArthur, in pressing for a perspective of expanding the war in Korea, represented in his statements the logical carrying-out of Truman's own position, and that Truman, in order to condemn MacArthur, has to condemn his own policy action. The reaction to both the con-

tent and manner of presentation was very favorable. The student audience was particularly responsive to his presentation of the dilemmas and contradictions into which the U. S. government is plunged by its reactionary foreign policy. There was also almost unanimous anti-MacArthur sentiment, not only at the meeting but on the entire U. of C. campus.

Despite the length of the speech, the interest was so intense that questions were asked anyway. One person asked what is the ISL attitude toward the present labor leaders like Green and Murray. Shachtman answered that we support them just to the extent that they encouraged an independent labor movement. A number of people gathered around the speaker to ask further questions after the meeting was officially adjourned and he was another half-hour getting away.

In view of the typical Chicago rainy weather the meeting was surprisingly large and reflected Shachtman's increasing popularity on the U. of C. campus.

LABOR SCOPE

NLRB Ruling Sets Dangerous Precedent

By LARRY O'CONNOR

A new wrinkle has been added to the campaign to throw Stalinists out of unions and at the same time, out of their jobs. And this one can be a real danger to every socialist or trade union militant who becomes uncomfortable to his employer and to his union bureaucracy.

The Taft-Hartley Act provides that a worker cannot be fired because he is expelled from his union. This section of the law, like most others, was opposed by the whole labor movement on grounds that it could protect vicious anti-union elements in plants which have union security clauses in their contracts.

Now the National Labor Relations Board's general counsel, George Bott, has ruled that a Stalinist can be fired if his presence in the plant causes "considerable unrest among employees."

The ruling was handed down on an appeal by Matt Piker who had been expelled from the AFL's hosiery workers union, and then fired by the Holeproof Hosiery Co. of Milwaukee. Piker has signed the Stalinist "peace appeal," and identified himself on the petition by the name of his union and the number of his local. He was then expelled on grounds of using the union's name without authority and bringing discredit on it.

APPEALS TO NLRB

He filed a petition with the NLRB for re-instatement, claim-

ing that the ruling was an appeal from an appeal by Matt Piker who had been expelled from the AFL's hosiery workers union, and then fired by the Holeproof Hosiery Co. of Milwaukee. Piker has signed the Stalinist "peace appeal," and identified himself on the petition by the name of his union and the number of his local. He was then expelled on grounds of using the union's name without authority and bringing discredit on it.

dom and state power to which he referred later in his talk. On the platform of the defense of civil liberties, liberals have traditionally played their most important and dynamic role. Today they falter and capitulate. The ADA again, takes a clear position in resolutions on the question but is blind to the fact that it is their Truman administration that is carrying on the witch hunt. Paradoxically enough, Draper pointed out, the McCarren act is an advance toward democracy when compared with the administration's activities in this area. In arguing against this act Truman claimed that he was already accomplishing everything

that the Taft-Hartley Act guarantees his job rights, and that union expulsion is no legal grounds for dismissal. When the regional office did not order his reinstatement, he appealed to Bott, the court of last resort on whether the NLRB will take a case.

Bott held that "the underlying reason for the discharge... was suspected Communist activity... resented by the employees and union and a subject of great concern to the employer (because) it caused considerable unrest among employees."

This ruling obviously sets a most dangerous precedent. Every reader of LABOR ACTION knows that this paper opposes Stalinism and the Stalinist party and fights its influence in the labor movement. Yet we have always insisted on the right of Stalinist workers to belong to unions and to make a living. And the reason for this insistence has been precisely that we are convinced from long experience that to make political belief a basis for membership or expulsion from the labor movement can only endanger the whole structure of union democracy.

The unions have been forced to live with the Taft-Hartley Act, and to use its machinery to the extent possible, despite their continued opposition to the law. It is hardly surprising, then that individual workers will also seek whatever protection the law may give them when they get into

such legislation could do, and more cheaply, quickly, and certainly by administrative procedure. His crushing argument against the act was that it set up an unwieldy system of review! Draper found the roots of the other major current in liberalism in the New Deal victory of 1932. He pointed out that liberals became less concerned with defending individual liberties against the infringements of a powerful state. They accepted the goal of the solution of social ills, believing they could now concentrate on making sure that the government was one of progressive liberals and not bad reactionaries.

trouble, whether this trouble is brought on by anti-union acts, political disagreements, or an employer's attempt to rid himself of a militant. But Bott's decision is obviously intended to deprive workers of that protection. Often in the past when LABOR ACTION has insisted that the abrogation of the trade union rights of Stalinists weakens union democracy and thus endangers the rights of all workers, we have been scoffed at. Even some good, militant unionists have sometimes felt that we are inclined to be too fearful on this point. But in the political atmosphere which prevails today, no one can honestly doubt that the employers, the government and sections of the union leadership will gladly avail themselves of the drive to oust Stalinists from unions and plants to also get rid of socialists and even many militant trade unionists who have no socialist political ideas.

This has been amply demonstrated in the Coast Guard's wholesale ousting of radicals and the ships and docks on both coasts. This procedure has become so raw that even the leadership of the International Seafarers Union—AFL and the National Maritime Union—CIO (both of which have shown a brutal disregard for the union rights of dissidents), have had to protest.

It has further been demonstrated in the notorious "screening" of socialists from plants in Buffalo by the military. The examples could go on and on.

OPEN INVITATION

Now George Bott has gone a little bit beyond the supposed question of "security" in the name of which most of the above firings have taken place. His ruling is an open invitation to reactionary employers and union leaders to gang up on any union militant whom they want to bounce. All they have to do is to incite a few simpletons in the plant against the "undesirable," and they can be assured that the NLRB will look the other way when a man is fired, regardless of the clear provisions of the law.

Pittsburgh Trial Gives CP New Lease on Life

By GERRY McDERMOTT

PITTSBURGH, April 11 — The Commonwealth of Pennsylvania is now in the fourth month of a trial aimed at jailing the leaders of the Communist Party of western Pennsylvania. The trial is being conducted under an ancient "sedition" law, dating from the days of the Palmer raids, and only recently resurrected. On trial are Steve Nelson, Andrew Onda and James Dolsen, arrested many months ago after a dramatic raid on CP headquarters. A great deal of literature was seized and carried away during the raid, after which the headquarters was padlocked.

The action was initiated, not by the state administration itself, but by Judge M. A. Musmanno, a Pittsburgh democrat. It is ironic that Musmanno is the darling of Pittsburgh's labor leaders, and supposedly a liberal! The CIO pushed Musmanno for governor in the 1950 elections. In fact, the action against the CP was started as a publicity stunt in the Musmanno campaign. Musmanno led the raid on CP headquarters as a "private citizen."

The trial, which is treated by the newspapers as a sort of circus, has become a dreary busi-

ness. Judge Musmanno (acting as a witness—he is not presiding in the case) digs out quotes from Marxist or Stalinist literature calculated to frighten the jurors and catch the headlines. The defense has followed the Foley Square tactics used when the national leaders of the CP were on trial in New York City last year. The defense tries to provoke a mistrial by legal antics, name calling and general horsing around.

The meaning of the trial is clear. No matter how disgusting the Stalinists are, they are being tried in this case for the advocacy of ideas and the possession of books. The trial is in reality an extension of the principles of the Smith Act on a local scale. As such, it is one more step in the direction of thought control in the United States, taken in the name of fighting thought control elsewhere.

The case has had another effect. It has actually provided the battered Stalinist organization a new basis for existence. The Stalinist machine here has been badly hurt by several events. Most dramatic were the disclosures of several FBI agents who had been working inside the CP, who recently revealed themselves and named many party members. But other factors probably did more long-run damage. One was the appearance of Titoism, which riddled the strong control the CP had built up among Slavic groups here. The other was the loss of their big base in Westinghouse Local 601 to the IUE-CIO.

ACQUITTAL LIKELY

The trial, however, has given the harried Stalinists a new lease on life. First of all, it provides them a rostrum to preach their phony peace appeals. It makes them appear as martyrs to freedom of thought and speech. And it gives the apparatus of the party an issue on which to base activity.

Acquittal seems more and more likely as the trial continues. It is probable that the dramatic and egotistical Musmanno has completely alienated at least one witness by now. More important, the court reporter who started the trial has since died, and some of his records in shorthand appear to be illegible to other stenographers. Unless his untranscribed notes can be deciphered by someone, the cases can be thrown out on that ground.

But in any event, the atmosphere of intellectual and political terror here will be stronger as a result of the trial. So far, virtually no one has protested against the whole sorry spectacle. Democracy, not Stalinism, is the loser.

Birds of a Feather

A news dispatch dated Madrid, April 11, reads as follows:

"Generalissimo Francisco Franco received the Medal of Merit of the American Legion today in recognition of his valiant fight against communism."

"The medal was presented at the Generalissimo's residence, Pardo Palace, by Herman Luhrs, representing the Legion's National Commander, Eric Cocke Jr."

Any day now we expect to hear that the Legion has also decorated Franco's noble helpers, Adolf Hitler and Benito Mussolini, posthumously, of course.

LABOR ACTION BOOK SERVICE

114 W. 14 Street, N. Y. C.

specializes in books and pamphlets on the Labor and Socialist movement, Marxism, etc., and can supply books of all publishers.

Send for our free book list.

Embryo Titoist "International" is a Casualty of the Cold War YUGOSLAVIA VIA SLIPS INTO U. S. BLOC

By RICHARD TROY

Several months after the Tito-Stalin break political mapmakers, in order to show the effects of the split in international relations, always drew in Yugoslavia with a third color. The American-dominated countries were usually white; the Russian-dominated countries were usually black. And Yugoslavia, appropriately enough, was a combination of the two: black stripes on a white background.

Today this has changed. Yugoslavia, on the new maps, is all white, in other words, part of the "Western Bloc," the "American bloc." No attempt is made to portray Yugoslavia as a "third force," an "intermediary," a "half-way house in the world conflict," etc. And the mapmakers have good reason for abandoning the old distinction between Yugoslavia and, say, Italy or Greece.

For so far as the organization of the world for the cold war is concerned, Yugoslavia is part and parcel of the western bloc. But it goes further: Almost as much as Yugoslavia once was oriented toward Moscow today it is oriented toward the West. To a certain extent, Moscow has been replaced by London, Paris and, above all, Washington.

It was not difficult to forecast this development immediately after the famous Titoist rupture occurred. However, it has required almost two full years for the full rapprochement with the West to occur. There are, of course, many ways to account for the fact that it required 22 months for this full 180-degree turnabout. A natural shift in thinking among the leaders in Belgrade, accustomed for decades to a Moscow-orientation, is one of them. Perhaps more important, however, is the reluctance of the Titoist bosses to admit, while speaking to the traditionally anti-American world of nationalist Stalinists, that they believe the future of Yugoslavia to be dependent, in the long run, upon the fortunes of the United States. Another factor, of course, has been the intensifying of the cold war and the immediate threat of a Russian-directed invasion.

Tito in the U. S. Camp

Today the rapprochement is well-nigh complete, and very few residues of the era of "independence" remain. This is not to say, of course, that the essentially Stalinist (i. e., totalitarian, bureaucratic collectivist) characteristics of the regime have changed appreciably (although some internal relaxation is quite evident), but simply that Yugoslavia is now western oriented, by the necessities of its position. The Belgrade leaders simply see no choice. A Russian victory means certain annihilation for them. On the other hand, the question of the position of the Yugoslav rulers in an American-dominated world is speculative and represents no immediate danger. Tito said recently, for example:

"This help from the West is the best proof possible that peaceful cooperation is possible between countries under different political systems. . . . This proves that it is not rivalry between capitalist and socialist systems which raise present danger of war but rather the desire for imperialist domination and expansion."

The implication, of course, is that the cause of the present conflict is RUSSIAN imperialism—which they fear, obviously, more than American imperialism.

The culmination in the long series of steps that led to the complete reorientation was the announcement, made two weeks ago, that the Belgrade government was finally asking the United States for military aid (and on last Sunday an agreement for 20 million dollars worth of armaments from France was completed). As late as the middle of February Tito told reporters that he did not think he was going to make these requests; he was obviously reluctant to make such a "concession." However, he probably realized that he had gone so far in the rapprochement with the West that one further step would no longer seriously alter matters, especially when the Yugoslav army needed modern equipment so desperately.

The reorientation is seen in many ways. Whereas Lavrentiev, the Russian ambassador in Yugoslavia until 1948, was once one of the chief powers in Yugoslavia, today, George Allen, the American ambassador, seems to be at the center of operations. Whereas Vyshinsky used to make annual trips to Belgrade to check personally on conditions, today, Perkins, the American assistant secretary of state, makes these annual trips. Dozens of American congressmen, reporters, traveling businessmen, and tourists-in-general, make Yugoslavia now one of their parts of call; and they are often granted long interviews with Tito or Pijade.

No Criticism of the U. S.

America is no longer the subject of any serious criticism in the Yugoslav press (Russia, of course, has been substituted). Tito did advise the United States to withdraw its troops from Korea when the Chinese launched their big offensive last December. But he gave this advice as a friendly power. Continued efforts in Korea were, he said, ". . . hopeless, futile. . . ." Nothing whatever was said about the Americans "having no business in Korea" or being "representatives of U. S. imperialism."

Read
The NEW INTERNATIONAL

In Yugoslav propaganda the term "American imperialism" is very rarely employed. It is interesting to note that, recently, there was organized in Belgrade an Emigrants Club, made up of Yugoslavs who had spent part of their lives in the U. S., England or France. The stated purpose of the club was the ". . . developing of relations with the West," to disseminate information about the West among the Yugoslav people (shades of the now-disbanded Society for Cultural Relations with the USSR.)

The United States is praised for its "generosity" and "friendliness" in sending Yugoslavia the grain necessary to make up for the deficit created by last summer's terrible drought. The U. S. Information Service maintains a large library in Belgrade, employing eighteen people (reopened since the "split.") Western military observers were present at the recent maneuvers of the Yugoslav ski troops. British professors swarm all over the University of Belgrade, giving lectures on British history and culture. The American organization, CARE, is organizing a huge campaign to send packages to Yugoslavs, and George Allen is honorary chairman (with Kardej) of the committee established by the Yugoslav government to distribute the goods. A high Yugoslav official, when asked recently by an NBC correspondent to describe the general flavor of the new legal code adopted in Yugoslavia, answered ". . . the laws are like those in Western nations. . ." (The significance of this remark is not necessarily that the content of justice in Yugoslavia has changed, but that the impression is created that changes are being made on the Western model.)

Yugoslavia has become, in addition, part and parcel of the area which western leaders must take into account when they plan their military strategy. The U. S. has made it plain that it will defend Yugoslavia if attacked (echoed by Trigue Lie several days ago on behalf of the UN). *Life* magazine ran a long story on Yugoslavia in January which reminded one, with the exception of a few mild references to Tito the dictator, of a product of the Yugoslav propaganda agency, *Tanjug*.

Bankers Open Tito's Books

Bankers in charge of the International Bank have had access to all the secret files of the Yugoslav government with reference to the growth of their economy. And, recently, an American government commission declared that, over the next four years Yugoslavia will need 450 million dollars worth of outside aid. The U. S. government, in other words, has taken on the responsibility for maintaining the Yugoslav economy (in Marshall Plan fashion), and with it, of course, the Tito regime.

Naturally, the U. S. was irritated when Yugoslavia took a neutral stand on the question of branding the Peiping government "aggressors." However, though the Yugoslav delegation to the UN did not vote with the U. S. on this crucial issue, Tito himself a few weeks later, branded the Chinese intervention as "aggression." The long-held hopes of Belgrade that Mao Tse-tung would follow Tito's example appear to have faded completely, and almost no mention of these hopes is heard today. Mao is considered in a category with Gottwald and Pauker, that is, essentially as a puppet.

Yugoslav trade is necessarily all with western countries. Great Britain has extended over fifty million dollars worth of credit and is doing a big Yugoslav business. So is Western Germany. And, logically enough, the British Labor Party and the Bonn Government have received a great deal of praise in the Yugoslav press. The BLP, Tito told a Reuters correspondent, is a workers' party "led in practice by a socialist science, especially in solving economic problems." Tito has also declared that the Yugoslav CP would "collaborate" with all progressive and socialist parties in Europe, and he included, in that category, beside the BLP, the Socialist parties of Italy (Saragat), France, and the Social-Democratic Party of Germany.

A Deal with the Vatican?

Even Yugoslavia's attitude toward the Vatican has changed. Recently the Government charged that the Papal Nunciature in Belgrade was seeking to "worsen" relations between the Vatican and Yugoslavia. The suggestion was, of course, that relations between the Vatican and Yugoslavia would be good and cordial, were it not for this particularly obnoxious representative. Vicious, all-out attacks on the Vatican, or, for that matter, the De Gasperi government, have ceased completely. In addition, when Tito was asked whether or not he was going to release Archbishop Stepinac, he said that he personally was ready to do so, but that the peoples of Yugoslavia, still remembering his collaboration with the fascist Ustachi during the war, would not permit it! Stepinac, incidentally, has been made available for several long and uncensored interviews with western newsmen, and has shown a willingness to come to terms with the present Yugoslav Government.

"He who pays the piper calls the tune," and if the western nations are the force which, in effect, hold up the Tito regime in Yugoslavia, the western nations must, naturally, call the tune. It was through an American diplomat that the rapprochement between Yugoslavia and Greece was eventually worked out. Many thorny problems were tackled; much national sentiment was involved. And it was only when the U. S. stepped in as arbiter and forced them to come to terms with each other that the deal was made. The thousands of children who were taken to Yugoslavia during the days of the guerrilla fighting were returned to Greece, and today, trains are again running between Athens and Belgrade, carrying, among other things, ambassadors and their entourages.

Last December the Yugoslav relation to the United States was well illustrated in a little incident in New

York. The Yugoslav delegation to the UN was invited, for the first time in over a year, to a Russian diplomatic reception. They were about to accept the offer when it suddenly occurred to them that the Russians had invited them only to embarrass the Yugoslavs in front of the American congress which was debating the aid-to-Yugoslavia bill. If congress had noted that the Yugoslavs were mingling at a reception with the Russians. . . the bill might have lost. Yugoslavia, as this incident shows, is now, to some extent, subject to whims of the congress.

Third Force Pretensions Gone

The payoff in this whole development came several weeks ago. Tito announced publicly that Yugoslavia would fight (presumably against Russia) if any nearby nation were attacked whose subjugation threatened to endanger Yugoslav security. In other words—and this was the specific example stated—if Italy were attacked by Russia, Yugoslavia would fight. The implications of this development are far-reaching, for, in truth, if Western Germany were attacked Yugoslav security would be almost as much endangered as if Italy were invaded. Consequently, the question arose, why does not Yugoslavia join the North Atlantic Pact? All pretensions to constituting a third force, or even the embryo of one, are gone: Yugoslavia has committed itself to the Western bloc. Almost as much as Italy is under the thumb of the United States, Yugoslavia is under American hegemony. Logically, therefore, she is among the North Atlantic Pact nations.

And, eventually, perhaps when Greece and Turkey are involved in a Mediterranean Pact (probably as a sub-pact under the North Atlantic agreement) Yugoslavia will sign up too. Perhaps the only thing that holds up such an agreement now is the psychological situation referred to at the beginning of this article.

Above All: Stay in Power!

Tito's abandonment of attempts to create a Titoist International is the consequence of two important factors: First, the growing intensity of the cold war and the increased likelihood of a Russian invasion. This means that Tito is especially anxious, in fact desperate for allies: parties or nations, of any stripe whatsoever, which will come to his aid in the crisis. Secondly, the lack of confidence which the Titoist leaders in Belgrade have in the possibilities of a large-scale socialist movement in Europe which might lead the struggle against Stalinism. (It is indeed a matter for conjecture whether Tito would ally himself with a genuinely democratic and anti-totalitarian movement.)

Above all the Titoists want to remain in power. They are quite willing to do for American imperialism precisely what they did for Russian imperialism, that is, whitewash it, in order to retain their hold on Yugoslavia. The vain hopes that many self-styled socialists have entertained that Tito would lead an independent movement are being rapidly scuttled by Tito himself. It is quite natural that he seeks to "collaborate" with pro-war parties such as the French Socialist Party, and does nothing to assist in the growth of genuinely socialist forces. Of course Tito is still giving a "socialist" veneer to many of these actions. (For example, his continued rejection of a formal military alliance with capitalist powers.) Elements, small and almost meaningless, of the "third force" concept still linger on.

But, as has been suggested, they do not linger long. For a while, whenever an American high diplomat visited Yugoslavia, he made a public announcement of the intention of his visit. This was done, they have admitted, because the Tito government did not want to make it easy for the Cominform press to make sinister conjectures as to the purpose of the visit. However, when Perkins made his February visit no public announcement whatever was made of his intentions. It was a "secret" visit. The last of the black stripes over Yugoslavia may be erased by the alert mapmakers.

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.

CONVENTION OF THE UNITED

Delegates For a Fighting Program, But Allow Swing to Machine Control

By BEN HALL

United Automobile Worker delegates came to the Cleveland convention ready to endorse a fighting union platform. And they got it. This must be emphasized over and over again as the key to an understanding of the stable position of the top leadership, enjoying an almost unlimited confidence of the ranks, and as the background for the shift in the internal life of the union. "Reuther's program" means, to the active unionist, the platform embodied in the resolutions of this convention.

For many, it already means more than a series of paper declarations. In the past two years, hundreds of the men who came to the '51 convention had already been in real struggle to win demands ratified in last week's sessions. Ford and Chrysler workers remembered their nation-wide walkouts and plant by plant slow-downs. Agricultural implement delegates knew of the long and bitter strikes against International Harvester and John Deere.

By acclamation, without a single dissenting vote, 2,500 delegates voted the resolution against any no-strike pledge. "The successful struggle to preserve our escalator and improvement factor agreements would have been doomed to defeat if we had relinquished our freedom to strike," it declared, going on to "rejoice vigorously any proposals that the trade union movement pledge itself to refrain from use of the strike weapon where that is the only means available to defend and advance the rights of our members." At a time of war preparations, even while a limited war is waged, there could be no dispute on this question because all were united. And the top leaders were as vigorous as any delegate. All resolutions on domestic questions were tinged with this same spirit. Such was the temper of the delegates, and the tone of all speeches and reports.

On speed-up: the resolution recommended by the leaders and accepted by the convention proposed a "policy of liberal authorization of strikers in production standards and piece rate disputes."

On price control: after denouncing the "fraud and hoax" of Washington's program, it demanded real controls and insisted that control be turned over to "public officials who are not obligated for their past or future livelihood to the business interests they are regulating."

On defense of contracts: "There was a time," said Reuther, "when we were within an inch of losing our contracts. . . . If they tamper with our contracts we will fight. . . . They only seem to understand power. If that's what they want we will use it." And he appealed to the cheering crowd to pass the resolution unanimously; and they did.

It pledged, "full use of all the resources of our union to assure future preservation of the integrity of these contracts including full use of the strike weapon." It called for a joint defense fund for all organized labor and mandated the officers to use all power to win escalator clauses and improvement factor clauses for all UAW members who had not yet won them.

On labor unity: the UAW called for organic unity of the entire union movement. Pounding on tables and applauding, the delegates approved Reuther's appeal to all labor leaders to trust aside the trivial differences that still blocked unification. "Only a dispute over who should occupy what swivel chairs still stands in the way," he said.

On the government's "loyalty" program: the union demanded the reinstatement of James Schuetz of Bell Local 501 who was discharged by navy order for "lack of integrity" displayed by obeying union decisions and participating in strikes and picket lines. Reuther pledged to "fight against government agencies as well as the corporations" to defend union men against such victimization and the convention amended the resolution to authorize strikes in future cases. (A complete report on the Schuetz case will appear in an early issue of LABOR ACTION.)

Loopholes for Retreat

In discussing the long resolution which endorsed the actions of the United Labor Policy Committee, Fenster of Local 45, who still follows the Stalinist line, objected to the inclusion of a brief phrase which called for a fair "wage stabilization" program. "Our approach has always been that we are for controlling prices," he said. "A formula of wage stabilization would mean that for a long period of time the possibility of winning improvements would be greatly eliminated. We have always said that prices could be controlled and wages could be raised." He was right.

But it would be futile and almost useless to mine through all the resolutions to dig out the weaknesses and inconsistencies. No one was reading the fine print. Everyone was voting for a program of militant action. Suffice it to say, that the necessary legal loopholes were left to permit a policy of extreme moderation, even of retreat.

The resolution against the no-strike pledge, for example, promised to minimize strikes if a fair government disputes board were established. Mazy told the press that the UAW would not compromise on minimum demands; but hints were slipped into resolutions and speeches that labor would return to the government boards even before its major demands were granted. On the last day of the convention, newspaper headlines announced labor's entry into Truman's advisory board on somewhat ambiguous terms. Reuther, still chairing the convention sessions, was reported to be one of its representatives. No one commented. Such things were unmarked, unexpressed, and almost unnoticed.

Even with all their hidden reservations and glossed-over shortcomings, we can say of these resolutions: carry them out in the spirit in which they were adopted, militantly and aggressively, and the UAW will lead the way

for the labor movement. If that is done, no one can quibble over phrases.

A New Mood

A new mood dominated this convention on all inner union questions. The free and easy criticism of the leadership so apparent at all other conventions has disappeared, and with it the sense that the delegates and ranks were supreme and the officials merely chosen agents subordinated to them. That is gone. The old rank and file spirit inside the union which marked it as the most democratic union in America is now undermined and brought under control from above.

It would have been possible to unify this union around a fighting program and at the same time preserve that initiative from below which made the UAW a symbol of genuine workers democracy. Reuther, however, is clearly uniting the union, maintaining its militant program, and at the same time, bureaucratizing it. For the moment, the militancy is controlled and handed down from above and in a certain sense serves as a means of undermining the union's democratic spirit. In the long run, bureaucratic trends can only undermine the militant program itself.

A handsome salary increase for top officials was recommended by the Constitution Committee and accepted by the convention after only token opposition. A somewhat less substantial increase went to the plebeian elements of the officialdom, the appointed international representatives. A few delegates pointed out what was so obvious: to raise officers' salaries at the very moment when the membership had to be convinced of the necessity of paying higher dues could only make the whole question more vexing and lead to deepening suspicions. But these objections were waived aside. The feeling grows that the ranks may be ignored in such matters.

One over-zealous enthusiast was inspired to suggest a \$50,000 annual salary for Reuther, who receives a bit more than \$11,000 under the new scale. "That's what John L. Lewis gets," said the delegate, "and our president is a more important man." Reuther hastened to repeat his usual disclaimer when such matters are raised. He didn't care how the delegates voted on these questions . . . he was not asking for anything . . . he wouldn't even know what to do with \$50,000 a year . . . he became leader of this union not to line his pockets but to fight for the noble ideals in his heart . . . he would work just as hard, even harder, for even less than he was already receiving.

The "Porkchopper" Vanishes

These lofty personal sentiments are undoubtedly genuine . . . but somewhat irrelevant. This is not a personal matter but one which now affects a whole stratum within the union, the entire officialdom. Protected behind Reuther there stands a body of hundreds of full time officials whose attachment to this selfless devotion is not always as intense as it might be. They act and fight on issues like this as though they were defending their social existence within the union. Reuther's personal prestige and undoubted integrity in all financial dealings makes the growing number of ordinary officials, motivated by far more worldly considerations, glow with reflected honor.

And the organized body of officials, the machine, must be elevated into a position of respect, and the ranks must learn to treat it with a certain awe. It is no longer in good taste to refer to "porkchoppers"; a new etiquette prescribes that they be called international representatives, their full title of respect. Said Reuther, in the dues discussion, "Yes, they talk about pork choppers. That's a popular thing. But I am the Number One pork chopper in this union." At this point, every official breast swelled with pride and with gratitude.

At a caucus rally, Reuther heaped praise upon the paid officials for their untiring services. Undoubtedly many of them work hard and long hours. But the nature of their work has changed and with it the nature of the men. For most of them, the heroic days of the union are over, days which demanded sacrifice of income and risk of physical injury. Except for the few who are assigned to organize stubborn anti-union southern plants, their duties have subsided into an ordinary humdrum routine.

Now Reuther insists, they too, must have higher pay, pensions, hospitalization, insurance benefits, just like the UAW member. In a rich and powerful union no one would deny them this security. Justified or not, these trends illustrate and illuminate the rise in status of the collective officialdom, its increased weight morally and politically within the union and its unification around its own material and social interests. It is not a caucus; it is not a faction; it is a machine always available to push through the decisions of the top officialdom on any question it feels is decisive.

The Machine Cares for its Own

The union administration is solidly entrenched. All four top officers were reelected; Reuther and Mazy, running without opposition, were chosen by acclamation; Gosser and Livingstone met only trivial opposition for the two vice-presidencies. The tiny group led by Paul Silver of Local 351, Detroit, was unable to piece together a slate of any kind. It nominated Silver and Kenneth Forbes of Saginaw for vice-presidencies in order to permit them to make speeches of declination in which they tried to sum up their criticisms of the Reuther administration. Of the 19 Regional Directors, 18 were re-elected. But not all without opposition.

In several regions, the incumbent directors found themselves opposed by rivals who also considered themselves Reutherites. (Regional directors, who are members of the International Executive Board, are chosen not of the full

convention sessions, but at separate meetings of the delegates from each region.) These contests became as bitter as the intense struggles with the Addes-Thomas-Stalinist bloc . . . but all behind the scenes where the machine dominated. At previous conventions, the votes for each candidate, winner and loser, were reported to the full convention. This time, however, Emil Mazy simply read the names of the lucky winners. It is no longer in good taste to dwell on the fact that some regional directors meet opposition from the ranks.

Everyone knows that Reuther is dissatisfied with several regional directors who simply cannot do an ordinary good union job. And he has hinted many times that he would seek their replacement by more able men from among his own supporters. But such shifts must not be effected from below, lest they upset the delicate machine structure and cause uneasiness among the office-holders. He therefore dissuades his own supporters from organizing caucuses to effect the change. They must wait patiently and calmly until he decides how, when, and if a removal should be manipulated, without calling the local leaders into action.

The dramatic upset of this smoothly-rolling convention was the election of Robert Carter as regional director of the Flint area, and the defeat of Reuther's candidate, Patterson. The former director, Chapman, facing defeat, did not run for reelection. Carter, the new regional director, was a candidate for president of the Rank and File Caucus against R. J. Thomas at the 1944 convention where he joined in the fight to rescind the no-strike pledge. He becomes the only member of the International Executive Board not endorsed by the present administration and elected against its will. In the context of this convention, his victory becomes a significant factor in stemming the trend toward a single, unified machine control over the UAW and was therefore the only important setback at the convention for the officialdom.

The Case of Local 659

It was in discussions of a Flint local that new characteristics were openly displayed by the top officials who begin to speak in arrogant and imperious phrases. The tone of the dues debate only hinted at what was to come on the very last day of the convention when the Grievance Committee reported out three cases involving G. M. Local 659 in Flint. The matters in dispute, details, arguments and merits were quickly superseded in importance by the manner in which they were handled and by the methods used against the local.

In the first case, the only one discussed at all, the Grievance Committee condemned the local union and its paper the *Searchlight* for attacking the GM agreement after it had been ratified by the local membership, for denouncing the 1949 Ford contract and attempting to influence the balloting at Ford Local 600 when it was considering the agreement. The local was excoriated as "anti-union" for opposing the dues increase on the ground that "chiselers and pork choppers attempt to raise dues." Also "anti-union" was the "derogatory flavor in references to the top leadership of our International Union" accompanied by a "laudatory flavor in references to the top leadership of a union outside the CIO" (an obvious mention of the miners).

Finally, it charged that the *Searchlight* had called upon the GM workers to vote against a union-shop in elections under the Taft-Hartley Law and that it consistently refused to print any material which opposed the line of the local leadership and supported the policy of the international.

Carter, the newly-elected regional director whose jurisdiction includes Local 659 appealed to the convention for a chance to settle the issues in a spirit of unity and good-will. He pointed out that the bitterness of the dispute intensified under the regime of the former director and requested that the convention forego action and avoid sharpening the fight. But the administration was out for blood and would not accept any such reasonable compromise.

It was impossible to sift out the issues where the local was within its rights from those where it exceeded them. Even where the *Searchlight* acted within the clear limits of reasonable democratic rights, it employed provocative and sometimes irresponsible language.

A Lesson in "Democracy"

It is easy enough to maintain a democratic calm in the face of mild and temperate criticism. Democracy is fully tested in cases like that of Local 659. Here was one local, isolated and with little influence in the international; facing a powerfully entrenched administration. If the local was irresponsible in its criticisms, the international was irresponsible in its manner of treating a powerless critic.

Caburn Walker, president of Local 659, took the floor facing an actively hostile convention which booed and pounded on the table throughout his speech. He made no effort to refute the point by point criticism of the Grievance Committee. Instead he tried, in vain, to itemize his own grievances against the Reuther regimen and to explain why he thought it had mishandled his local.

"Come to the point, Walker," jeered Mazy, who was in the chair, in brutal almost snarling tones heard for the first time at a UAW convention. "What have you got to say about the *Searchlight*?" The delegates took the hint and drowned out Walker in a gale of hissing and booing. He tried to continue. "Stop beating around the bush, Walker," interrupted Mazy. More booing. And in this atmosphere, Walker ended.

"This is a fight between those who would build our union and those who would destroy it," said Reuther in reply, speaking without interruption or time limit. He lumped together every charge against the local, accusing

AUTO WORKERS (CIO) — — 2

Walker of sabotage, anti-unionism, and helping the employers. And he whipped up the convention with stories of how he and Mazy had fought and sacrificed to help GM workers win their early struggles.

But a big gap remained. Walker had charged that Reuther had met with representatives from Local 659 and demanded that they swing their votes away from Carter to his own candidate Patterson. If not, Walker said, Reuther threatened to crucify the local at the convention. "But we wouldn't move," said Walker.

—And More Democracy

Reuther finished speaking. Great applause. The vote went through. One delegate then asked "What about Walker's charge?" Reuther, totally out of character, remained seated. Chairman Mazy without consulting him shouted, "That's a lie, like everything Walker says." Walker demanded the floor. "Sit down, Walker," Mazy ordered, "you're not running the convention like the petty tyrant you are." A moment's pause, and Mazy apologized to the convention for becoming upset. "I can't stand hearing an anti-union man like Walker criticize Walter Reuther." Great cheers.

Then Livingstone took the chair to flex his muscles. Everyone had to have a chance to practice the new poses. In the second case, the Grievance Committee upheld the local in some respects and endorsed the position of the

international in others. The vote was jammed through without discussion. In the third case, a speed-up complaint of Local 659 against the international, the report indicated that the local had never processed a speed-up case through the bargaining machinery up to the international level. The international was ready to authorize strike action in any legitimate case.

Walker asked for the floor. "Sit down," cried Livingstone, "or we'll have the sergeant at arms sit you down." Walker remained standing at a microphone, his hand raised, silent. "We know your tricks," said Livingstone, "you want to get thrown out so you can get your picture in the papers." At least Walker managed to say a few words. He shouted angrily that he and his delegation were thinking it over; they were considering voting for the committee report; they asked only for a minute or two to consult among themselves. Here came a moment when statesmanship could have replaced arrogance. But the request was ignored; the vote was pushed through.

The administration now bequeaths to Carter's new regional administration the task of introducing all the charms of brotherly tranquility and union solidarity.

For Militancy and Democracy

Obviously, this reporter has been highly critical of trends toward machine control in the UAW. But this undeniable tendency must in no way blind us to the fact

that the union remains fundamentally a fighting union and is still the most democratic important union in the United States. If it tends toward bureaucratization, it does so in its own way. The top leadership is able to begin the creation of a permanent, rigid officialdom because it does not have to rely upon intimidation or force. Quite the contrary. It has so convinced the overwhelming majority of union activists that it stands for aggressive union methods and tenacious defense of workers rights that the remnant of the old opposition begins to crumble of itself and needs only a little push to speed up the process of inner disintegration.

Only such a leadership, which proclaims such a militant platform as described in the reports on the convention sessions, could succeed so soon in winning the tolerance of the ranks for a machine-type control. That explains, at least in part, the trend to bureaucratism in this union; but it does not justify it. No union militant can reconcile himself to such developments; he will insist upon control resting with the ranks, upon preserving initiative from below, and maintaining the democratic spirit of unionism.

The UAW today is more united than ever behind Reuther's administration and for the militant program identified with it. It is those militants who are so determined to maintain a fighting union policy who will preserve the UAW as the democratic union it is, and make it "vanguard in America, the architect of the future."

Detroit: Post-Convention Reactions

DETROIT, April 16—A violent attack on the Reuther leadership of the United Automobile Workers (CIO) featured the current issue of *Ford Facts*, official publication of Ford Local 600, and it has created somewhat of a stir in UAW circles.

As background to understanding the virulent tone and hostility of Carl Stellato, Ford local president, who was vigorously attacked by Walter Reuther, and second because he spoke and voted against the dues increase.

Having cast his die insofar as a future in the Reuther caucus is concerned by his opposition to the dues increase, Stellato naturally seeks to make capital among the ranks out of his stand.

Thus the current issue of *Ford Facts*: The headline "Betrayal" is a full three inches high, eight columns wide. Stellato blasts the role of the "porkchoppers," in selling the dues increase. He points out that Emil Mazy's financial report shows the union is worth \$3,727,000 more now than in 1949, having a net worth of better than \$7,000,000. He emphasizes that under Reuther dues went from \$1.00 to \$1.50.

This kind of argument, even though much of it is irrelevant and even misleading, is very popular with the rank and file.

Stellato adds, "Our union, under President Reuther, is developing into a union similar to the United Mine Workers and Steel Workers, where the cardinal sin is to disagree with the top leadership. For this sin you can be exterminated politically, you can be fired if you are an international representative, you can be brought to trial by the Executive Board

and thrown out of the union, you can be denied the right to criticize union policy or union officers in local union newspapers. Every such action is a denial of the great democratic traditions of our union."

Stellato describes in detail the pressure techniques used by some international union representatives at the convention on the dues increase. He reminds the Ford workers that for seven years he was an international union representative, who is now being denounced as anti-union because "I felt the delegates had no right to impose an increase in dues on our membership since they were elected as delegates to oppose an increase in dues in Local 600."

THE LOCAL 600 "TRIAL"

This highly exaggerated interpretation of the situation in the union will hardly impress experienced UAW militants who will recall that several months ago five officials of Local 600 were charged with being "Communists," and long hearings were held on the accusation in an attempt to remove them from office. However, the elections for the general council showed that the Ford workers were not falling for this line. The so-called "left wing," which includes a mish-mash and is not dominated by Stalinists, won a victory at

those elections. Today the general council, in spite of Stellato's protests it is reported, voted to dismiss the trial committee which had failed to render its verdict for three months. It had stalled because its verdict could not get a two thirds vote of approval in the general council. It couldn't get a majority.

The action today may end the farce of those trials. But they gave the Reuther leadership a potent weapon against Stellato when the question of union democracy is brought up. This is true despite the fact that at the time the charges were brought against the five the Reuther leadership did not frown on the whole business, to put it politely.

The first official reaction of the UAW top leaders to the attack in *Ford Facts* was a mild one: It was a press release pointing out that the convention delegates, by overwhelming majority had voted democratically for the dues increase, and that the convention is the highest body of the union. This statement, of course, emphasizes the fact that Stellato is bucking a convention decision.

The whole incident signifies that Reuther's main base in Local 600 has split with him. For Stellato was re-elected president by a slim margin as a Reutherite. The majority of the general council and the executive board were already against Reuther.

Not the least of the ironies of the situation is that with a dues increase, Ford Local 600 will have more funds, and Stellato may have a chance to build his own machine in opposition to Reuther, for he will have his share of "pork chops" to give out in the form of local union jobs, and "lost time."

If the UAW, which is so strongly united on the main questions of trade union policy is now thrown into real turmoil over the dues increase, it will be clear that the tactics of the top leadership at the convention have boomeranged on them. In a union with the democratic traditions of the UAW it may very well turn out that the most efficient and surest way of getting things done is still the democratic way: with the ranks, and not over their heads.

Celebrate

MAY DAY

with the

INDEPENDENT SOCIALIST LEAGUE

MAY DAY DINNER

Delicious Food

Delightful Dancing

Melodious Singing

Memorable Fellowship

247 Lexington Ave. Saturday, May 5
New York City 7:00 P.M.

DONATION \$1.50

"Peace Scare" is New Word on Wall St.

As Sylvia Porter, financial columnist for the *New York Post*, noted last week, the term "peace scare" has become one of the stock phrases in the terminology of Wall Street. It has become the accepted phrase to denote the terrible dangers for Wall Street finance inherent in any serious decline in the prospect of war.

The finest illustration of the effects of the "peace scare," of course, was the fall in stocks the day following the dismissal of General MacArthur. It was the stock market's way of stating to the world that the much-debated removal signified a slight slackening in global tensions. Since last June, as Miss Porter points out, the market has been steadily gaining, the Dow-Jones average soaring from 197 to 255. The post-war economy, its prosperity resting upon the tremendous spending of the cold war, actually required the war in Korea to put itself in full-speed operation. The growing

stalemate in Korea threatened to wipe out the conditions which made this possible.

It is, of course, absurd to think that MacArthur's insistence upon extending the war was due to any Wall Street connections of his own. But, at least it may be noted that the development of a total war in Asia was consistent with the requirements of an intoxicated stock market.

Sylvia Porter recognizes the painful conclusions one might draw from this situation. "What a commentary on the civilization in which we live," she remarks. For her it is a commentary upon the stupidities and absurdities and irrationalities of financial leaders. Do they not understand, she feebly asks at the close of her column, that there could be much greater prosperity if we had "real peace?"

Evidently they do not, and Miss Porter shudders when she thinks of it.

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

"To Our Friends in Asia" — —

(Continued from page 1)

and ludicrous phrases of The Nineteen. To these circumstances must be added the vastly complicating phenomenon of Stalinism and Stalinist imperialism, which we readily grant Lenin did not feel it necessary to analyze when he first set forth his theory in 1916. However, the development of Stalinism does not modify, let alone diminish, the imperialist character of American capitalism. It only accentuates it, and makes it more odiously manifest to the peoples of the world—a fact which is really emphasized by the necessity The Nineteen feel to make their "explanatory" appeal to the Asian peoples.

From the standpoint of the working class and of socialism, the triumph of Stalinism, which enslaves the people, is the very antithesis of the great Russian Revolution which began their liberation. But from the standpoint of the capitalist classes, there is no such antithesis. Wherever Stalinism threatens, it also threatens the capitalists; where it conquers, it wipes them out; where it wipes them out, it narrows down still further the "living space" of world capitalism. Nowadays, these last two words mean more and more: American capitalism.

The capitalist world is so far gone in its disintegration that there is not a single country that can challenge the Stalinist empire, let alone defeat it. Indeed, leave out the U. S. A. and all the rest of the capitalist world could not successfully clash with Stalinism. That's the miserable state reached by capitalism which so many helpless and muddle-headed people still think of salvaging. Capitalism can hope to beat the Kremlin only if it is organized, sustained and led by the United States.

The simple people of the world have not read Lenin's work on imperialism. But in their own way, they understand it not too badly; in any case, better than the nineteen democratic socialist scholars, including those who once did read it. Millions, tens of millions, understand that American capitalism can maintain its exceptional position in the world, a position which the rest do not and cannot and will not enjoy, not by its political superiority, not by triumphing over Stalinism by means of better political weapons, but by a war involving the entire world and threatening its very existence.

The people, everyone knows, do not judge by theories but by results. Millions in Europe alone have gone through two world wars in one life-time. From both of them, they came out more cruelly impoverished; more thoroughly bled, more deeply rent and scarred than before. The U. S. came out of both with many casualties, to be sure, but with far, far fewer than Europe; above all, it came out both times richer, more powerful, more world-dominant. With what feelings do you think the people of Europe—and Asia—now face the prospect of a third world war?

U. S.—An Aristocratic Democracy

To tell them that the U. S. is an "imperfect democracy" is to mislead them—or rather to try, because they are not so easy to mislead. Even to say it is a capitalist democracy is not sufficiently accurate. The U. S. is indeed a democracy of a kind—an aristocratic imperialist democracy. Its aristocratic democracy—enjoyed by an aristocracy among the world's capitalist classes and even an aristocracy among the world's working classes—is based on its extraordinary economic power. Its economic power is based upon the impoverishment of the rest of the capitalist world.

Because it is a capitalist country, the capitalist class is privileged as against the working class. Because it is an imperialist aristocrat, it is, as a nation, privileged as against all the other capitalist nations. That is why it arouses the hostility not only of the common people of the rest of the world but even of the capitalist classes of the other countries! And we will see that the U. S., its working class in particular, will have to pay even more heavily and tragically for the aristocratic position it enjoys and which saturates it with a chauvinistic psychology from which not even "democratic socialists by conviction" are exempt as they would like to believe.

If everyone in this country does not understand the aristocratic privileges enjoyed by the U. S., everyone in the other countries does. What is more, the vast majority abroad understands that American capitalism (not imperialism, of course, just capitalism) does not intend to share these privileges with the rest of the world and, so long as capitalism exists here, under Coolidge or Truman or even Col. McCormick, it never will share them.

"Why should we share them, when we alone worked for them with our own hands?" exclaims the honestly innocent—as well as the not-so-innocent—American patriot who does not realize how heavily saturated he is with good American chauvinism. He does not grasp the feelings of the peoples of the other countries; his leaders and his newspapers do not allow him to grasp them. These peoples, the Europeans in particular, feel that in the two greatest world crises of the twentieth century, it was they, far, far, far more than we, who made the sacrifices of blood and wealth; but it was we, and we alone, who came out vastly richer, richer at the expense of their pauperization, and, relatively, at least, physically unscathed. The *Chicago Tribune* does not understand this because its class head is not, as it were, shaped that way. But what about the "democratic socialists"?

Will Not Share Privileges

The peoples of the world also see that the U. S. has no intention of sharing its privileges, let alone of foregoing them. They know—they need not be reminded every week by The Nineteen, for the *Chicago Tribune* reminds them of it every day—that the U. S. has "spent on relief and rehabilitation in Europe and Asia since the war

\$36,500,000,000." Some of these funds undoubtedly saved many, many lives, and reconstructed much of the economy, primarily, as even the recent American trade-union delegations to Europe have pointed out, for the benefit of the capitalist classes. But what stands out, what appears to them and is far more important is this: the "relief and rehabilitation" of Europe and Asia, and the additional billions being poured into those lands now, are sent and used for the purpose of mobilizing them for the third world war which they all fear and hate. For that, they do not have the gratitude that American chauvinists expect them to show.

Why not? Look at the situation "in the light of the facts." Last year, the U. S. appropriated about 34-35 million dollars under Truman's "Point Four Program" for the building up of the underdeveloped and backward countries. Practically, for these countries, it meant next to nothing. About half went to the UN, where it is dribbled away; the other half is likewise dribbled away; altogether it could change the economic situation of the countries envisaged by the breadth of one finger.

BUT—the appropriation proposed by Truman for the fiscal year of 1952 for direct military aid to countries abroad—that is, to mobilize and arm them for war and destruction—amounts to no less than 6 billion dollars, or almost twenty times as much as was appropriated last year for Point Four! The budget proposed for the same period for the arming of the U. S. alone amounts to a good 40 billion dollars, and it will, of course, be adopted by Congress with minor changes if any. But the miserable few million dollars—miserable by comparison with the war budget—required to alleviate somewhat the appalling famine that threatens India? That appropriation is held up. Every child knows why. Do The Nineteen? Then why do they not write another letter to their friends in Asia explaining that the U. S. is not imperialist, that it does not use its economic power to impose its political and military decisions upon a weaker nation?

American capitalism, imperialist through and through, talks about defending democracy from Stalinist imperialism. It may even be that its spokesmen believe what they say. No matter. We need not believe about a man what he believes about himself. In reality, they want to defend only their privileges and power which, precisely because they are imperialists, they do not and will not share with the other peoples of the world. But they cannot defend their privileges without the support of other nations and they know it. This support they cannot get from the free will of the peoples! This too they know and many of them virtually admit it. The present world political situation is so delicate for them, so hazardous, that they cannot impose their will on other nations in the "old" imperialist manner, by sheer, open employment of armed force. A fine reception that would meet!

A New Imperialism: New Methods

So, they seek to impose their leadership by the means unique to American imperialism today, their exceptional economic power, on which their military power is based. They cannot send Marines to France or England or India, as they did to Nicaragua a quarter century ago;

and they need not do that today. They hold over the ruling classes of the other countries their unique economic power, saying, in effect: "Without us, your economy will collapse overnight; the Stalinists will take power; or the workers themselves will take power; in either case, you are done for." Or: "If you had voted right in the UN meetings, there would be no delay in sending you food to ward off your famine." Every well-educated child, even if he is not a "democratic socialist by conviction," knows how restless and irked even the UN delegates from the capitalist countries feel under this constant economic-political pressure of American imperialism. If that is how they feel, is it so hard to imagine how their peoples at home feel and how right they are about American capitalism's imperialist nature, even without reading Lenin or Hobson?

Unquestionably, write The Nineteen, "the American people are ready to use large sums for cooperative war against war throughout the world, especially if this war can be substituted for the present terribly expensive race in arms."

Right! We would even like to say, one hundred percent right. But the sentiments of the American people are not what the other peoples call into question, and the shift in terms is—how shall we say?—misleading. What is in question is: American capitalism, American imperialism.

Not Peace, But Profits

And that question is at the heart of hearts of the whole question. To that question, evasively affirmed by The Nineteen who cannot quite summon up enough strength to say "the American capitalist class" or "the American government," we reply categorically: NO! American capitalism is concerned not with world peace, but with world profits, not with world prosperity but with its own jealously-guarded privileges. It will spend billions of dollars to prepare for the most hideous war in history, and more billions of dollars and millions of lives to fight it, millions of American lives and millions of lives of peoples of other lands it can enlist behind its command, in the hope that this war will enhance its wealth and privilege, as the last two wars did. But for the "cooperative war against war throughout the world," it will grudgingly count out pennies and dimes, and even that not always. That, The Nineteen do not see, is because American capitalism is imperialist and imperialism does not exist to improve the conditions of the people, most certainly not of the pariah peoples among whom the American aristocrat is dominant.

All that has been said is not meant, by so much as a word, to deny the abhorrent character of Stalinist despotism, which we understood somewhat earlier than the defender of the Moscow Trials, Upton Sinclair. Not by so much as a word is it meant to deny that Stalinism is a menace to socialism, to the working class, to the freedom and future of the people. We know what Stalinism signifies, we have said it often and we will not stop saying it.

But it is meant to say this: American imperialism, because it is what it is in its very nature, cannot conduct a progressive struggle against Stalinism, cannot conduct a democratic struggle against it. It is, by its very nature, too dependent upon the reactionary forces that depend upon it—the dark clerical parties of Europe, the Vatican and its Franco, and the Rheids, Bao Dais and Chiang Kai-sheks of Asia. It cannot even come to harmonious terms with such inadequate democrats, if we may say so, as the Labourite chiefs in England and Nehru in India. American imperialism cannot instill confidence in itself among the popular masses of the world, not even the "free world," as it calls it, not even with the help of "democratic socialists by conviction."

So far as the masses of the people of the world are concerned, American imperialism stands virtually alone, and that is how it will stand. There is the tragic penalty the American people, who are indeed menaced by the rise of Stalinist totalitarianism, must pay for the rule and aristocratic privileges of the American ruling classes! It is a penalty from which we can be released only under one condition: a workers' government in the U. S., with a genuinely democratic program—for that alone can win the brotherhood and confidence of the peoples of the world. Only under that condition, and nothing short of that.

Stand by Your Positions!

That cannot come tomorrow morning—we really know that! But it will never come so long as the workers of this country do not declare their complete political independence of the capitalist class, its parties, and its imperialist course which poisons us with chauvinist ideas and alienates us from the peoples of other lands and them from us. That independence will never come if we listen to and preach the sickening apologies for American imperialism that are typified by the "Appeal to Our Friends in Asia."

And it will not come soon if our friends in Asia, who are so far ahead of us that they have decided to "stand clear"—to be independent of—Stalinism and American imperialism, and thereby have begun to raise up a new rallying point of hope for peace and freedom—if these friends listen to the shallow appeals of the defenders of American-imperialism-which-is-not-imperialist, defenders who have given up the fight against war and begun to recruit for it. We want with all our strength to believe that the people of India, justly proud of their hard-won independence and resolved to extend it in all fields, and above all their most advanced fighters, the socialists of India, will stand stoutly by their positions.

LABOR ACTION
BOOK SERVICE

can help you build your own labor and social-liberty library... Write for free book list.
And remember: we also supply books of ALL publishers. Get ALL your books from

LABOR ACTION BOOK SERVICE
114 W. 14th St. New York 11, N. Y.

The Handy Way to Subscribe
to LABOR ACTION

LABOR ACTION
114 West 14 Street
New York 11, N. Y.

Please enter my subscription:

NEW RENEWAL
 6 months at \$1.00
 1 year at \$2.00

NAME
(please print)

ADDRESS

.....

ZONE APT.

CITY

STATE

Bill me Payment enclosed