

# LABOR ACTION

Independent Socialist Weekly

APRIL 14, 1952

FIVE CENTS

## THE CRISIS IN STEEL:

What Does Truman's Steel Seizure Give The Steel Workers?

Big Steel's Political Aims

A Strike Wave Builds Up

... page 2

## WHY CAN'T TRUMAN CLEAN UP? The New Stage of the Corruption Scandal— And a Muffed Opportunity for Labor

By HAL DRAPER

With the events of the past week, highlighted by the double firing of McGrath and Morris, the corruption scandal in the federal government has entered on a distinctly new stage, with at least two characteristics which are beginning to make it rather unique in modern American history. We shall point these out; but even if they are considered only a matter of degree they are noteworthy. Something new has been added.

What this underlines for us, in connection with what we believe is the *main* problem in national politics, is this: The labor leadership has missed the boat in 1952. A great opportunity has been thrown away, an opportunity to make labor play a new great role in political action.

The connection between these two statements is, we believe, not far to seek.

Corruption scandals are nothing new in American politics, not even scandals revealing the widespread character of government corruption. Likewise in the present situation, it is not the *extent* of government corruption which is new, no matter how much material is still to be brought to light. In any case, in such inquiries seven-eighths of the dirt always remains under the surface, like the well-known iceberg.

### A Remarkable Fact

The "classic" referents for national political corruption in America are such affairs as the Teapot Dome scandal under Coolidge, the Harding administration before it, and, going further back, the Grant administration. As everyone knows, these exuded a smell which blanketed the country. When the present scandals got underway with the RFC and tax-evasion stories, it was hardly to be expected that the Truman administration would overtop them all.

But the fact is (to take the most notorious of the above predecessors of the Fair Deal) that, when the Teapot Dome affair became serious, the Coolidge administration was *able* to proceed, and *did* proceed, to a cleanup—that is, to what passes for a cleanup in American politics. The cleanup was accomplished by a non-partisan commission under the aegis of the administration itself. A cabinet officer was fired in disgrace. At least the front was made tidy.

What we have just witnessed this week is the confession of the administration that it is completely unable to make even the pretense of a cleanup. Truman's Fair Deal in 1952 cannot even put on a show of doing what Coolidge's Republicans were able to do.

And this is a remarkable fact.

It is twice as remarkable when one remembers that all this is taking place at a critical juncture in a presidential-election year when there are not only the ordinary pressures for putting up a front of honesty, but when the pressure of

an imminent and uncertain election would seem to make a housecleaning (or a stab at it) a matter of elementary self-preservation.

It is impossible to come to any conclusion other than that the Fair Deal *cannot* clean up, since we know no reason to doubt that Truman would *like* to be able to do so at least as much as did that mediocre puppet for big business who enjoyed room and board in the White House in the Teapot Dome era.

What is absolutely clear on the basis of anyone's version of the obscure dealings behind the McGrath-Morris dismissals is that the White House is involved in the muck up to its new balcony. As we have said before, we do not believe this is so because of personal involvement by Truman in dishonest dollar-dealings.

### Is It More Deep-Going?

Last December Truman hurried back from vacation in Key West, after the discharge of Caudle, to take personal charge of the corruption situation. It can safely be said that there was not an observer in the country who entertained the slightest doubt that *some* well-publicized (or dramatic, or even spectacular) measures would be taken to show that, whatever malfeasances were taking place in the lower echelons of the administration, the tops were suitably anxious to do their duty—and clear their own skirts. Whether these measures would really mean anything, was another matter; but something had to be done.

After unusual delay, which itself provoked comment, Truman did do something: he appointed Newbold Morris as clean-up man, promising a "free hand," etc. The evidence now is that Morris was knifed from the top while Truman turned his back, reappearing on the scene of carnage only to carry off the corpses of both combatants. After which he appoints, as mortician, a new attorney general who announces that his first job is "to find out if a cleanup is needed and where!"

It is an understatement to say that the Truman administration has not been able to make even a show of cleaning up. The fact is that the first move it made in this direction has served only to involve higher and higher layers of the administration in the mess, through two members of the cabinet (McGrath and Snyder), to the White House staff of secretaries, to the Presidency.

Can one dismiss the notion that there is something more deep-going here than appeared even in the Teapot Dome case?

### Not Just the Administration

Let this lie for a while while one considers the second newly accented feature of the present situation:

This is not a question merely of a "corrupt administration."

In fact it has been unfair and misleading to talk in terms only of the "Truman administration," as we have done above and as others do: It is not untrue but it is inadequate to explain what has happened merely by deploring the tendency of a party which has long been entrenched in power to sink deeper into the ways of graft and bribery. At least this does not begin to account for another thing which is at least quantitatively new about the current scandal:

Never before has a corruption scandal so thoroughly enmeshed not only the party in control of the administration (which is "natural") but also (a) the party, in the two-party system, which is NOT in power, and (b) virtually every other element in and around Washington, "non-partisan" and "independent."

The Republicans are in this up to their necks. Even the material brought out prior to the McGrath-Morris explosion showed as much, in the cases of Senators Bridges and Brewster, for example (hushed up by the Congressional committee investigating the tax frauds). One of the dossiers upon which Morris was reportedly ready to act concerned "a certain Republican senator who has been one of the prominent opponents of the Truman administration"—an unusually broad hint for the *New York Times*. Above all, in full view of the audience, the entire Republican machine in Congress went at Morris with hammer, tongs, dagger and club with as much, if not more, enthusiasm than even Truman's own political family. Republican Senators Mundt, Nixon and McCarthy led the pack in full cry.

Within the Democratic fold, an *anti-Fair Deal* opponent of Truman like Senator McCarran made common cause with McGrath against Morris. Few things so unanimous have been seen in Washington since the British put it to the torch. And for the Republicans this was not "smart politics" unless... At any rate, with the corruption issue looming as their spearhead for the election, they threw away half its value, even though they will still use it and benefit from it for all it is worth.

### Wilson's Businessmen

It is not only the Republicans. The same is true of the top-flight businessmen who gathered in covets in Washington behind C. E. Wilson. We are not referring to five-percenters or the little businessmen who infest Washington's hotels looking for contracts. Morris' "celebrated questionnaire" about outside income had a violently allergic effect on the "non-partisan" industrialists and financiers who head up the war agencies. It was "resented... perhaps most strongly not by the politicians but by the substantial businessmen who are serving the government on a temporary basis during the emergency," reported the *Times* of the dollar-a-year patriots. At the cabinet meeting on March 28, according to Arthur Krock, C. E. Wilson (not yet resigned) "also agreed with the attorney general [McGrath] and mentioned the names of some of his most important subordinates as likely to leave office."

One of the dark spots of the whole picture concerns another "non-partisan" agency, the FBI and its J. Edgar Hoover. This much is fact:

When McGrath called reporters to his office to announce his dismissal of Morris, the FBI head was at McGrath's side among other officials. With Morris out, McGrath's successor McGranery immediately announced that the FBI would henceforth carry the ball for the investigation. Max Lerner and others have understandably opined that Morris was much *persona non grata* to the FBI as to all the other honorable men in Washington.

We repeat: it is not a question merely of a corrupt administration. What we seem to have here, to an unprecedented extent in the public view, is a situation of such all-prevailing bipartisan and non-partisan corruption throughout the whole state structure that it becomes not a political issue in the narrow sense but a social issue.

### The Social Trend

Can it be that corruption has become institutionalized not merely as a lubricant of the party-machine setup, as it always has been, but as a deep-seated ingredient of the state structure, apart from which party machine is directly in control of the spoils?

Such a sweeping generalization at this point would no doubt be going too far and fast beyond the immediate evidence; but before it is scornfully dismissed even as

(Turn to last page)



TRUMAN DENOUNCES STEEL COMPANIES BUT—

# What Does Steel Seizure Give the Union?

**By LARRY O'CONNOR**  
 APRIL 9—The United Steelworkers of America (CIO) called off its strike against the steel industry last night after President Truman announced over the air that he had ordered the industry "seized" by the federal government. The question which steel workers as well as the rest of the labor movement are asking themselves is: Where do we go from here?

The president's radio speech was a vigorous attack on the greed of the steel barons. He pointed out that the union had been willing to accept the recommendations of the Wage Stabilization Board, even though these fell below its original wage demands. He went on to point out that the steel companies, despite the fact that they are making just about the highest profits in their history, have been holding out for price increases which would guarantee them a profit of \$26 or \$27 per ton of steel. "That's about the most outrageous thing I have heard of. They not only want to raise their prices

to cover any wage increases; they want to double their money on the deal," he said.

Truman placed the blame for the strike squarely on the shoulders of the steel capitalists. He stated that even though they need no price increase whatever to ensure adequate profits after the wage increase recommended by the WSB, they are due to get about \$3 per ton under the Caphart amendment to the price-control law, but no more.

Finally, he said that he had instructed the director of defense mobilization to call the union and the employers to Washington for the purpose of settling their dispute, and that he hoped they would do so immediately as he does not want to have the government "running" the steel industry for a single day longer than necessary to prevent an interruption in steel manufacture.

**NO WAGE HIKE**

The first impression which most people inside and outside the labor movement will have of the president's speech and his action in taking over the steel industry will no doubt be that he has

placed the government squarely in support of the just demands of the workers.

But the question is: How are the workers now actually to get what they are fighting for?

The steel bosses have gone to the courts to have the president's seizure order enjoined, and eventually to have it declared unconstitutional. There is no way of knowing how the courts will rule on the matter. But even assuming that the "seizure" is sustained, how will the workers get their contract with their wage increases?

The president's order authorizes the secretary of commerce to "determine and prescribe terms and conditions of employment under which the plants, facilities, and other properties possession of which is taken pursuant to this order shall be operated," and also directs him to "recognize the rights of workers to bargain collectively through representatives of their own choosing and to engage in concerted activities for the purpose of collective bargaining, adjustment of grievances, or other mutual aid or protection, provided that such activities do

not interfere with the operation of such plants, facilities, and other properties."

Just what does that mean? Secretary Sawyer has already told the press that for "the time being" the present wage terms and conditions would continue, and that the wage increases recommended by the WSB would not be put into effect while Defense Mobilization Director Steelman is conducting the collective-bargaining negotiations ordered by Truman. But now that the union has called off the strike, what kind of pressure can it apply to the steel owners to settle the dispute on terms acceptable to it?

**PROFITS AS USUAL**

While the wage demands, which Truman has declared are quite just, will not be granted, at least immediately, the industry will continue to reap the profits which the president has declared are exorbitant. According to the "seizure" order, the management of the industry "shall continue their functions, including the collection and disbursement of funds . . . payment of dividends on stocks, and of principle, interest, sinking funds and all other distributions. . . ." What real pressure does the "seizure" order put on them to settle with the union?

The president's speech, to be sure, puts the finger of blame on the capitalists, and presumably has the function of arousing public opinion against their greed in demanding a price increase which would contribute to the rising cost of living. But already the Washington correspondents are writing that Steelman is offering the companies \$4.50 or \$5 a ton instead of the maximum of \$3 which they can get legally under Caphart amendment. And Nathan Feinsinger, who

has been directing the government's negotiations with both parties in New York during the past few days, has offered a "compromise" in which the union would accept a two-year contract without further wage increases if the companies will agree to the WSB wage formula. This would mean that the government is putting the heat on the union to forgo or at least postpone future wage increases for a settlement now, while at the same time offering the industry an inflationary price increase.

The history of government "seizure" of industry, as experienced especially by the railroad workers, certainly bodes no good for the steel workers. The president's speech is one thing, the realities of the situation are quite different. If the government were to grant the wage increases immediately, the pressure would definitely be on the companies. But if it does not, the union's hands are now tied behind its back, while the companies have every advantage of their vast economic power and their ability to conduct a great propaganda campaign, while the workers have only the consolation that the president has said they are good fellows.

But right now, the question still remains: Where does the steel union go from here? And it is not a matter which concerns the United Steelworkers alone. This "seizure" business has become one of the patterns in the government's handling of strikes in the vital industries. Sooner or later, the whole labor movement will have to decide its attitude toward it, and its tactics to meet it. These, it should be clear, lie as much in the realm of politics as of strict trade-union strategy.

# U.S. Cracks Whip on Italian Labor

By MARY BELL

After a Rome dateline, the *AFL News Reporter's* correspondent, Syd Stogel, gave "assurance" to American labor last week that "no defense purchases under the U. S. Security Program would be placed in Italy with any plants or firms where Communist trade unions are in control."

Stogel's information was the result of an exclusive statement from M. Leon Dayton, chief of the Mutual Security Administration mission to Italy, who indicated that the U. S. "off-shore procurement program" would be undertaken in compliance with the Benton amendment to the Mutual Security Act.

The wording of the Benton amendment is "to encourage, where suitable, the development and strengthening of free labor union movements, as the collective-bargaining agencies of labor within such countries," in the administration of procurement.

What the application of the Benton amendment comes down to is an American policy of refusing to do business with firms whose workers are in Stalinist-led unions, a situation which obtains widely in Europe, and particularly in France and Italy.

The *AFL Reporter* cites the repercussions of this policy in Italy, in the case of the huge Fiat Motor Company of Turin, employing 60,000 workers, of whom 65 per

cent voted recently for CP-led unions to represent them as their collective-bargaining agency.

**U. S. EXPORT**

In the delicate words of the *AFL Reporter*, "when Washington began to hint that no defense contracts would go to Communist-dominated factories, the Fiat company made a sudden about-face and for the first time in many years began to crack down on the Reds."

Washington has only to "hint"—and the crackdown starts! Those hints, however, are backed up with the power to dispense or withhold American dollars, and thus American hints easily dictate policy to European concerns.

As a result of the crackdown, the chief of Fiat's Employee Benefits Division, admittedly a member of the Italian CP, was discharged, as well as a number of employees who "were caught committing acts of open sabotage," according to the *AFL* writer.

Finally, the *AFL* organ concludes, "If Fiat's new labor policy spreads to other major industries, critics predict it will prove the greatest boon to free trade-unionism in Italy since the fall of fascism."

How much of a boon to free trade-unionism is this prime U. S. export—anti-Communism?

First of all, it has always been

not merely a point of pride, but a necessity for its independence, for the trade-union movement to solve labor problems within the framework of the labor movement, including the problem of Stalinism and Stalinist domination of unions. The progressive elements in unions in this country have had a policy of fighting Stalinism from within, through political struggle and confrontation and not by bureaucratic means from above or outside.

**WHO'LL GAIN?**

Where there have been departures from this policy of letting labor solve the problems that are labor's from within the labor movement, they have been signs of real weakness of the labor movement, either organizationally or politically. Bureaucratic measures, even against Stalinism, whether from within the organization, or through calling the cops or the government from outside, have redounded to the favor of Stalinism by letting them grab the mantle of martyrdom or through the stifling of genuine democracy and independence.

A triple danger is courted through labor's backing such a policy with regard to the European trade unions. Not only is labor departing from its traditional progressive policy of setting its own problems in its own way. But in cases similar to that of the Fiat works in Italy, American labor is assuming responsibility, which is dictatorial, arbitrary and discriminatory. Worst of all, there is little or no guarantee that the widespread application of such a policy will do what it is supposed to, namely root out Stalinism and aid free labor in Europe.

European labor is skeptical, to begin with, of American aims. It keeps at least half an ear cocked to Russian propaganda concerning American aims at world domination. When American action corresponds to Russian claims, the results can only redound to Stalinism. American labor has even more to lose in risking its face and friendship with European labor.

On-the-spot investigating teams of the American labor movement have already severely criticized the administration of Marshall Plan aid in Europe, finding that scarcely a tiny trickle made its way to the working people. The administration of military procurement funds is now being applied so as to dictate policy within the labor movement.

## AN APPEAL TO SOCIALISTS AT THE DANGER LINE

By L. G. SMITH

As business manager of LABOR ACTION and the *New International*, I have been watching the Fund Drive figures with growing concern. During the past few weeks I have felt as if there were others reading the figures over my shoulder. And sure enough, there are. They are the people with whom I have the privilege to deal, our creditors.

It seems to me that the time has come to say a frank word to our comrades of the Independent Socialist League, our sympathizers and all the readers of LABOR ACTION. Without a doubt, many of you have been contributing handsomely to the drive. Many of you have had to really scrape and deprive yourselves of things you have been expecting to buy; in some cases perhaps you have even given up necessities.

But the fact remains that the drive is now in serious danger of falling far short of its goal. And the further fact is simply that if we do not make the full drive, or at least come very close to it, both our publications will be in critical danger.

Our fund drives are not conducted in order that we may acquire a nice financial cushion on which to sit during the nine or ten months between drives. They are not designed to balance our budget for the year ahead. They are designed for one purpose only: to pay off enough of our debts so that we can re-establish credit for the year ahead. And usually they come just in the nick of time, when our very patient and even generous creditors can no longer afford to permit us to increase the sums we owe them.

I would like every reader of LABOR ACTION to think about this seriously for a moment. The hard fact is that if we are not able, during the Fund Drive, to reduce our debts to minor figures it will be simply impossible, dur-

ing the months ahead, for us to keep them within the limits which our creditors can stand.

Neither LABOR ACTION nor the *New International* have missed a single issue for financial reasons since they were founded some twelve years ago. It has always been tough to get them out, but we have managed to swing it. But if this drive fails badly, it will not be simply a question of our being compelled, perhaps, to skip an occasional issue, unfortunately as that would be. The survival of the publications themselves will be endangered.

**IT'S UP TO YOU**

There is no principle which compels a socialist organization to get out any particular type or frequency of publication. Yet it seems to me that it would be a very great shame, even a tragedy, if the firm and consistent voice of independent socialism should be muted, let alone silenced, at the present time. And that is what this Fund Drive is about.

As business manager I am in a position to understand perhaps more clearly than most of our comrades and readers just what the failure of this drive would mean. But I am in no better position, as a socialist, to feel what the loss of our publications would mean both to us here in America, and to the hundreds of socialists from Great Britain, to Germany, to India and Australia . . . socialists to whom LABOR ACTION and the *New International* are the sole objective evidence that international socialism has its representatives in the heart of the main fortress of capitalism.

Comrades and friends, socialists: it is up to you whether our publications will be able to continue. It is up to you, and to those whom you can approach to make sizable contributions. No one else will do the job.

# Strike Wave Builds Up

By GORDON HASKELL

A significant section of the American labor movement is involved in battle, or rather a series of battles, with the employers. For the past few weeks attention has centered on the preliminary skirmishes which have led up to the big strike in steel. For the labor movement as a whole this is, of course, the most important struggle. But, as LABOR ACTION goes to press, several other important unions are engaged in strikes which, taken all together, constitute a "strike wave" of proportions not seen for some time.

In Akron, Ohio, Local 5 of the United Rubber Workers (CIO) has been conducting a strike against the B. F. Goodrich Company on behalf of the office workers. This strike has become extremely bitter, with the company resorting to court action to enjoin the union from picketing. George Bass, president of the local, and other officers have been convicted of contempt of court as a result of the union's alleged refusal to abide by the court's restrictions on picketing.

The other rubber locals in Akron are supporting the strike, which is reported to be the most bitterly fought struggle since the '30s when the CIO organized the rubber industry. In addition, AFL mechanics and CIO bus drivers have walked out in a dispute with the Akron Transportation Company.

**TEL AND TEL HIT**

Although wage increases, seniority provisions and other forms of trade-union protection for the Goodrich office workers are being demanded by the union, the chief issue seems to be the refusal of the company to recognize the right of the union to represent these workers.

Much more national publicity has been given the strike of some 31,000 members of the Commercial Telegraphers Union (AFL), against the Western Union Telegraph Company, which has tied up operations all over the country. In this case wages and hours are the main issue. But here also the company is using every possible weapon against the union, including the old dodge of claiming that there is a "back to work"

movement. The company is also transporting scabs from city to city in an effort to give this story an appearance of reality.

A much larger strike, also in the communications field, is the one involving some 66,000 members of the Communications Workers of America (CIO). This strike is being conducted against several sections of the American Telephone and Telegraph empire, including its subsidiary Western Electric Corporation which installs and repairs telephone equipment. The strike against Western Electric involves some 10,000 members of the CWA's Divisions 10 and 11 in 43 states and the District of Columbia. As these workers may picket many of the central telephone offices they may succeed in tying up all operations in much of the country if other workers observe their picket lines.

In addition, telephone operators in New Jersey, Michigan and Northern California and Nevada have gone out on strike against their respective sections of the American Tel and Tel network. In each case a major wage increase plus the union shop are the main demands.

**ANTI-UNION PUSH**

It is just a coincidence that these strikes are taking place at the same time, and that the attitude in each case shown by the employers is similar to the arrogant attitude of the steel barons which has been so clearly evident during the negotiations in that industry?

It would be going beyond the evidence at hand to state that there is a "plot" of big business to buck the unions, or at the very least to force them to abandon the demand for the union shop and to accept wage increases far below those which they are demanding, which are permitted by the law, to which they are clearly entitled, and which the giant corporations involved are well able to pay. Yet the fact remains that rubber, steel and communications are some of the most highly concentrated capital holdings in the country, and that the people who effectively control all of them are either the same men or men whose interests are closely interlocked.

L. S. Buckmaster, international president of the United Rubber Workers, has charged that some of the major rubber companies have stepped up anti-union activities to an extent which indicates a "concerted effort on the part of

many important rubber producers to try to break up or at least cripple our union." On Sunday, April 6, Benjamin Fairless, head of United States Steel, took to the air waves to make a vicious attack on the union, and particularly on the demand for the union shop. We cannot recall such violent anti-union language in public by a major corporation executive since Walter Reuther demanded that General Motors open its books to inspection by the United Automobile Workers.

**BOSSSES RIDING HIGH**

What is obviously taking place is an anti-union drive, and that is true whether or not the big employers have gathered in some smoke-filled room to plot their course. The fact of the matter is that they feel that the temper of the times favors them. Politically, the forces of conservatism and reaction—that is, the forces most closely allied with big business—are riding high.

The Fair Deal wing of the Democratic Party is in confusion bordering on panic, and this includes the politicians of the labor movement. For years they have placed a good deal of reliance on at least some degree of backing from the government. But now the backing which can be expected (if any) is at its weakest, and the employers are fully aware of this.

But the unions have cards in their hands too. Their industrial strength is as great as it ever has been. The cost of living is pressing the rank and file hard. They really need the wage increases for which they are striking. Their support of the union shop has been demonstrated so overwhelmingly in elections under the Taft-Hartley Act that even this reactionary Congress dropped the union-shop provision from the law. The steel union has been preparing for a real showdown for months, and the other unions which are on strike received strike authorization from their members by overwhelming majorities.

With the steel and communications strikes just starting it is much too early to foresee the outcome of the struggle. But all signs point to bitter strikes in both fields. The upshot may well be decided by the degree to which the whole labor movement grasps the significance of these strikes, and rallies to the unstinting support of the workers and unions who are on the firing line.

# Big Steel Bosses, Pockets Bulging, Are Playing for Political Stakes

By GERALD McDERMOTT

PITTSBURGH, April 6—Charles E. Wilson's resignation as war mobilizer represents a victory for the United Steelworkers and the labor movement.

It is highly probable that the union offensive will have become a strike by the time this article is printed.

Wilson, spokesman for big business in the mobilization program, resigned as President Truman sided with the Wage Stabilization Board, the union and Price Stabilizer Ellis Arnall in denying the steel industry a price hike, at least for the present. Wilson held out for a price hike for his fellow monopolists. He resigned when this was denied.

Actually, the steel industry will not lose a nickel in actual profits if it grants the WSB package without raising prices. The costs of the raise would come entirely out of excess-profits taxes; net profits would remain the same, at least for the big producers.

**BIG STEEL'S AIMS**

Therefore, the steel barons are not fighting for their immediate profits. They are fighting a political battle for the capitalist class of which they are an important part.

They have several aims. One aim is to discourage wage increases in other industries—after all, the directors of steel companies are also directors in many other companies. Another aim is to push further the despicable lie that labor is causing inflation. And most of all, they want to frustrate the union. Every gain that the union wins will strengthen it for the next inevitable struggle. Then, too, the monopolists just plain hate to pass out a raise. They still operate on the theory that a hungry man will work harder and be more docile.

That the industry is well able to pay is further illustrated by the fact that a number of smaller companies—Kaiser Steel, Detroit Steel, and a dozen others—have settled on the union terms. And these companies are in a less favorable economic position than the giants who are holding out.

Even the big companies have backed down on many points. In their first offer to the union, they agreed to all of the WSB package except the union shop and part of the wage increase.

**LEWIS AWAITS**

Actually, Truman did not close the door on a price hike. In his reply to Wilson's resignation, Truman promised an eventual price hike if one is "required on demands."

(Turn to last page)

## LONDON LETTER

### Labor Gains, Tories Divided

By ALLAN VAUGHAN

LONDON, Apr. 1—I have just returned home after posting election addresses for the Labor candidates in the forthcoming county council elections. Naturally the subject of Thursday's council elections are uppermost in my mind. I have no doubt that we will be able to increase our Labor vote, even though most Londoners seem to be apathetic over the whole affair.

The proximity of the Butler Budget (the new budget passed by the Tory government) will certainly help to swell the Labor vote, since its effects are just now beginning to take on an unpleasant appearance. The rise in the bank rate, which transfers 100 million pounds a year from taxpayers' pockets to the bankers, has already led to unemployment in the textile industries in Lancashire, and unemployment is on the increase in other industries also.

Not long ago Alfred Robens, former minister of labor and national service, warned the Tory front benches that a million unemployed by the end of this year is not impossible. And Harold Wilson, whose ability is generally recognized, warned both the Conservative and Labor Parties that a slump was quite likely.

**TORIES DIVIDED**

Another important event has been carefully hidden by the capitalist press in this country. Only the *Labor Party's Daily Herald*, for its own reasons of course, gave the Churchill-Woolton split any publicity.

It appears that Lord Woolton, lord president of the council, offered his resignation to the prime minister. It was on the promise that the food subsidies would not be cut (a promise made by Lord Woolton over the BBC during the last election campaign) that many deceived people gave their votes to the Tories.

The fissures within the Conservative Party, carefully concealed from the public, are at least as deep as those within the Labor Party. To many Conservatives, the chancellor of the exchequer,

According to press dispatches, the British Labor Party won significant victories in the county council elections, recording big gains at the expense of the Tories.

Labor held the London County Council with a record majority of 55, the most important prize. It also wrested complete control from the Conservatives in the neighboring county of Essex, registering a gain of 31 seats, which gives it 52 against the Conservatives' 25 (with 18 others going to Independents).

The Labor opposition also chalked up advances in Staffordshire (gain of 11), Cheshire, Leicestershire, Gloucestershire, Hampshire, Merionethshire, East Suffolk, and Lincolnshire.

R. A. Butler, is only a Hugh Gaitskell in disguise!

However, Butler's dexterous handling of the budget debate placed him in the line of succession to Churchill, within the Tory party. Knowing the Tories for what they are, we realize that if ever they become more strongly entrenched—possibly as the result of a snap election—they will dismiss Butler and replace him with a man more to their own liking. There are still Conservatives who would like to return to the "good old days" before the war when the Trade Union Congress was "in its place" and unemployment queues made the British worker know who was boss.

**ANOTHER FOR BEVAN**

An interesting Emergency Resolution is to be placed before delegates to the Cooperative Party congress at Glasgow during Easter. The resolution is to be moved by the national committee; it expresses no-confidence in the government's intention to put through an arms program which is flexible enough to avoid overstraining the national economy and undermining living standards and social services.

This resolution, if it is passed (and this is likely), will strengthen Bevan's position immeasurably. In addition, the Seretse Khama affair has reflected little credit on either

(Continued on page 5)

## Fund Drive Box Score

	Quota	Paid	Percent
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>\$12,500</b>	<b>\$6026</b>	<b>48.2</b>
Oregon	50	65	130
Indiana	50	50	100
Sfcreator	25	25	100
Socialist Youth League	1,500	1180	78.6
Cleveland	200	150	75
Boston	50	35	70
Pittsburgh	150	103	68.6
Oakland	500	300	60
Newark	300	162	54
St. Louis	50	26	52
New York	4,000	1938	48.4
Detroit	750	355	47.3
Buffalo	650	300	46
Chicago	1,800	710	39.4
Philadelphia	300	103	34.3
Los Angeles	600	200	33.3
General	1,000	276	27.6
Baltimore	25	5	20
Seattle	300	55	18.3
Akron	75	0	0
Reading	75	0	0

## CONTRIBUTE to the ISL FUND DRIVE!

**Independent Socialist League**  
 114 West 14 Street  
 New York 11, N. Y.

Enclosed is \$..... as my contribution to the ISL's 1952 Fund Drive.

NAME .....

ADDRESS .....

CITY ..... STATE.....

(Make checks payable to Albert Gates.)



# The ISL Program in Brief

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

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

Stalinism, in Russia and wherever it holds power, is a brutal totalitarianism—a new form of exploitation. Its agents in every country, the Communist Parties, are unrelenting enemies of socialism—which cannot exist without effective democratic control by the people.

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

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

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

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

### INTERESTED?

Get acquainted with the Independent Socialist League—

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

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

I want to join the ISL.

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

# Youth and Student Corner

## California Institutes a Spy System at U. of C.

By JOHN PARKER

BERKELEY, Apr. 7—Students of the University of California were notified on March 25 that henceforth the school administration would report any suspected subversive activities to the state Senate Committee on Un-American Activities. The announcement was made following a conference at Los Angeles, where representatives from ten California schools met with Senator Hugh M. Burns, chairman of the state Un-American Activities Committee.

The group set up a liaison committee to be composed of agents from each campus, who would be responsible for the investigation of "all levels of suspected communist activities, from the student ranks through the faculty and administration." The information will then be sent to the Senate group, which will inform the school of what it knows of the case. Also, the senators may recommend action, which the schools may or may not follow. However, it was made clear that the committee would strongly criticize any school which rejected advice.

President Robert Gordon Sproul of the University of California was one of the initiators of the action. He claims that the only intention of the schools is to trade information with the state committee, and that he was not in favor of any system of espionage or a new means of screening teachers.

### CANDY COATING FOR A BITTER PILL

No matter what the original intention of the good professors, the senators have their own ideas about the extent of their powers over the schools. After warning the public extensively about "subversive infiltration" of the campus, Burns called for cooperation of "educational, military, and civil agencies to meet this danger." In flat contradiction to Sproul, Burns further said that the purpose of the new liaison committee was to screen applicants for professional and other jobs.

As for Sproul's denial of the existence of an espionage system, the function of the "contact man" on campus is that of a spy. The president's reassurances are only candy coating for a very bitter pill.

It is impossible to say what the outcome of the conference will ultimately be. Even official sources are in conflict about the powers of the state committee. Since the new organizational procedure is not the result of legislative enactment, the relationship of the university to Burns' group is nowhere formulated in a public document. No one knows what private agreements were reached at the Los Angeles con-

ference nor the real intentions of the participants. One possible result may be the long-fought loyalty oath for students, or even wholesale expulsions of Stalinists and radicals.

News of the conference was enough to add perceptibly to the already stifling fear of the students and faculty. There has been only one editorial in the student newspaper, and no student opposition. Political repression has grown to such massive proportions that even the most courageous student hesitates to make himself conspicuous in a political way. Manifestation of political thought is almost non-existent today, and liberal political groups, such as the Students for Democratic Action, are silent.

### TERRORIZATION AT SATHER GATE

The extent of the police regime at the University of California must be astounding to outsiders. Liberal elements of the faculty have either been weeded out or silenced since the imposition of the loyalty oath three years ago. The student paper is under surveillance by a committee of representatives of faculty, administration, alumni and students, all appointed by President Sproul. An administration ruling of last winter bars individuals connected with organizations on the attorney general's subversive list from speaking on campus.

Police agents have joined with the administration and regents in terrorizing the university community. Sather Gate, which was once the "Hyde Park" of Berkeley, is today almost the exclusive property of plainclothesmen. At a recent street meeting held by the Socialist Youth League, FBI agents circled among the crowd of timorous students, while police photographers snapped pictures of speakers and audience. Any student who asked any sort of question pro or con could expect attention from the cameraman. At the end of the meeting, not one question was put to the speaker, nor did students gather around for the long and heated discussions once typical of Sather Gate meetings. Unlike previous occasions, when street meetings began at noon would continue until 4 p.m. or later, the last one ended after one hour.

Such monstrous repression is rapidly spreading over American campuses from coast to coast. Since American capitalism in its war with Stalinism can think of no better weapon than the police club, we can expect a real reversal of the trend only with the political intervention of labor. In the meantime it is the responsibility of every progressive student to organize and protect himself and his school from regimentation.

# Readers of Labor Action Take the Floor

## Socialist Unity

To the Editor:

I was very gratified by the appearance in full of my letter in your Jan. 28 issue [raising the question of socialist unity—Ed.] and particularly happy to see you devote so much space in your Feb. 25 issue to reply ["Why Can't All Socialists Unite?"]. In the main, I can agree with your analysis, although I balk at your characterization of the Socialist Workers Party as "Stalinist-oriented." On this point I think it would be more accurate to consider the latter as "tradition-encrusted" or something of that sort, for their thinking seems to reflect only a reluctance to keep abreast of new events; it is not so much a question of sympathies as of movement: they are stagnant, not malign.

For that matter it would be wise to take note of the fact that great numbers of the members of such organizations as the Communist Party, *Monthly Review* and other pro-Stalinist groups are sincere and devoted people

who, if approached correctly, could be brought into the camp of genuine Marxian socialism. I believe it is necessary to distinguish between the creed and its professional proponents on the one hand and its adherents on the other hand. The incidence of disillusionment and consequent turnover among the membership of these Stalinite groups is higher than you may imagine, and it is particularly tragic that those disillusioned abandon Marxism at the same time they forsake Stalinism. I have known personally of a number of such cases, and among very few were the persons involved drawn into a healthy alternative socialist channel. . . . The few cases of "Marx-survival" have been (in my experience) those where the Stalinist who is beginning to doubt is befriended by an anti-Stalinist socialist—befriended, not baited. . . .

There remain a few points in my earlier letter to which you made no reply. . . . Under the heading of united activities for socialist groups I would like to see a Socialist Bookstore, located

on the street level at some convenient spot, where interested persons could buy the pamphlet and periodical literature of all the various socialist tendencies. . . . it would serve as a kind of Socialist Information Center for the interested passer-by. . . .

Parallel with the above is the idea of economy of floor space and rent which would be effected if a number of socialist organizations which today occupy one floor each at several different addresses were jointly to rent or buy a single building. This is admittedly far-fetched, and I do not offer it as a suggestion for immediate achievement. Perhaps it is for various reasons totally impractical. There it is, at any rate, for whatever it may be worth: a possibility to aim for in the next few years. . . .

I don't expect the enclosed \$5 will bring the above suggestions into realization, but if this drop in the bucket will help keep you going I feel sure that the future will continue to hold the possibilities I have outlined. I am for the most part rather proud of the existence of the ISL, whatever its faults, and am willing to do what little I can to see its success increase, for without entirely agreeing with you I see in you the brightest hope of the socialist movement in America today. I am only sorry I cannot help more.

Roy HOLLISTER

enough trouble" now.—Hollister unfortunately isn't acquainted with the SWP's political line; far from being merely "tradition-encrusted" it has broken even with Trotsky's political views on Russia and Stalinism. It's a question of political line, not of pro-Stalin "sympathies" or "malign" intentions versus "sincerity."—Ed.

## Wall Street's New Yardstick for Industrial Production

Headlines in the Wall Street Journal:

### LABRADOR IRON ORE

Steel Producers Push Into Wilderness to Get At 2-Billion-Ton Lode

WORKERS BUILDING RAIL LINE IN 40-BELOW-ZERO COLD;

OUTPUT TO START IN 1954

Enough Ore for 4 Big Wars

## BOOKS RECEIVED

Received from the New American Library, publishers of Mentor and Signet pocket books:

*A World I Never Made*, by James T. Farrell. A Signet Double Volume, 50 cents, 512 pages, pub. March 26.

*New World Writing: An Important Cross-Section of Current Literature and Criticism*. A Mentor book, 50 cents, 320 pages.

## Subscribe to LABOR ACTION

# Douglas: Point 4 Useless Without 'Peasant Revolts'

By PHILIP COBEN

Emphasis on Point Four aid to economically backward countries, particularly those in Asia, has been a leading plank in liberals' proposals for American foreign policy, often to the extent where it is put forward as the central means whereby the U. S. could counter Stalinism's appeal to the colonial peoples. Most dramatic was the plan put forward by Walter Reuther for a Point Four program in billions of dollars.

In criticism of the liberals' approach on this question, LABOR ACTION has often made the point that the main difficulty with the Point Four idea is not the paltriness of the sums which Washington has allocated for this purpose (and these often intermingled with military appropriations) but rather this: that as long as U. S. foreign policy helps to maintain in power the semi-feudal landlord cliques and reactionary classes who run the land, as long as social relations there remain unchanged, Point Four in any quantity to be expected will not materially benefit the masses who are exploited by the rulers. The power of the Stalinists' appeal to these masses is that it is directed against the power of the landlord exploiters, even though the Stalinists' own aims are only to subject the people to their own dictatorship.

Police agents have joined with the administration and regents in terrorizing the university community. Sather Gate, which was once the "Hyde Park" of Berkeley, is today almost the exclusive property of plainclothesmen. At a recent street meeting held by the Socialist Youth League, FBI agents circled among the crowd of timorous students, while police photographers snapped pictures of speakers and audience. Any student who asked any sort of question pro or con could expect attention from the cameraman. At the end of the meeting, not one question was put to the speaker, nor did students gather around for the long and heated discussions once typical of Sather Gate meetings. Unlike previous occasions, when street meetings began at noon would continue until 4 p.m. or later, the last one ended after one hour.

### 'WHO ARE YOU FOR?'

A sensational speech by William O. Douglas—sensational in that it comes from a leading figure of such prominence—now asserts that less for liberals in strong language. Douglas' reputation as a consistent liberal has been found-

ed on his Supreme Court dissents on civil liberties as well as on his criticisms of U. S. Asian policy. His speech of April 7 adds an important buttress to the latter and shows a depth of political understanding such as very few liberals in the U. S. have expressed.

Douglas advocates American help for "peasant revolts" in the Asian countries. Without this, Point Four aid is "only underwriting the status quo" and perpetuating the conditions for the growth of Stalinism. Unless it is accompanied by breaking up the landlord system, the program would only make the rich richer and leave the poor in a state no better than the present. The U. S. must decide, "Who are you for, the peasants or the landowners?" Reducing the death rate or infant mortality only increases the number of people among whom it is necessary to ration poverty. Technical agricultural aid, which is the prize exhibit of Point Four enthusiasts, might increase crops several fold but "the return to the fellow at the bottom of the economic pile would be infinitesimal because the average return to the 99 per cent of the people who produce the crop is between 5 and 16 per cent, while the rest goes to about 200 people who own the economy."

Whether Justice Douglas actually expects an American capitalist government, concerned with maintaining the power of the ruling-class status quo all over the non-Stalinist world, to become the vanguard of the world revolution—no less!—is another matter. Liberalism, even the best of it, can after all go only so far in its insights. Sufficient unto his speech is the wisdom thereof.

# London Letter --

(Continued from page 3)

side of the House. Both front benches have a guilty conscience, and there can be no doubt that the South African government has had a say in the decision to depose Serete.

The most important event this week may well be the publication on Friday, April 4, of Bevan's testament *In Place of Fear*. Parts of the book are being serialized in the *Reynolds News*, and its publication is being awaited by both Bevan's many admirers and his many critics. The importance of the book for many lies in the fact that it is generally regarded

as an oblique attack on the right-wing leadership of the Labor Party—at least by implication.

Whether the book has been specifically designed for this purpose or not, whether the contents have been cast so as to call into question the infallibility of the Labor Party's leadership or not, is a matter which cannot be assessed until the book's publication. What we do know for certain is that the rightist press is looking forward with trepidation to its appearance.

[Bevan's book is also being published in the U. S. It will be reviewed in LABOR ACTION shortly.—Ed.]

## "THE CASE OF COMRADE TULAYEV"

A Novel of Modern Russia

by VICTOR SERGE

\$3.00

Order from:

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

### JUST OUT—

BOUND VOLUME of LABOR ACTION for 1950 WITH FULL INDEX FOR YEAR \$3.00

Order from:

Labor Action Book Service  
114 West 14' Street, New York City

# READING from LEFT to RIGHT

TRIBUNE (London)—March 21. Articles by J. P. W. Mallalieu and Fenner Brockway.

A neat journalistic stunt, with a snapper, is pulled by the regular columnist for the *Tribune*, which of course is the Bevanite magazine in England. Mallalieu begins his column as follows, and no doubt his readers' eyes bugged as they read on:

"This week may possibly have decided the battle for the leadership. Even before the war the party was seriously divided, and though war bridged the division, the result of the 1945 election smashed the bridge. It also completely altered the balance of power between the two wings of the party.

"Whereas, before the war, the right wing of the party had dominated, with the left wing producing little more than a few pained squeals under pressure, after the war it was the left wing of the party which both called and played the tune, leaving the right to rumble a few discords from the body of the hall.

"This development was all the more interesting because the actual leader of the party is himself right-wing and has a personal contempt for the adherents of the left and the policies they advocate. In any organization, other than a political party, a leader who is out of line with the main body of the organization finds himself deposed.

"But in politics it is not done to shoot a sitting leader. So the rank and file have concentrated on the engaging game of choosing a successor against such time as the sitting leader shoots himself. The game has gone on for six

years and, as I say, this week may prove to have given us the result.

"Before I tip the winner, I would like to run through the starters. Favorite without question was Anthony Eden—for, of course, I am talking about the Conservative Party. . . ."

Under the heading of "Spanish Justice," Fenner Brockway writes of the Tories' relations with Franco:

"If you had heard the Tories snarl when Barbara Castle, Desmond Donnelly and Michael Foot put their coordinated questions about recent Spanish political trials in the House of Commons, you would understand the danger of a British-Spanish entente.

"Franco took advantage of the late king's funeral to send not only his foreign minister to London but his three chiefs-of-staff. The foreign minister saw Mr. Eden. It would be interesting to know whom the chiefs-of-staff saw.

"I believe relations between Spain and the United Kingdom are about to enter a more favorable phase," said Nicolas Franco, the dictator's brother and ambassador at Lisbon, to the foreign editor of the *Daily Express*. "The Churchill government has taken the initiative by treating us with courtesy . . . friendship will surely follow."

And Brockway quotes a letter from the Tory foreign secretary, written to himself, which defends the recent fascist-style trials of trade-unionists and militants.

Churchill, an admirer of Mussolini to this day, may yet show his hand more openly on an alliance with Franco, reversing the Labor government's policy.

# WORLD POLITICS

## POLISH STALINIST POWER COLLIDES WITH PEASANTS

By A. RUZCENSKI

The agrarian and peasant problem in Poland is still the most difficult headache for the Stalinist regime. Now that the single official party of the bureaucracy has absorbed the "shadow parties" and has totalitarianized the political and cultural life of the country completely, the Stalinist "magnates" have to solve the peasant problem within the framework of their totalitarian economy and policy.

Their pattern, of course, is the "Russian way," or more accurately, the "Ukrainian way," with its forced collectivization, starvation of millions of peasants, banishment of other millions to the slave-labor camps in Siberia, and other well-known methods of Stalinist "conquest." But the adaptation to Poland of the "Ukrainian way" of collectivization is opposed by many political factors: the Polish political opposition is not annihilated as in Russia; it is only banished to the underground.

The principal political currents of the country do exist and have their organs in exile; there exists also an active and powerful workers' opposition, represented by the Polish Socialist Party (PPS); there is the enormous peasant mass of three million peasant farms; there is the strong bloc of the Catholic opposition; there is the strong nationalist current of the anti-Russian opposition.

To all of these factors is added also the need of Russian war policy to conquer the Polish people in order to carry out its aims and to form a solid Russian-Polish alliance against German territorial revisionism—that is, against a new partition of Poland in the "American way."

### SLOWED UP

For these reasons the use of the "Ukrainian way" against the Polish peasants is very difficult, in spite of all the bloodthirstiness of the Russian NKVD. Despite all the collectivization efforts, on January 1, 1952 the Stalinist bureaucracy could boast of only 3,054 collective farms, and these had absorbed 77,000 individual peasants' farms out of 3,000,000 peasant economic units. A year before, on January 1, 1951, there had been 2,199 collectivized

farms; on July 1, 3,036. These figures indicate that the tempo of collectivization was restrained in Poland during the second half of 1951, because of the strong resistance of the peasants and because the official party was afraid to provoke an internal political crisis.

It was for this reason, as we have previously written in LABOR ACTION, that the trial of the Stalinist bureaucrats in Gryfice was intended to show the peasants the regime's "good will." But this was only a temporary retreat on the part of the regime, in order to disorient and deceive the peasant masses. Now the Politburo has ordered new attacks against the peasants in the form of new meat quotas for delivery by every peasant to the government.

Every peasant farm is required to deliver 20-40 kilograms of meat per hectare of land, particularly pork meat. This new anti-peasant imposition means a very heavy burden for the Polish peasants, since they were thoroughly exhausted by the Germans' wartime requisitions and despoliation of cattle and hogs. Now they see coming back the same kind of feverish requisitions and quotas as existed under the German occupation. What time in the year the government is left up to the local organs by the regime's law (or lawlessness).

But there is no propitious climate for an "armed struggle" against the regime in Poland today, because the people know that Stalin is waiting for an opportunity to banish millions of Poles to Siberia, thus to obtain easy millions of forced-laborers for the NKVD's slave industries. The fight against the regime in Poland is taking the form of spontaneous passive resistance, in industry as in the villages, and this hidden resistance is more difficult to fight than armed struggle.

### PROVOCATION

The Stalinist parasites thus set in motion a new powerful army against the village, forge a new whip against the working peasants. There is as yet no news about the workings of the new

law on quotas; it was decreed only in February. But this is the way in which the bureaucracy is thinking of "solving" the supply crisis and accelerating the tempo of Stalinist collectivization—that is, of enslavement of the peasantry.

It is very difficult to predict success or failure for the new quota policy in Poland. The regime's situation is made very difficult by the fact of the spontaneous opposition of the entire people. The peasants form a very strong salient against the state and are supported by other classes in society. The Polish workers do not back the regime in its struggle against the peasants—on the contrary, they support the peasants.

The power of the political underground is so great that the regime may provoke opposition to the "little civil war" in order to try to destroy it before it can endanger the Russian war program. The Polish press abroad has been writing about the fate of the signed provocation manufactured by the Bespieka (security police).

But there is no propitious climate for an "armed struggle" against the regime in Poland today, because the people know that Stalin is waiting for an opportunity to banish millions of Poles to Siberia, thus to obtain easy millions of forced-laborers for the NKVD's slave industries. The fight against the regime in Poland is taking the form of spontaneous passive resistance, in industry as in the villages, and this hidden resistance is more difficult to fight than armed struggle.

## 'THE NEW INTERNATIONAL'

is the leading Marxist magazine in the United States, internationally recognized as among the foremost organs of Marxist thought and political analysis in the world.

SEND 35 CENTS FOR THE CURRENT ISSUE OR SUBSCRIBE AT \$2.00 A YEAR

New International, 114 West 14 Street, New York City



# 'Tomorrow — Your Daughter!'

The Universal Military Training bill was stopped in Congress—at least for this election year, when it is not likely to add votes to the congressmen voting for it—but it is not dead. Meanwhile the military are looking ahead not only to pushing from conscription to UMT, but also to introducing the conscription of women.

The following documentation is by the National Council Against Conscription, part of a pamphlet entitled Today Your Son—Tomorrow Your Daughter. Research and preparation of the pamphlet is credited by the NCAC to John M. Swomley Jr.

Omitted here are interesting sections discussing the effect of militarization on family life in the U. S., juvenile delinquency, and the argument that conscription of women is necessary to ensure an adequate labor force.

A universal-conscription program for girls was envisioned by the President's Commission on Universal Training when it made its report in 1947. Since this commission largely accepted army recommendations on UMT there is added significance to its statement:

"For practical reasons we exclude women at this stage. . . . We urge that consideration of the advisability of establishing a program for women in all possible fields of wartime importance be a function of the commission set up to administer the Universal Training program for young men." (Emphasis added)

A law drafting women has been an army ambition ever since the wartime use of WACs, WAVES, and other women's units. But the army has been cautious about asking Congress for such a draft in view of its failure to make a case for the draft of nurses during the last war.

Despite the army's caution, it has not been idle. The first step toward a draft of women was to get Congress to approve a peacetime Women's Army Corps. General H. H. Arnold in his report issued November 11, 1945 spoke the mind of the Pentagon when he said:

"The next war in which the U. S. might participate may well require complete mobilization of all Americans, in consequence, a nucleus organization of female soldiers should be maintained in peacetime in order to provide for rapid and efficient expansion in time of national emergency."

The army was successful and on June 2, 1948 Congress approved a military proposal to enlist women in the regular army, navy and air force. General Eisenhower, in urging a House committee to approve this request for a permanent WAC, said that women would have to be drafted "just like anybody else" in case of another war. He declined to answer a question from Rep. Bishop of Illinois as to whether women should be included in a universal military training program. [Chicago Sun-Times, Feb. 19, 1948.]

That the army was thinking of more than military conscription of women was evident from a statement on June 16, 1948 by WAC Director Col. Mary Halloran that women as well as men should be registered for military and industrial service in wartime. [Washington Star, June 17, 1948.]

## Militarizing Women

To implement military thinking about women, the National Security Resources Board called to Washington Mrs. Waitstill H. Sharp, the wife of an Unitarian clergyman, to lay the groundwork for conscription of women. In an interview with the press, Mrs. Sharp said: "We want everything on a voluntary basis at first. But every man, woman and child must have a role. . . ." [San Francisco Chronicle, Oct. 22, 1950.] (Emphasis added.)

Mrs. Sharp has been meeting with leaders of women's organizations to help sell them on the role of women in defense. There have also been others selling women on conscription. The army has a Bureau of Public Relations with a Women's Interest Section headed by Margaret Banister. [San Francisco Examiner, Feb. 11, 1949.]

Miss Banister's job is to tell women's organizations what the army wants and to enlist their aid. One of the techniques used is to invite key women to the Pentagon for an off-the-record session attended by high-ranking officers. These persons think they are getting secret information, whereas in reality they are being indoctrinated and briefed.

A House committee on July 24, 1947 exposed these sessions and reported that General J. Lawton Collins, after telling women's leaders about the proposed UMT program, asked them to go and lobby Congress to get the military program adopted. Collins said: "We would like your support in that on our approach to the Republican leadership to endeavor to get them to support a non-partisan national military security program."

In other words, women's leaders are being used to pass the military "word down through the world of women, not in quotation marks, but as something very authentic." In this way the army expects them to help "by making the voice of women audible to Congress." ["Packaged Thinking for Women," by Lucille Crain and Anne B. Hamilton.]

The Hoover Commission on Reorganization of the Federal Government appointed by President Truman was evidently aware of this propagandizing of women's groups.

One of its task-force committees said: "The utilization of women for war, if improperly developed, has certain dangerous implications to our way of life." It asserted that the purpose of some persons "particularly the publicists in uniform" who backed the use of women in the armed

forces "was to glamorize war and to convert the arch-opponents of war in the past, women, to the service point of view."

The committee, speaking about the expanded use of women in the armed forces, warned that "all of them collectively and some of them individually would greatly increase military influence in the United States and, over a period of time, might tend to set the national thinking in a military mold." [Washington Evening Star, Mar. 15, 1949.]

A few years earlier, General Eisenhower, in discussing the need for psychological indoctrination, said: "The national mass, civilians and the uniformed services, must have a common understanding of the ideals and reasons for which the United States will fight a war. . . ." This, he said, is one "of the important reasons for universal service in time of peace."

## Make 'Em Worldly

In recent months the armed forces have stepped up both their campaign for the drafting of women and their propaganda among women's groups. A Defense Advisory Committee on Women in the Armed Forces composed of 44 members including representatives of women's educational, professional and even religious groups, is a perfect sounding board for draft spokesmen.

On September 18, 1951, Col. Mary A. Halloran, director of the WAC, told this committee that it took a draft to get men into the army and that an all-out emergency might not leave sufficient time to attract women on a voluntary basis. "The machinery," she said, "is national registration and general service."

The New York Times, in reporting this, added, "A suggestion was made and informally agreed upon that the committee would give close consideration to the subject of a possible draft of women." [N. Y. Times, Sept. 19, 1951.]

Mrs. Douglas Horton, who is vice-president of the National Council of Churches, a past president of Wellesley College, and a former national commander of the WAVES, is in an excellent position to be a military spokesman in women's religious and educational circles. Speaking to the Radcliffe Club of New York on February 10, 1951, she said:

"It seems to me only sensible to register the youth of our land (male and female) to discover the skills, resources, aptitudes and interests of the total age group and select the people who can do the work which needs to be done, with the least disruption of our economy."

Mrs. Horton believes in drafting everyone—women as well as men—for she has within a few months' time advocated it over a national radio hook-up, in an article in the spring 1951 Journal of the American Association of University Women, and in an article in the February 1951 Ladies' Home Journal.

Mrs. Horton is by no means the only spokesman for a woman's draft. Congresswoman Frances P. Bolton of Ohio wrote in the June, 1949 American Magazine that if men are drafted "to serve for a period of training so it seems to me should their sisters." She adds that she has known several "shy and helpless creatures" who entered the WACs and came out "literally women of the world."

In addition to the pro-draft publicity being circulated, chiefly in women's groups and periodicals, actual draft plans have been allowed "to leak" so that women will not be suddenly aroused at the drastic program the Pentagon has prepared for them. General Lewis B. Hershey, director of Selective Service, in discussing a draft of women, said: "Women should be thinking about it." [N. Y. Times, July 2, 1951.]

Two men close to the military have described the plans. William Bradford Huie did it in the November 1950 Cosmopolitan; Major George Fielding Elliot's description appeared in the February 1951 Woman's Home Companion.

## Emulating Russia

"You can be certain," says Huie, "if you are a healthy American woman between 16 and 52 that your government is planning a war role for you." If war comes, he adds, "you will be forced either to enter the armed services or to work at an essential job." The reason for drafting women is the age-old one. Our enemy does it and so must we.

"The Communist system employs 'complete utilization' of women . . . our women will have to match them in skill and devotion." As in Russia, so it will be here. Our women, says Huie, "will have to comply or go to jail."

They would be used in the army, as "forced farm labor," in civil defense and munitions works. For the concentration camps that have been planned for American opponents of the war, "we would need women guards."

Major Elliot's picture is equally grim, and even more specific. "It's likely that if you're a single woman or a childless widow or divorcee you will have to go into military service if you can meet the rather severe physical requirements."

He believes there will be about two and a half million women in the army and another million in the navy, marines, air force and coast guard. Mothers would be drafted into "tough exacting jobs" either in civil defense or in factories near home, but not until other mothers are at work giving daytime supervision of their children.

Since Congress isn't likely to pass a draft of women except under the pressure of emergency, the only immediate prospect, he says, is for a general registration.

In 1948 when Congress was considering whether to set up a Women's Army Corps on a volunteer basis, the chief opponents of the proposal argued against it because they felt army leaders wanted it chiefly as a nucleus or cadre for a draft of women. They made it clear that they believed in equal rights for everyone without regard to sex but argued that equality for women did not justify conscription just because men were being drafted. There is no point in denying freedom to women just to prove they are equal with men whose freedom has been taken away.

Some of those arguing most vociferously for the draft have argued only theoretically for it on the grounds of equality. Mrs. Horton, for example, wrote: "Nobody who knows anything about military life seriously contemplates making the army or navy—and certainly not the marine corps—into fifty-fifty coeducational organizations! The main business of military service is combat, and women should be non-combatants." She pointed out that "grueling physical exertion, demanding muscular strength, is not the most efficient use of women's ability; and trying to mix men and women in the appallingly heavy industry of war combat is not smart." [Ladies Home Journal, Feb. 1951.]

The real reason, of course, for having women in the armed forces, is so they can fill jobs which release men for combat. Military spokesmen have referred to the need for stenographers and filing clerks, telephone operators, teleprinters and persons who will take other non-combat jobs. This work, said opponents at Congressional hearings, "could be done by civilians much more efficiently and at less cost to the taxpayers, particularly if done in the United States." Girls could live at home rather than have special uniforms, special barracks and other costly services which it is estimated cost the taxpayer about \$10,000 per soldier each year.

## For Whose Morale?

One of the principal reasons advanced for having women in uniform while working for the army is to secure for the wearer the rights of a combatant under international law. WACs, however, are normally not combatants and are seldom captured. They could be identified in government service by badges such as employees wear at atomic energy project locations.

Even if women should be placed in positions where they might be captured, the uniform would be of little value. As Major Elliot pointed out, "women soldiers who fall into enemy hands can expect little consideration." [Woman's Home Companion, Feb. 1951.] He might have pointed out, though he did not, that the same is true for women who are unprotected in some American military establishments.

The New York Times for December 14, 1948 reported the death of a female navy employee who had been brutally attacked on Guam. Buried near the end of the news report was this sentence: "The navy said that until two years ago all civilian women workers on Guam were required to have armed escorts at night."

Another argument used in favor of drafting women into the military establishment is that it would lift the morale of the male soldiers to have girls constantly around the army post or on board ship. But a Hoover Commission subcommittee suggested that neither the men of the armed services nor their wives are completely sold on women in uniform. [Washington Evening Star, Mar. 15, 1949.]

It is obvious that many men would not be eager to have their sisters, wives, or fiancées drafted into the temptations and risks of army life and it is understandable that the wives of soldiers who cannot be with their husbands would not be convinced of the morale value of other women!

One veteran, in testifying before a Congressional committee, said of the last war: "Most of the soldiers who were in the army at that time, officers excepted, thoroughly detested it and all its ways. They felt that it would be only fair of them to protect their wives, sisters and sweethearts from living in the same unhappy environment." [House Armed Services Committee hearing, Mar. 1948.]

## Regimentation

Still another reason advanced against drafting of women is the danger involved in militarism and regimentation. Muriel E. Richter, President of the New York State Women's Lawyers' Association, referred to the fact that totalitarian countries have drafted women whereas the United States has placed the individual and the family above the state. "The whole idea of militarizing women," she said, "is so repugnant and offensive to me that I cannot possibly condone it." [Detroit News, Jan. 26, 1951.]

That the fear of regimentation is not idle is seen from the report on the women's draft in Britain which appeared in the August 5, 1942 New York Times. The reporter spoke of "thousands who, having been uprooted from home at an early age, have adapted themselves to a perfectly regimented military life and dread the time when they may suddenly be thrown from their present routine into a life to which they are no longer emotionally accustomed."

Any draft of women would complete the regimentation already begun in conscripting men. What this would mean to American democracy would be difficult to predict in detail but regimentation is an aspect of an authoritarian system, not a step toward freedom.

One more problem needs to be discussed in connection with proposals to conscript women—compulsory registration of women. The argument for this is that whether or not we resort to a draft we shall at least know who is available for work. The National Federation of Business and Professional Women's Clubs during the war came out against such a general registration, saying: "General registrations are expensive, laborious, consuming of time and machinery that are needed elsewhere. Experience in other countries has proven that general lists soon become outdated. People move; their training changes; they marry; they suffer disabilities; they die."

A general registration for informational purposes proves nothing in itself. It is merely a count of heads. It will not get a single person in a new job or out of an old one. If information is needed as to the availability of women, their mobility and their training, it is obtainable from many sources already. Many national professional organizations, including our own, have a master

(Continued bottom of next page)

## BOOKS and Ideas

### Fritz Sternberg's "Capitalism and Socialism on Trial"

# An Ambitious Work That Fails to Come Off

CAPITALISM AND SOCIALISM ON TRIAL, by Fritz Sternberg.—John Day Co., N. Y., 604 pages, \$7.00.

By HAL DRAPER

There is more than one reason why we wish we could enthusiastically recommend Fritz Sternberg's latest and most ambitious book, described as his magnum opus and life work. The difficulty is not that the description is inexact; but it is true, and relevant to the criticism to be made, that the book is not an opus in reality; it is more a kind of Collected Works of Fritz Sternberg, or, better still, an anthology. Sternberg has never had any prejudices against repeating himself, not only in the same book, but, even more copiously, from one book to the next. Capitalism and Socialism on Trial to a very large extent consists of previous books, plus "continuity" (in the script writer's sense).

Many of its interesting portions, then, are not new, but this is certainly no derogation. The new reader will appreciate them.

Perhaps the outstanding thing about Capitalism and Socialism is the fact that it is an attempt to present within a Marxist framework a synoptic survey of the course of economic and political development from the rise of capitalism to the problems of today's cold war. Whatever one thinks are its inadequacies or its errors, it thereby demands an attentive reading. Our times are not rich in men who set their aims that high.

And there are not a few sections of the book which to a greater or lesser extent repay expectations which might be aroused. I cannot list them all here, nor is it necessary in order to indicate what can be found in a work which, chapter by chapter, discusses the development of capitalist economy and imperialism, crises, the effect on the system of the two world wars, etc. Especially interesting to me were Sternberg's discussions of the different characteristics and methods peculiar to the various capitalist states and their imperialisms on the background of varying origins, national particularities and needs.

Very much worth reading, also, in spite of the fact that I think it is wrong, is his exposition of his views on the role of imperialism in the development of capitalism; in brief, Sternberg argues that capitalist imperialism is not to be linked in any special way with the era of monopoly capitalism (as Lenin and Hilferding did) but that it always was a sine qua non for capitalism as a going concern. It is a thesis which is at least in part dependent on his support of Rosa Luxemburg's views on the accumulation of capital—views which have been often and severely attacked by leading Marxists.

The important thing is that Sternberg's presentation stimulates constructive Marxist thinking on the problem; and one thing we would have wished is that as much could be said not only for other sections where we disagreed with his opinions but (worse) even for sections where we agreed.

Last but not least, we frankly confess that many of Sternberg's political views on the current cold war like-wise make us wish that we could hail the book. In many respects they are very close to our own, at least in the general form in which they are put forward. His main political line for today is emphasis on the need for a Socialist United States of Europe as a bulwark against both the American and Russian cold-war blocs. Readers of his How to Stop the Russians Without War (1948) will be acquainted with what he says in his new work also.

## A Frustrating Characteristic

There are, then, interesting sketches scattered through the book. But Sternberg is like a talented easel painter, who has here and there turned out some good things, who above all yearns to produce a great panoramic mural—and simply doesn't have what it takes. Bluntly, as a whole Capitalism and Socialism is a pretty bad failure, in terms of its own pretensions.

Part of the failure—though certainly not the most basic part—is perhaps due to the character of the book as an anthology, in spite of the impression conveyed by the Table of Contents. The latter only seems to itemize an over-all survey of the development of capitalism. Actually the various sections are so uneven as to be disjointed. Whole subchapters devoted to important periods or events cannot, by any stretch of the imagination or good will, be considered even attempts at adequate economic-political analyses.

Rather they consist too often of separate comments on aspects in which Sternberg is perhaps particularly inter-

ested, but which do not add up. To the American socialist reader the most glaring case will be the section on the New Deal period in the U. S.; it is amazingly uninformative, unanalytical and inadequate for any purpose, even apart from its importance for the over-all program of the book. (The section on "The Growth of the Trade Unions" does not even mention the appearance of the CIO—really!)

Since the criticism made above is a pretty sweeping one, and justifiably so, it may be advisable to mention a second example, which also serves to illustrate what the trouble may be. There is, for instance, Sternberg's whole "Part One" on the rise of capitalism. It is simply not anywhere near a rounded and adequate summary of the subject announced, not by a long way. It is something else. It is that much of a discussion of the rise of capitalism as is thought necessary by Sternberg in order to put forward his own theory of imperialism.

And the same thing is true throughout the book. It is in fact one of the book's most frustrating characteristics. Under one chapter heading after another, Sternberg discusses only so much of his subject (and presents only so many facts) as is useful to argue for this or that special view of his. Since he constantly writes, however, as if he has covered his subjects, the result is a very, very distorted one. It is also a reason why the parts do not hang together.

## Tracing a Line of Argument

For the reason explained, the book essentially depends for its value not so much on its exposition of the subjects seemingly promised by the contents, but precisely on Sternberg's "special views" on a series of questions, which constitute the main integrating factor of the work. It is precisely here that the book is often at its worst. We shall try to indicate why, by following a chain of Sternberg's thought which runs quite throughout the book, from economic tables in Part I to the last passages on the cold war.

In discussing the development of capitalism up to 1914, Sternberg emerges with an economic fact which he holds aloft, with the greatest emphasis, as a key to ensuring political development. With Sternberg, emphasis very often means repeated iteration in virtually unchanged words; it will be enough here to state it once: For a generation before 1914 there was a rise in real wages in the advanced industrial countries.

Why is this raised to such a pinnacle of importance by Sternberg? Because for him it actually "explains" three very important things: (1) Why there was a "lessening of social tension" on the eve of World War I, not the sharpening of class antagonisms that existed in the opinion of left-wing socialists; (2) why no serious revolutionary developments took place following the war, outside of Russia; (3) that Lenin's basic mistake was in the Russian Revolution and in founding the Third International. This is surely a tall order for said economic fact!

Sternberg reasons thus: Since real wages were rising up to 1914, with its accompanying economic effects, there naturally must have been an easing of social tensions (which, of course, includes political class tensions) . . . And he does not devote a single word to the well-known historical evidence (with which I could fill an article twice the size of this review) that class tensions and antagonisms were getting sharper in the couple of years leading up to the outbreak of the war—in Germany and England as well as elsewhere in Europe, even outside Russia where barricades had appeared in Petrograd just before the war crisis became immediate.

Strikes were on the increase in Britain; even the German Social-Democratic leadership was taking a stronger stand. . . . But there is really no reason to detail evidence the very existence of which Sternberg ignores. (Incidentally, real wages were rising in Russia too, but since Russia is too obvious an exception, as Sternberg admits, he simply ignores the fact; he might reply that the wage level in Russia was so much lower than the rest of Europe to begin with. . . . but then, you see, the one little economic fact does not suffice to explain political developments.)

## History as Economics

This reviewer does not begin to understand how Sternberg can blithely push such an analysis without even a reference to whether historical facts bear out his deduction or not; but the worst is yet to come.

For the one little economic fact (rise in real wages up to 1914) also explains, according to Sternberg, why "the First World War did not lead to social revolutionary actions on any dangerous scale in the big European industrial countries, and that was true of both the victors and the vanquished," or, to quote again, since the informed reader may not believe his eyes, "The socialist revolution did not materialize outside Russia. There were not even any serious attempts to bring it about."

That there was no victorious socialist revolution in the post-war period outside of Russia is well enough known (if we forget about, or play down, the Hungarian Soviet Republic and the events in Finland, as being only cases of temporary power). But Sternberg's insistence is not merely that the socialist revolution was not victorious; what he keeps insisting on is that there was no serious revolutionary upsurge of the working class at all outside of Russia.

And this is incredible. No mention of what happened in Austria; none of the events up to 1920 in Italy. The incredible turns into the fantastic when Sternberg finally does decide to discuss what happened in Germany—without even mentioning any of the events which dozens of bourgeois historians refer to as a matter of course as the German Revolution, and not merely because a kaiser abdicated.

Such sovereign contempt for historical facts I do not

remember seeing anywhere in reputable quarters. For Sternberg, apparently, these things did not happen because they could not have happened—since (don't forget) real wages had been rising up to 1914, etc.

This is not the only feature of the book which leads me to remark that, time and again, Sternberg reveals his method as a quite crude economic determinism, in precisely the sense in which this is different from Marxist historical materialism.

It remains to add that Sternberg would at least have a "right" to dismiss the Europe-wide revolutionary upsurge of 1917-1923 as of no serious import (if such was his opinion, even as a unique minority) if he so much as indicated why he thinks the historical facts added up to nothing in his eyes. What I have referred to as incredible and fantastic is his off-hand and repeated assertion of such a unique reading of history with virtually no explanation whatsoever.

Now for the third step, which the reader can anticipate at this point: according to Sternberg, Lenin's basic mistake was his unfortunate view that the war could stimulate the revolutionary strivings of the working class and that in fact the war did do so. In non-Sternberg history, there was a tremendous revolutionary upsurge after the war, which was defeated, and it was this European revolution on which the Russian revolutionists had counted, as is well known. In Sternberg's history, nothing happened outside of Russia; and THEREFORE the Russian Revolution was all a mistake to begin with!

## The Right to Whitewash

This type of absolutely empty prestidigitation with history is, however, only one side of a larger difficulty that Sternberg labors under. It is borne in on one as similar passages accumulate in the book. Sternberg has talent as an economic analyst in restricted fields; he has some political tendencies that we ourselves like; but he is not only thoroughly incompetent in political analyses (and tends to mechanically derive them from economic material with which he is familiar) but more: political analysis does not, I suspect, really interest him. It is, at any rate, a theory to account for his absolute lack of interest in developing political views from what actually happened, rather than from economics—or crotchets.

Thus, to go further along with Sternberg, he has a "right" to whitewash the German Social-Democratic leadership of the World War I and post-war period, if such is his considered political view; but to do so without (again!) even mentioning the role that it played is to fill perfectly useless pages even for the misguided who might want to agree with him. And whitewash the Social-Democratic Eberts and Scheidemanns is what he does. Since there was no post-war revolution (on the planet about which he writes), there was no counter-revolutionary role for the Social-Democrats to perform. The deep-deyed reformism of the Social-Democrats and the part it played in opening the door to Hitler's power likewise does not exist for him. There was a single cause; the Communist split in the working class—which, apparently, even accounts for the fact that the Social-Democrats themselves had no program to counter Hitler's!

I have been discussing sections of Sternberg's book which raise problems which are not only of importance in themselves but to which Sternberg himself ascribes great importance and devotes much space. Much the same could be said of many more casual points.

For some reason, for example, Sternberg in one passage lays great stress on the fact that the aftermath of the First World War "put an end to [the] comfortable conviction" in the minds of socialists that the collapse of capitalism necessarily means the rise of socialism; and brought home that the alternative of "barbarism" also loomed. Now as a matter of fact, this did not become very strong in the socialist movement until after the Second World War; and it is to be met with in the socialist movement before the First. This much is sure: Sternberg gives two quotations apparently to illustrate the change he speaks of as happening after the First World War—one from Luxemburg and one from Lenin; and the one from Luxemburg is from a book written before the war!

In sum, Sternberg's magnum opus is, at the best, spotty. At its worst it is quite bad. And we have not as yet mentioned an especially unfortunate aspect of the book which is among the most important in judging the qualifications of a Marxist analyst today: Sternberg's views on Stalinist Russia and Stalinism. It will be discussed in a follow-up article next week, since its main interest, perhaps, is not so much in connection with the review of a particular book as in illustrating, in the case of an anti-Stalinist, a type of ambiguity with regard to Stalinism which is of interest today.

"NEXT—  
A LABOR PARTY!"  
by Jack Ranger

A Hard-Hitting Presentation  
Of the Need for an  
Independent Labor Party

25 cents Order from:  
LABOR ACTION BOOK SERVICE  
114 West 14 Street, New York City



# New Developments in Los Angeles Scandals

By REX HILL

LOS ANGELES, April 3—New developments in the race-bombing affair and the police-brutality case ensure that public attention will not yet relegate them to the closet as skeletons. The press has found more sensational items to rate the headlines.

On March 31 it was reported by the *Mirror* that William Bailey, young Negro school teacher and recent victim of a bombing apartment (West Adams District) home, had received a new threat. An anonymous message, which he made public, said:

"The next time we mean business. You have 72 hours. You think those two-bit police can protect you. Stick around and find out."

This letter was signed with the initials "KKK" and three crosses. Whether authentic or not, the signs here were the first public infirmation that any fascist groups were possibly involved. As yet references to G. L. K. Smith's latest visit, in which he spewed out hate propaganda against minorities, is not to be found in the daily press.

Before this latest warning, "members of the Don Brown Chapter of the American Veteran's Committee asked postal inspectors to investigate two previous threatening letters mailed to Bailey." Bailey teaches at Carver Junior High School and is a member of AVC, former chairman of the Wendell Wilkie Chapter.

Meanwhile, police posted sentries around the home of a young white couple, Mr. and Mrs. Charles Gould, who said that "an anonymous telephone caller threatened to burn their house because of the presence of a Negro guest there. Before the call, the front door of the home was nailed shut and the visitor, musi-

cian Nathaniel Reed, found two tires on his car punctured with nails." (*Mirror*)

## POINTS TO RACISTS

Leslie Claypool's column in the *Daily News* of March 31 stated: "Eleven so-called 'neighborly groups' in Los Angeles were charged with 'promoting and fostering the type of hatred that can result in an act like the Dunsmuir Avenue bombings' in a statement issued today by the Los Angeles County Conference on Community Relations over the signature of its chairman, Edward Mehrer.

"We charge them with the encouragement of attitudes that are un-American in principle and practice," says the statement which does not name the groups. "We are asking the attorney general of this state to make a thorough investigation of these groups."

We may recall that speakers at the recent protest meeting here placed much of the responsibility for the Jim Crow bombings on those real-estate and landlord groups that upheld restrictive covenants in "white neighborhoods" for so long before such covenants were declared illegal by the Supreme Court. There appears to be evidence in some areas that anti-Negro and other restrictive agreements still exist, though illegal in terms of enforcement. It is not illegal to conspire with the view of preventing minorities to rent or buy homes in certain residential areas but only to enforce such contracts.

In the cop-brutality exposé three main events took place recently. The six youths who were beaten savagely by officers after arrest in a mass "Christmas Orgy" were cleared of charges that they interfered with arrest. Judge Joseph L. Call placed them on probation

and then allowed them to plead "not guilty," the charges dropped from the records.

This judicial act was publicized as a direct "slap in the face at the police." The judge's motivation was that the youths had been guilty of a misdemeanor, while their police assailants were guilty of felony. But prosecution of the cops hinges on identification. Many are involved and the Police Department, with its "police commission of inquiry," is reluctant to put the cops in a lineup before their accusers.

Instead, they paraded photographs before the youths. Several cops were identified from the pictures, however, although the youths insisted on a lineup and one of the victims said, "These photos appear to be several years old, in some cases."

Anthony Rios, head of the CSO (Community Service Organization, which champions rights and improvements for East Side minorities), who was beaten by officers, together with Alfred Ulloa, and then released from charges of "interference," promptly retaliated. Rios filed suit for \$5000 against the officers.

## NEW CASE

According to the *Mirror* (Mar. 31), "A new instance of police brutality came to light today when Artney Todd, 1560 Grieto Lane, accused two Hollenbeck Station policemen of breaking his jaw in an arrest January 20."

Todd identified the officers as R. C. Ferguson and L. L. Simeone. Todd's attorney, Edward C. Maddox, reported the affair to the county grand jury, and filed a civil suit against the cops. Like the other two main cases of brutality, prejudice against minorities appears to be involved. The grand jury resumes hearings April 8.

Todd stated he was walking on East 1st St. when two cops approached him. One of the cops said, "Move along, Black Sambo!" Todd said he merely objected to the insulting name and his lawyer claimed to have witnesses to prove that Todd made no physical resistance to the arrest following his objections to the Jim Crow epithet.

"After release from jail, Todd discovered his jaw was broken in two places. He was hospitalized at the Veterans Administration Hospital in Sawtelle for eight days."

Until Los Angeles cleans up its police force and provides protection for minorities from hoodlums, the city will deserve the current adverse reputation it enjoys. Police Chief Parker published a lengthy letter in the press, asking for public confidence in his force and maintained that press publicity on the brutal cops undermined public support.

His view was that only a few "bad cops" are to blame, and claimed his department for years moved quickly to weed out sadists, crooks, thugs, and racists. He pleads for the right of the department to police itself, and is willing to take all complaints in writing!

Many people will find his protestations hard to swallow, especially police victims and minorities who have seen the force in action. The attempt to whitewash officers and big brass through photo "lineups" and concealed testimony of police witnesses won't help Parker's cause, either. Los Angeles, like other great American cities, is in an area where racist hoodlumism, cop brutality, and general civic corruption reflects the national tone of repression against liberties and, in turn, affects the over-all American drift toward authoritarianism.

## Big Steel's Stakes —

(Continued from page 2)

grounds of fairness and equity or otherwise in the interests of the defense effort." This elastic formula can be interpreted as a virtual guarantee of an eventual price hike.

But the companies are playing their reactionary political game to the end. As government seizure becomes more and more likely, the steel barons are reported to be even making plans to fight this move in the courts.

On the coal front, a steel settlement may well bring a change in the current waiting game of John L. Lewis. Lewis is holding off his own demands in the hopes of getting badly needed mine-safety legislation through Con-

gress. However, he is also undoubtedly waiting for the steel negotiations to set a precedent.

Also, as long as there is the possibility of a steel strike, a coal strike would be unwise. With the steel mills shut down and the demand for coal thus seriously curtailed, a coal strike would be relatively ineffective. In 1949 the steel and coal unions went on strike at the same time with unfortunate results for the bargaining positions of both unions. The mistake is not likely to be repeated.

Once the steel situation is resolved, however, the outlook will be different. For the present, Lewis can be counted on to issue another strong statement, supporting the steel workers.

# The New Stage of Corruption—

(Continued from page 1)

marking the tendency, we wish to recall a particularly thoughtful point made by Blair Bolles in his recent book. With considerable insight, Bolles links up the corruption picture with what is in fact one of the most important over-all trends in American society: the great strides taken toward the increased intervention of the national state machinery into the economic life of the country. This is a trend which started growing to immense proportions with the New Deal of the '30s, speeded up by the war, and given even new forms by the Permanent War Economy upon which the U. S. is entering.

It is this, we wish to suggest, which is behind the new stage which the traditional type of corruption scandals has apparently entered into.

## What They Won't Do

It is not a question of deciding whether increased corruption is, under the American capitalist system, an "inevitable" or "inherent" accompaniment of increased governmental involvement in the economy. That is a very "iffy" question, which could scarcely be discussed without extensive qualifications. What is scarcely to be doubted is that the increased dependence of the economy, and of every industrial setup, on decisions of the government and of government officials, trebles and quadruples the "natural" drive of businessmen to corrupt political officials for their private purposes—and that neither the Fair Dealers nor (even less) their Republican rivals have the will or ability to set special obstacles in the way of the corrupters. For in the case of both parties, we are dealing with political machines which speak for "private enterprise" in their respective ways—and it is the private enterprisers who are the source of "corruption," not the money-hungry officials whom they suborn.

It is, of course, far from impossible for even a capitalist government and capitalist parties to take steps to repress these "natural" tendencies of capitalist society, or at least to keep them within respectable bounds. The conditions under which this would be possible would require further intervention and control by government over business, and American capitalism is in no mood to accept this and is not under any great constraint by its major parties to accept this. Again, one thing seems to have demonstrated this past week: neither the Fair Deal administration nor its Republican opponents have any will to make the attempt.

This is where labor comes in. Or rather: this is where labor should come in.

For the whole situation cries out, not for the traditional kind of honest-candidate-who-is-going-to-clean-up-the-Augan-stables, but for a third political and social force which CAN do so.

In the present stage of the corruption issue, it is an

issue which properly belongs not to the "outs" against the corrupt "ins," not to the "new face" against the old one, but to a new political and social force.

## Corruption as an Issue

This is an issue which belongs to a labor party which has no ties with the old capitalist party machines and whose interests are not tied to the capitalist forces behind those machines.

The Republicans will, more or less successfully, use the corruption issue as a camouflage for a reactionary social program.

Kefauver (perhaps Eisenhower) will use the corruption issue more or less as a substitute for a social program, as Halley did in New York City.

Only an independent labor political movement could use the corruption issue with full legitimacy, effectiveness and meaning, as an integral part of, and spearhead of, a progressive social program.

The Fair Deal bids fair to come to an inglorious end, not in an honorable defeat by forces further to the right, but in the muck and mire of discredit and disgust. Our saltiest tears are not for that quite possible eventuality. What is damning about the situation is that the suicidal policy of the labor movement makes its leadership sharers in the shipwreck and helps to bring labor's political action down with the fortunes of the Fair Deal to which it has tied itself.

Instead of being able to go to the country as an ALTERNATIVE to the political forces which are discrediting themselves, the labor politicians keep silence or mumble, or utter pious deploring platitudes, just as if they were partners in crime—and in a properly negative sense, they have been.

A labor party in 1952 could have come before the people with a powerful appeal far more meaningful and fundamental than a mere call to throw the incumbent rascals out and put new ones in. Only it could have made the corruption issue a social issue integral with a broader progressive program.

It is not a question of whether it could have won the presidency in 1952; in general, the idea that a labor party cannot be formed until it is actually hopeful of winning the sweepstakes is one of the most unintelligent and shortsighted of all the theories which cumber the minds of the labor strategists.

## The Boat They Missed

The important thing is that it could make an impression on the political struggle a hundred times more powerful than anything it will be able to do by November 1952. The important thing is that it could BUILD real power of its own on the political field, instead of facing the danger of being pulled down by the fate of the capitalist politicians of the Fair Deal because it has been hanging onto the latter's coattails.

What this concerns, however, after all, is a lost opportunity. We are not really interested in merely bewailing the lost opportunity itself. It is a question of whether the men who have fouled up this chance are able to learn anything therefrom—or whether they are so enslaved to their theories about riding behind the Fair Deal that they cannot recognize, if only as practical men, the practical results of their theories. They have missed the boat in 1952.

It isn't the last boat. Capitalism and its parties, on other issues and other fields, will see to that. We don't necessarily expect the labor leaders to break with their past, and form a labor party, simply because they have suddenly become farsighted and politically sophisticated. It is one explosion or another of the corruption of capitalism in all its forms which will push them to the wall, sooner or later. But if a reasonable degree of farsightedness is wedded to a moderate amount of practicality, it will be sooner rather than later.

## 'VPERED'

is the organ of the Ukrainian socialist resistance movement, published by its section in emigration in West Germany, recording the thinking and activities of the new anti-Stalinist underground fighting behind the Iron Curtain. It is written in Ukrainian, of course, but an English summary of the contents appears in each issue.

For Ukrainian friends, *Vpered* is a must. Others will find the English page of extreme interest—and can help the movement by subscribing.

One dollar for 5 issues.

Order through: LABOR ACTION BOOK SERVICE  
114 West 14 Street, N. Y. C.

Read about INDEPENDENT SOCIALISM  
Send for the two special issues of LABOR ACTION devoted to explaining the ideas of the Independent Socialist League —  
May Day 1950—The Principles and Program of Independent Socialism  
May Day 1951—Independent Socialism and the War  
10 cents each