

LABOR ACTION

Independent Socialist Weekly

OCTOBER 26, 1953

FIVE CENTS

**Press Agents of the Pentagon:
The Military Propaganda Machine**

... page 5

The U.S. and British Guiana

... page 6

MRA Exposed as Anti-Labor

... page 3

SPOT-LIGHT

Baffled

A few pages away from each other, last Sunday (October 18) the N. Y. Times published two stories which deserve to be given a closer acquaintance with each other in this column.

On page 28 we were informed that "Red Latin Inroads Baffle U. S. Aids," which translates as: Growing Stalinist Influence in Latin America Leaves State Department in Usual Frame of Mind.

Washington would like to do something about CP strength in Guatemala especially, and wants to start a "campaign" but . . . "it seems to be a campaign without any decisive weapon . . . the problem of what to do about it has so far baffled them."

On page 34 we were informed that "U. S. Capital Rises in Latin America." This does not baffle anybody. The Department of Commerce reported the up-to-date facts as follows:

"U. S. venture capital finds Latin America an increasingly attractive area for foreign investment." Direct investments by U. S. capital at the end of 1952 stood at double the 1943 figure (\$5.7 billion). This money controls about 2000 enterprises in Latin America. After local government taxes had been taken out, and after the cut went to non-U. S. investors, U. S. capital pulled \$615 million out of its ventures on the continent (1950 figure). "For U. S. investment capital, Latin America continues to lead all other areas of the world by a substantial margin." Forty per cent of total U. S. foreign investments (1950) were there, led by petroleum. The biggest increase has been in investments in Chile.

The Air Force Was Embarrassed

The outcry over the case of Lieutenant Milo Radulovich did not succeed in moving the air force to make any concessions. Radulovich is the young reservist who was discharged as a security risk on the ground that he had made a mistake in choosing his father and sister.

A board of three colonels decided that Radulovich is guilty of being related to a one-time reader of an allegedly pro-Stalinist Croatian newspaper (his father), as well as of another crime: making his case known to the public. As one of the colonels is reported to have told the young man: "Listen, you made a mistake in going to the newspaper with this story. You had no right to seek to embarrass the air force."

Examine the implications of that statement and you come up with a pure

(Continued on page 3)

Did you know that
OCTOBER 31
is next Saturday?

For other up-to-the-minute information, see last page!

Let the People Of Trieste Vote!

By GORDON HASKELL

The territory of Trieste has once again become one of the hot spots of the world. Even in these times of turmoil and sometimes incredible happenings, it is hardly possible that the struggle over Trieste will erupt into an actual war between Italy and Yugoslavia. But it certainly can create a major political conflict, a large-scale diversion among America's military allies in Europe.

At the end of the last war, the territory of Trieste was divided into two zones by the victors. Zone A, which includes the city of Trieste, was occupied by British and American troops, while Zone B was taken over by Tito's Partisan army. Since then various proposals have been made on the final disposition of the territory, usually with some particular political objective in mind.

Trieste is one of those ethnically mixed areas which exist in particularly large numbers in the Balkans and Eastern Europe. The city itself and the larger coastal towns are dominantly Italian in population, while the surrounding countryside is primarily Slavic.

After the breakup of the Austro-Hungarian Empire at the end of World War I, the whole territory was given to Italy. During the period between the wars an intensive campaign of "Italianization" was carried on among the Slavs of the territory. When the Titoists took over after World War II in Zone B, they introduced the same kind of Stalinist regime which they imposed on the whole of Yugoslavia.

In 1948 the governments of Britain, France and the United States issued a declaration in which they said that the whole area (both zones)

(Turn to last page)

T-H Hobbles AFL in Fight on ILA Gangsters

By BEN HALL

The first murder in the war between the AFL and the gangster-dominated International Longshoremen's Association, it is feared, has already taken place.

On September 29, Michael Brogan, a pro-AFL hiring boss, disappeared from his job on Pier 32 at Canal Street and Hudson River, New York City. His street clothes were still in his locker and his time card had not been punched out; he has not been heard from since. Brogan was a member of Local 895, which was one of the first to leave the ILA and go over to the new AFL longshore union. Readers of the New York Times will recognize this local as the subject of an article by Budd Schulberg entitled "How One Pier Got Rid of the Mob."

It was on September 28 that Local 895 voted to switch to the AFL. The next day, strong-arm men from the ILA came down to its piers and told its members to sign ILA loyalty-oath cards, or else. That day, Brogan vanished. The ILA has undoubtedly succeeded in terrorizing scores of longshoremen by that single act.

Terror is the weapon of the ILA rulers. In local after local, machines based on rackets, fear, bribery and discrimination dominate. Thus far, only a minority of the ILA membership in New York has declared for the new AFL union; they are the courageous men who begin the fight; but meanwhile, doubtful waverers are held in line by fear and Brogan's fate reminds them that this

fear is grounded in the ruthlessness of vicious men.

SABOTAGE BY T-H

To win its fight in the decisive port of New York, the AFL must combat this atmosphere of fear and terror; it has to show longshoremen that gangsters and racketeers can be defeated by the united power of trade-unionism. For this, it can rely upon the united support of teamsters and seamen and the brave longshoremen who fought on for years, alone and unaided, to rid their industry of gangsterism. In this key task, the AFL has to be free to mobilize all its strength at any given point; where racketeers gang up on its sympathizers, the AFL has only one reply: united action by all its waterfront supporters.

Now comes the Taft-Hartley Law to cut the ground from under the AFL and its fight.

When Judge Weinfeld issued his injunction against the ILA-called dock strike on October 5, no one seemed offended or alarmed. The ILA leaders did

(Continued on page 7)

Behind the POW Riots In Korea

By L. G. SMITH

After a fitful and balky start, the "explanations" to the anti-Stalinist prisoners of war in Korea have stalled again. The halt may be temporary, or it may be the end of one of the strangest episodes in the strangest war of modern times.

In accordance with the truce, some 14,500 Chinese and 8,000 North Korean POWs have been placed under the control of a commission composed of Czechs, Poles, Swedes, Swiss and Indians. They are supposed to listen, over a 90-day period, to persuasion by Chinese and Korean Stalinists. Each man is brought into a room where, in the presence of members of the neutral commission and of representatives of the press the "persuaders" can talk to him. After they have finished, he is told that if he wants to return to Stalinist China or Korea, he will walk out of one door, and if he does not, he will walk out of another. He is then given five minutes in which to think the matter over alone.

Of the Chinese so far subjected to this process, only two per cent have elected to return to China.

Actually, the prisoners have thwarted the whole process. They have rioted repeatedly against it. When they were in groups they have stoned all Stalinists who came close to them. And even when isolated in the "persuader" rooms, most of them have greeted the Stalinists with shouts of hatred and derision, obscene gestures, and every other action they could think of to balk even the attempt to talk to them.

SOURCES OF RESISTANCE

During the war, the world was amazed at the militancy and determination with which the Stalinist prisoners fought their captors and guards in the prison camps. This was explained not only by the fanaticism of the prisoners for their cause, but also by the probability that as the camps were heavily infested with members of the Communist Parties of China and Korea, and with agents of the secret police of both countries, any prisoner who failed to display hatred against the captors faced prison or death when he would return home.

Now the anti-Stalinist prisoners are displaying similar militancy and determination against the Stalinists, and even against the Indian troops who have the thankless task of driving them through the "persuader" process. For this the reason must also be sought both in the realm of the character of this war and in the pressures to which these men are being subjected.

On the first point, one example should be enough. The press reports that when the first Chinese prisoner was brought into the room, a Chinese Stalinist asked him whether he ever thought of his family. "Yes!" he shouted, "they were all killed by the Communists." There, in a sentence, is revealed the social basis for the refusal of these men to return to their own country. Although not all their families have been killed by the Stalinists, each and every one of them has some reason to hate them or to fear them.

But it would be naive to think that

(Turn to last page)

Unemployment and Layoffs Are Rising

By PETE JARMS

CHICAGO, Oct. 18—"We've always been able to hire human beings, but lately we've been getting workers," says an official of a large Houston department store as reported in the *Wall Street Journal* for October 12, in a special column devoted to the problems of spreading unemployment.

The article went on to detail the various cities and industries that are in the throes of layoffs, reporting that Ford and Caterpillar have discontinued their drive in the South to bring workers up to their plants through daily advertising.

The hardest hit division is that of the farm implement manufacturers, but they are not alone and they are only the first to be hit. The farmers are not buying because of the huge drop in their income. If they have a four-year-old farm machine, they just use baling wire to keep it going.

Harvester has ten thousand laid off; John Deere has closed down several of its plants; Massey-Harris is suffering; Oliver is near bankruptcy; and J. I. Case has laid off up to 25-year men. Everywhere one travels, one finds huge stockpiles of farm machinery lying around in the dealers grounds.

John L. McCaffrey, president of International Harvester, made a speech the other day calling upon the industry to use "vision" and bring out new products that will make the farmer buy. He did not explain how the farmer is going to buy when he does not have the wherewithal.

WISCONSIN PORTENT

The 9th congressional election in Wisconsin showed clearly how the farmers felt. They voted for a "change." These dirt farmers who were hit the hardest in the last depression elected a Democrat for the first time in the history of that district.

The farmers are not the only ones "not buying" these days. Caterpillar and International Harvester's divisions of tractor construction have had severe layoffs. The Harvester plant in Milwaukee alone has 4,000 laid off, and it was devoted primarily to heavy construction machinery production. The same is true at Caterpillar.

In the field of Diesel railroad engine manufacture, all of the big manufacturers have had large layoffs. The Electromotive plant of GM in La Grange, Illinois, has laid off around 1500 employees.

Emil Mazey, secretary treasurer of the UAW, spoke at this plant's union meeting and, as quoted in the CIO News, said, "Some people think it might be a good thing to have five to five and a half million unemployed. It is a crime to have unemployment when there are so many needs to be filled. If we took an inventory on the basic needs of the American people it would give us work for 25 to 30 years."

Declining employment also was forecast by *U. S. News & World Report* in mining construction, transportation, utilities and wholesale and retail merchandising. The magazine also reported greater unemployment compensation claims. New claims for 23,405 jobless were reported in Pennsylvania in one week, the magazine reported.

One need only take a look at the unemployment compensation line in Moline, Ill., to bring back memories of the last depression. Lines extend over two blocks on any given day.

LUSH DAYS ARE OVER

The automobile division of the economy, with its short work-weeks and constant layoffs, is heading for a real crisis this year in spite of the '54 model change. No less an authority than Paul G. Hoffman, board chairman of the Studebaker Corporation, said so in a speech in Toronto on Friday, October 16. Some of his remarks deserve to be quoted.

Hoffman attacked the current "razzle-dazzle" type of auto selling going on. He said it is supposed to confuse the public but "wrecks the dealers, instead."

"Because of such practices," he charged, "it is no wonder we've had a revival of talk about that hardy perennial, the saturation point." He added that "chaos is the order of the day" for most auto dealers across the U. S. "Profitless prosperity on the part of dealers will, over the long pull, result in profitless prosperity for the manufacturers and an anemic industry."

And the dealers are disturbed. Recently the National Automobile Dealers Association visited Detroit, and its leaders talked to the manufacturers and even talked to the CIO Auto Workers leaders. Their lush post-war days are over, and they are worried about the constant drive of the manufacturers to load them up whether they can sell the car or not.

Some samples: Nash was shut down from July till the middle of September because its dealers were loaded. Studebaker closed down by one third last September 14 and admitted that its dealers were overstocked. Kaiser has not produced a car since June. Hudson and Packard have had continuous short work-weeks. General Motors was saved by the Livonia "hydratic" fire. The Chrysler division has suffered the most of the Big Three. (It will soon be the Big Two because another year like '53 for Chrysler will reduce its status to the Studebaker class.)

That is the auto industry. On top of this have come the huge cutbacks in "defense" production. Studebaker has closed its Chicago jet-engine plant, while the government builds a new plant for GM just three miles away. Chrysler has lost a tank contract. Harvester has the sole supply of 5-ton trucks; the other producers are eliminated.

UAW WORRIED

All these factors must back up on the part suppliers and on the steel industry. Already we have signs of this in steel.

Yes, unemployment is rife. One might think that farmers could not use farm machinery, that the huge construction machinery is overproduced, or that all the people have cars. Yet the simple facts in the U. S. show that out of 48 million families, 17 million do not have a car; on the farms 25 per cent still have neither a car or a truck. About 30 per cent of the people between 30 and 40 years old still do not drive. So there is a market—only the people can't buy.

The UAW-CIO realizes the importance of the situation. Its industry is hardest hit now. Its leaders are calling for a March on Washington, December 6 and 7. There they hope to spotlight the problem and demand some legislative relief. They are demanding that the people's purchasing power be increased, that the government immediately draw up plans for the construction of homes, roads, schools and hospitals.

An even more effective demand that would certainly get results would be to convene a congress of labor and working farmers for the establishment of a new party that would put the needs of the people ahead of the needs of the profiteers.

Kutcher Makes His 11th Appeal In Fight for Job Reinstatement

WASHINGTON, Oct. 16—James Kutcher, 40-year-old legless veteran, today filed suit in the U. S. District Court to recover his clerical job with the Newark Veterans Administration. This will make the 11th appeal since he started fighting his victimization under the government loyalty program five years ago.

Kutcher, who lost both legs in battle in Italy in 1943, was fired from his VA job in 1948 because of his admitted membership in the Socialist Workers Party, one of the groups on the attorney general's "subversive list." Denying that either he or his party were subversive, Kutcher contested his discharge through a series of administrative hearings and court actions.

In 1952 the U. S. Court of Appeals ruled that membership in the Socialist Workers Party was not in itself sufficient cause to justify his discharge and sent his case back to the VA for a new decision. Thereupon the Veterans Administrator ordered his discharge for a

LABOR SCOPE

LONGSHORE CASE SHOWS UP T-H HYPOCRISY

By BEN HALL

In the bitter struggle on the New York waterfront between AFL longshoremen and the ILA gangsters whose hold they are breaking, our sympathies lie with the new union. One sidelight aspect that can be considered entirely apart from the basic issues in the fight is the use of a Taft-Hartley injunction to end the brief pier strike recently called.

The "emergency" provisions of the law, on which the injunction was based, anticipated a catastrophic threat to the national welfare invented by the hysterical workings of the collective mind of Congress—a country paralyzed by mass strike; its industries shut down by lack of basic materials; transportation halted; starvation, misery, babies without milk, widows, orphans. This specter was enough to frighten even the opponents of the Taft-Hartley law into a begrudging admission that, if the Taft law was no good, some other measures were necessary to handle the threat of such dire emergencies.

Now, in the longshore strike, the injunction comes not as a stringently needed measure to ward off an emergency but as a way out of an embarrassing situation. A year ago, a strike closed the port for almost a month—no misery, no emergency, no injunction. Now, a four-day strike creates an "emergency."

With the help or tolerance of politicians, union bureaucrats, shipping company officials and public officials, gangsters and murderers fastened themselves on the industry and the union. In the national scandal that finally erupted, everyone had to dissociate himself from these crooks. The racketeers hastened to call a strike under their own leadership before it could be called against them.

WHAT EMERGENCY?

But the employers didn't want a strike and were ready to sign up with men exposed as criminals, past and present. Responsible men of free enterprise to sign up with known gangsters? To avoid that disgrace, machinery was improvised to apply a Taft-Hartley injunction. It was a simple matter of convenience, permitting employers to avoid a strike without reaching an accord with the gangsters of the old union or giving in to the new union. The law was applied dishonestly and hypocritically if not illegally.

How has the law been applied in the past? Joseph A. Loftus, in the *New York Times* for October 11, is anxious to prove that the Taft law has finally won public approval but he succeeds in shedding light on its dishonest use from the very start—up to now under a Democratic administration. In eight previous strikes,

the government sought injunctions under the emergency provisions of the Taft-Hartley Law. But did the prospect of a real emergency exist in any of these cases?

"Whether any one of these disputes imperilled the national health or safety is open to question," writes Loftus.

And he repeats more forcefully, "it is difficult to prove that any national emergency existed in any of the eight strikes in which injunctions were sought." Loud and shrillest are the shrieks of horror during every coal strike, with visions of a freezing and helpless nation conjured up in every daily paper. "Yet the data shows that coal strikes do little more than concentrate the idle time that the miners would experience over the year, if they hadn't struck at all," says Loftus.

We are able now to judge what kind of "emergency" Taft-Hartley is really devised to meet. The emergency faced by a suffering nation is a story especially invented to frighten liberal friends of labor. The real "emergency" is the one faced by millionaires and big-businessmen who see the power of labor growing in numbers and expanding into all the basic industries. To curb that power and to limit labor's right to strike is the elementary purpose of the injunction.

New NI Features Analysis of Hook's Apology for Purge

The latest issue of the *New Internationalist* features an article on Professor Sidney Hook's book *Heresy Yes, Conspiracy No* entitled "Civil Liberties and the Cold War Philosopher."

The article treats with the spreading liberal view that "anything goes" when dealing with Stalinists. It seeks to relate this changing attitude toward civil liberties to the whole social scene in America and to the cold war in particular.

The authors, Julius Falk and Gordon Haskell, have concentrated particularly on the area of academic freedom and the social and educational concepts which have given rise to the best traditions in this field. They deal in detail with the claim that members of the Communist Party should be automatically excluded from the teaching profession, and point up the abandonment of civil-libertarian concepts involved in this claim.

Other articles in this issue of the *New Internationalist* are "Behind the New Turn in Kremlin Policy" by Abe Stein, and "The Korean Truce and Its Aftermath" by the editors. Comrade Stein continues here his analysis of the Stalinist regime, since the death of Stalin, in articles which have been one of the magazine's strong points during the past year.

BOOKS RECEIVED

Published by New American Library, publishers of Mentor and Signet pocket books, publication date September 30:

From Here to Eternity by James Jones, Signet Triple Volume, 824 pages, 75 cents.

The Meaning of the Glorious Koran, An Explanatory Translation by Marmaduke Pickthall, Mentor, 464 pages, 50 cents.

Publication date October 28:

New World Writing No. 4—Mentor, 320 pp., 50¢. *The Living U. S. Constitution*, by Saul K. Padover—Mentor, 176 pp., 35¢. *Strange Fruit*, by Lillian Smith—Signet Giant, 204 pp., 35¢. *Scollay Square*, by Pearl Schiff—Signet Giant, 212 pp., 35¢. *The Mistress*, by H. C. Branner—Signet, 144 pp., 25¢. *Ashes*, by Charles F. Coe—Signet, 224 pp., 25¢. *The Darkening Door*, by Bill S. Ballinger—Signet, 166 pp., 25¢. *The Descent*, by Fritz Peters—Signet, 160 pp., 25¢. *The Naked Streets*, by Vasco Pratolini—Signet, 144 pp., 25¢. *Deadlier Than the Male*, by James Gunn—Signet, 160 pp., 25¢.

Get All Your Books from
LABOR ACTION BOOK SERVICE

114 West 14 Street, New York City

WEEK by WEEK . . .

LABOR ACTION screens and analyzes the week's news, discusses the current problems of labor and socialism, gives you information you can't find anywhere else.

A sub is only \$2 a year!

'Moral Rearmament' Is Anti-Labor Group

By BOB MILLAR

(London Tribune, Oct. 2.)

In 1948 I was one of a group of militant trade-unionists invited to a London revue called *The Good Road*. Not only was it a technically excellent show, but the moral was dramatically put over. And afterward the very capable cast of 180 young, unpaid performers mixed with the audience, explaining it in greater detail.

This was my first contact with the organization known as Moral Rearmament, M.R.A. Impressive though the performance was, I wasn't convinced, but many of my colleagues took away piles of literature and promised their support. No doubt many others throughout the world were equally impressed.

The impact of such activities is why the International Confederation of Free Trade Unions (which observes the principle of political and religious neutrality) took the unusual step last week of publishing a critical report on Moral Rearmament.

The movement first started in 1921 under the leadership of Dr. Frank Buchman. By giving house parties, and preaching his ideology of personal and public confession, he attracted a group of Oxford undergraduates. Young men and women openly described their sins to each other.

In less than twenty years the Oxford group spread to become an openly anti-Communist organization, attracting followers from all corners of the earth.

By 1938 the emphasis of the movement's program—absolute unselfishness, honesty and purity—had switched to "love in the personal, social and industrial fields." And by the end of the war its main theme was industrial harmony.

LOVE THY BOSS!

Trade-unionists all over the world have been invited to film shows, plays, and concerts, and pestered (often almost press-ganged) to attend the Moral Rearmament centers in Florida, Washington and, in Europe, Caux.

Here, in incomparable Swiss scenery, trade-unionists and others can spend from two to four weeks at three huge luxury hotels. All travelling arrangements are made for them; everything is provided free; and every moment is used to ram propaganda down their throats.

It is estimated that between eight and ten thousand men and women go to this center every year; are carefully indoctrinated; and sent back to industry.

There they are expected to spread the doctrine of "love thy boss," "work harder," and above all, "don't strike." This is all very well, of course—if the boss is also a disciple. But in practice, these converts have been used to disrupt trade-union activity.

Arthur Deakin himself has been com-

pelled to warn his London dockers against Moral Rearmament's pernicious influence. Walter Reuther and other important trade unionists have condemned the movement.

Dr. Buchman openly boasts of his success—and although the International Confederation of Free Trade Unions Report says these achievements were found to be "half-truths or fabricated successes," it was compelled to admit that Moral Rearmament had set up yellow unions, and recruited followers from the ranks of trade-union leaders.

Already important trade-unionists have criticized the Report. And many V.I.P.s throughout the world openly support the organization.

But we must recognize Moral Rearmament for what it is—a powerful organization opposed to social democracy, or anything which would change the class structure of capitalism.

PRO-FASCIST

Study its leader, Dr. Buchman. The I.C.F.T.U. has this to say of him. "His is not the path of a democratic movement but that of a dictatorship." He professes to be a Christian and democrat. Instead, when it suits him, he can be all things to all men.

He it was who said, among other pro-Fascist statements, "Hitler or any Fascist leader controlled by God could cure all the ills of the world."

The source of M.R.A.'s wealth is completely unknown, but it never runs dry. As well as the centers at Caux, Florida and Washington, it has offices and full-time workers in many countries, and can afford to send plays, choirs, films and literature around the world. When asked where his organization gets its money, Dr. Buchman's stock reply is "Providence provides."

Many of the movement's converts are ex-Communists, who are easy prey for Dr. Buchman's mysticism. During the war it also attracted, as the I.C.F.T.U. Report says, "nice young tennis players and pink-cheeked Thespians who were touring the country instead of defending it."

But it would be wrong to assume that its adherents are only psychopaths and misfits, or that it is simply leading another anti-Communist crusade.

No one can doubt that the world could do with a lot more brotherly love. We all want to stop wars, suffering, and man's inhumanity to man. Moral Rearmament claims to do just that, and so dupes many good-hearted people.

But brotherly love must be a two-way affair. Who can expect the workers to turn the other cheek, when it will be slapped good and hard? All Moral Rearmament does is to provide a pain-killing injection.

Appeal for Protests Against Mao Terror

An appeal for international protest against the terrorist assassination policy of the Mao Tse-tung Stalinist regime in China has been issued by a group of Chinese Trotskyists. Their account, written in January and smuggled out via Shanghai and Hong Kong, appeared in the *Militant* last week.

The five signatories, states the document, "are up to the present the only ones lucky enough to have escaped the recent wholesale arrests of Trotskyists." They relate the crimes of the Mao regime in persecuting and killing revolutionists up to last year, and then write:

"From December 1952 to January 1953, wholesale arrests of Trotskyists were staged throughout the country, from Peking to Canton and from Shanghai to Chungking. These arrests occurred at midnight of two different days, December 22, 1952 and January 8, 1953. . . . Up to now we have not yet learned exactly how many were arrested, but there are

at least a few hundred already. The victims are not limited to official members of the Trotskyist party, but include sympathizers and even those who do not have any organizational relations with the party itself except as wives or brothers of Trotskyists."

"We call," they write, "on all revolutionary organizations and individuals throughout the world who yearn for the liberation of oppressed humanity to come forward in protest and intervene against this reactionary practice of the Chinese CP, which is evidently in imitation of Stalin's methods and on instructions by the Kremlin."

STILL THE ILLUSION

Very important is the fact, which they point out, that this wave of murderous terror came "immediately after the Trotskyist delegates from Ceylon pronounced their revolutionary speeches at the Peace Conference in Peking." They are referring to the fact that at a Stalinist-style "peace conference" in China last year, delegates from the Ceylon Trotskyist group were permitted to attend and speak. At the time this unusual fact intensified illusions among the official-Trotskyists that the Chinese Stalinists were "different."

Also, they write, "We must point out that the arrests took place after the delegation of the Chinese Communist Party headed by Liu Shaochi participated in

SPOTLIGHT

Continued from page 1

slice of the brass-bound military mind, which turns out to be little different from the totalitarian mind. It's true that the military had no right to smear Radulovich by its action in the first place, but the guilt of the accused is verified by the fact that he dared to fight back.

Now, we know that the attorney general of the United States has expressed his displeasure at the idea that anyone should compare any acts of his democratic government with the sort of thing that takes place in Stalinist Russia; so we will point out the obvious difference between the U. S. military's new principle of guilt-by-blood and the Kremlin dictators' well-known principle of guilt-by-blood. The difference we have in mind: in Russia the taint is legally applied to children down to the age of 12 . . . Radulovich is 27.

The "Liberal's" Record on Civil Liberties

There are some rays of hope being seen by some in the appointment of ex-Governor Warren to the chief justiceship of the Supreme Court, in view of Warren's reputation as a kind of Republican liberal. Perhaps the hope is justified; and it is also true that in some cases there has been a development in the direction of greater liberalism after appointment to the court, due doubtlessly to the greater independence from reactionary political pressures which a justice enjoys. Perhaps also the hope may apply to Warren's stand on the most important type of issues coming before the court—civil-liberty cases.

But meanwhile we are indebted to the *Reading Labor Advocate* for reminding us of Warren's actual record in this field:

"Prior to 1942 he was attorney general for the state of California. During that period Warren was the chief mover of the wartime evacuation of Japanese-Americans from their homes into U. S.-style concentration camps. This episode is described by many as the blackest mark in American history for the past generation. Only incidentally, the Japanese-Americans were separated from their \$600 million produce industry in the process."

"Still earlier, as the attorney general, Warren pushed for a bill in the California legislature making it a criminal offense for a citizen of California to bring into the state an indigent person. This bill was aimed at stopping the 'Okie' invasion of that sunny paradise. In connection with his anti-migrant activity Warren, on one occasion, refused to prosecute local law-enforcement officers who, in the presence of many reliable witnesses, brutally broke up a strike meeting of the Farmers Union."

"It was Warren who bitterly opposed the pardon granted Tom Mooney, one of labor's martyrs. It was Warren who opposed naming Max Radin, liberal professor

of law, to the Supreme Court of California. It was Warren, the governor this time, who on the one hand protested the loyalty oath for teachers and on the other hand enforced a loyalty oath on all other state employees."

The Home of "Inquiring" Minds

The American Civil Liberties Union reports that "At least one 'book-burning' case, which recently took place in Brooksville, Fla., has ended in a substantial victory for free speech."

How tenuous such victories can be, as long as the political climate remains what it is, is indicated by the fuller information which the ACLU provides on this victory.

In Hernando County, a library board member had charged that some of the material was "pure Communist propaganda," and so the following was removed, among other titles: *Ambassador Joseph E. Davies' Mission to Moscow*, files of the *New Republic*, *Nation* and *Reporter*, and other magazines; and books by Anna Louise Strong, Maurice Hindus and Paul Robeson. Then the library board of the county ordered the purged literature returned to the shelves. That was the substantial victory.

In the same order the board reaffirmed a previous rule that books on Communism are not to be supplied to school children unless they have clear requests from their teachers for the books by title. (The teacher had better have a good story ready before she OKs such a request!)

The man who originally purged the books, a Colonel Parker, was reappointed to the board. Two board members who had opposed him were not reappointed.

In ordering the return of the books, the board gave the librarian discretion over what to put back on the shelves. The librarian was quoted as saying, "Don't be surprised if some of it doesn't get back on the shelves."

It is therefore clear that the library board, having dusted its hands of the "regrettable furor," had a perfect right to quote (as it did) the noble words of President Eisenhower in his speech before the librarians' convention: "The libraries of America are and must ever remain the homes of free and inquiring minds."

LOS ANGELES

FALL SERIES OF CLASSES

LOS ANGELES SYL
Tuesdays at 8 p.m.

ABC of MARXISM

- Oct. 13 Historical Materialism—I
- Oct. 27 Historical Materialism—II
- Nov. 10 The State
- Nov. 24 Marxian Economics

PROBLEMS of SOCIALIST THEORY

- Dec. 8 Capitalism and National Self-Determination
- Dec. 22 The Negro in the U. S.
- Jan. 5 Socialism and Backward Countries
- Jan. 19 The Working Class in Capitalist Politics

1433 North Beverly Glen
(1 mi. north of Sunset betw. UCLA and Beverly Hills)

For information or transportation call AR-8-7941 (evenings)

There's No Angel Around

to finance LABOR ACTION. It has appeared every week since 1940 because it's been backed by the dimes and dollars of independent socialists — AND YOUR SUBSCRIPTIONS.

A sub is only \$2 a year—
Subscribe now!

Read and subscribe to
THE NEW INTERNATIONAL

The Marxist review for serious students of social issues

35 cents

\$2 a year

WORLD POLITICS

TWO LETTERS: FROM INDIA AND FROM ISRAEL

We are in receipt of two interesting letters from abroad for publication in this column, one from India and one from Israel.

The first letter is from a friend in the Praja Socialist Party of India, which is the party that resulted from the merger of the former Indian Socialist Party with the KMPP. It is written from the point of view of the Gandhian socialism which nowadays is dominant in the Praja Socialist Party, but its contents refer to a peasant movement going on in the country which deserves to be known.

When the Praja Socialist merger took place, a Marxist wing of the old SP stayed out of the united organization to maintain the Socialist Party as a left-socialist group. We would be very interested indeed to hear the opinion of this group also on the peasant satyagraha movement which our correspondent describes.

The letter follows.

Bombay, October 6

Perhaps the most symbolic of the agrarian movements of the postwar world is the present *Khed Satyagraha* which the Praja Socialists are conducting in Pardi Taluka in Surat District about 130 miles from Bombay on the west coast of India. The word "khed" in the local language, Gujarati, means to cultivate and the words "khed satyagraha" would imply the meaning that the movement [of passive resistance] is essentially agrarian in character.

The bearded Praja Socialist Asoka Mehta, who is leading the movement, said prior to the commencement of the movement that the purpose of the *satyagraha* was to focus the attention of the public on the problems of landless laborers and not to claim proprietorship of land. What they were claiming were tilling rights and not ownership, the Socialist leader said.

While peasants in the thousands rally under the socialist banner and dig up grassroots with such harmless weapons as shovels, ploughs and pickaxes, the state government has found it fit to keep in readiness its entire district police force with tear gas shells and rifles in the taluka. Indeed as these peasant *satyagrahis* dig the land, police swoop on them and carry them over in police vans to local jails. Already all the leaders and hundreds of peasants have thus been arrested and are now awaiting their trials on charges of trespass into the lands of the landlords.

The Congress government of the state, whose chief minister is Mr. Morarji Desai, and the landlords are nervous at the mass appeal of this movement. They detect in this movement signs of growing peasant revolt and a serious threat to the landlord-infested Congress regime in the state.

Mr. Morarji Desai betrayed this sense of nervousness by his confused replies to the Opposition members in the state legislative assembly. He said he did not think the *Pardi satyagraha* was a *satyagraha* at all. "People, however, are prevented from taking recourse to *dura-graha* (stubbornness)," Mr. Desai said.

It is amusing to see this erstwhile follower of Mahatma Gandhi trying to re-define the term "satyagraha." To Gandhi, the chief exponent of *Satyagraha*, it was a political weapon—nay, it was even a way of life. He used it

against his wife, Kasturba, and his children. Gandhi also used it against an alien ruler and if it was a proper weapon to bring the foreign ruler to his senses, it certainly should be one against a government which has refused to heed the grievances of the landless peasants who stand the chance of being evicted from their lands by absentee landlords on silly pretexts.

In fact, while speaking in the assembly, Mr. Morarji Desai admitted that he was aware of the distress of the *kisans* (peasants) when he said that the collectors (district officers who look after revenue and administrative matters) in the state had been directed to issue "show cause" notices on recalcitrant landlords who had taken steps against the *kisans*.

Yet Mr. Desai felt it necessary to reply to the district secretary of the Praja Socialist Party that his department would require at least thirty months to do anything in the matter of redressing the pitiable conditions of the laborers.

On the face of these facts and the inability of the government to ameliorate the condition of the *kisans*, it at least does not lie in the mouth of the chief minister to question the propriety of the movement and say that it is "dura-graha."

Similar is the reaction noticeable in the attitude of the local landlords and congressmen. A resolution of the Surat District Congress Committee on September 14, expressed the fear that the *khed satyagraha* launched by Praja Socialists was assuming the form of a class war.

Surely the Congressmen see in the success of this agrarian movement a threat to their regime, and in a last-minute face-saving effort they appeal to landlords to subordinate their personal interests in their dealings with *kisans*, to try to be of as much help to them as possible, taking into consideration the present economic situation.

This appears clearly as a political maneuver on the part of the Congressmen to foil the success of movement, because they are genuinely afraid that the Praja Socialists might steal a march over them in rallying the millions of *kisans* in the country and convert this movement in a remote corner of the country into a countrywide agrarian revolution.

REPORT ON ISRAEL

The second letter, from Israel, was received by one of our friends in New York and sent to us by Comrade Al Findley, who thinks LABOR ACTION readers will find it interesting:

The situation in the country has gone from bad to worse. Prices on necessities are doubling and unemployment has not subsided. Taxes have risen, traveling rates have almost doubled and in general the standard of living is steadily declining.

The wave of emigration from Israel has risen the past two years; thus far there are no signs of abatement. On the other hand immigration has declined below the level of mandatory quotas. Yes, the situation is quite ominous.

Nevertheless there are rays of sunshine. Another *Shomer kibutz* will be settling on the border. *Aliyah* [immigration] of *chalutzim* from North and South America will continue. Indian Jews who left Israel for various reasons are clamoring for return. The movement in Israel "from the city to the village" is assuming dimensions. The only obstacle to absorption by the *kibutzim* is lack of housing facilities.

Government policy is inconsistent with the logic of the situation. Instead of allotting cement first and foremost to producers' settlements (Moshavim, kibutzim, etc.) the reactionary coalition government apportioned a nominal amount to the former while private luxury building receives the lion's share. A large supply is exported in order to get foreign currency.

There has been talk of a crisis in vegetable production in Israel. With the increase in sources of water supply due to successful boring, the area of irrigation has increased. Due to colossal *Aliyah* a large market was created especially for vegetables. *Kibutzim* doubled their production while private producers speculated in a big way. Among *kibutzim* production was more or less planned by the marketing cooperative "Tnuvah."

(Continued on page 5)

MARXISM for TODAY

III — The Case of 2 'Workers Governments'

By HAL DRAPER

Pursuing the meaning of the terms "workers' government" and "workers' state," we have come to the question: If a workers' party takes over the government of a state, and forms a government manned by leaders of this workers' party, do we thereupon consider that a "workers' government" has been set up? We are assuming that this workers' party which forms the government has a program to abolish capitalism and has the parliamentary or other power to effectuate that program.

Let us compare two other cases where this happened, before we come back to the contemporary British example. The two cases are:

(1) The all-socialist government formed by the German Social-Democratic Party following the German revolution of November 1918; and

(2) The Bolshevik-Left SR coalition government formed following the November 1917 revolution in Russia.

In both cases a provisional government took office following a mass revolution, undoubtedly supported by a majority of the people demanding fundamental social change.

Germany 1918 and Russia 1917

In Case I, in Germany, the Social-Democratic government was looked to for socialist measures, and it did a great deal of talking and promising about nationalization, etc. But it never carried out any part of a socialist program, nor did it take any anti-capitalist measures.

In spite of the fact that it had the program and majority support for that program, it consistently followed a policy of maintaining and preserving the capitalist system during the revolutionary crisis. It was faced with the choice of either bowing before the opposition of the bourgeoisie (and army officers' corps) to any socialist measures, or of mobilizing the existing revolutionary sentiment to put such measures through over the heads of the bourgeois opposition.

These reformist Social-Democrats were "in favor of" socialism—no doubt—but in real policy, they consistently SUBORDINATED THE INTERESTS OF THE WORKING CLASS to the demands of the capitalist class, because they were unwilling to break with the latter in a revolutionary fashion.

They thereby maintained the social bases of the capitalist state; they maintained the institutional structure of the capitalist state, in dependence upon the old reactionary officers' corps for armed force (against the revolutionary aspirations of the people) and upon the old state's bureaucracy for maintaining the administrative apparatus. They maintained the capitalist state in the role of a doctor tiding the invalid over a crisis.

This with a government completely working-class in composition.

In Case II, the Bolsheviks came into the provisional revolutionary government with a program which did not call for immediate socialist measures. Lenin's view was still that, because of the backwardness of the Russian economic and social structure, the revolution might go far in making radical bourgeois-democratic changes (land to the peasants, eight-hour-day, etc.) but socialist measures in this Russia would have to await the aid of the revolution in the rest of Europe. The nationalization of industry was not envisaged.

Yet this government, which did NOT programmatically propose nationalization, DID nationalize the capitalist industry—when the capitalists themselves forced it on them by abandoning their plants and going over to the counter-revolution. The Soviet government was forced to take over the industry to keep it going (inaugurating the so-called "war communism").

A paradox!—that government (Case I in Germany) which proclaimed its will to nationalize never did so, when it was faced with the choice of carrying out its program in the teeth of capital or of subordinating the program of the working class for the sake of an alliance with capital; but the government (Case II in Russia) which did not propose nationalization in its immediate program did go ahead and carry it out, when it too was faced with the same choice.

The latter government expropriated the capitalists even though it was not programmatically for it. The former refused to expropriate the capitalists even though it was indeed programmatically for it.

The state led by the German Social-Democratic government remained a capitalist state. The state led by the Soviet government was transformed into a workers' state. The test, in the last analysis, was not one's previous political opinion of either the Social-Democrats or Bolsheviks, but what they did in respect to the question: Faced with an irreconcilable immediate conflict between the progressive interests of the working class and the interests of capitalism, whose interests did they choose to subordinate?

Note: the above discussion is directed to the question of the class character of the STATE under these two governments. What about the class character of the GOVERNMENTS themselves?

Criteria for "Workers' Governments"

Well then, this Social-Democratic government which preserved the capitalist state in Germany—was it a "workers' government"?

And this Soviet government which set up a workers' state in Russia and, in spite of its own programmatic perspective, was forced to take anti-capitalist measures in the economy—was it a "workers' government"?

(1) Take the Soviet coalition government first: Lenin called it a *workers' and peasants' government*, not a workers' government—that is, a government which was based on the support of two classes in alliance, and composed of representatives of the parties of these two classes.

The *workers' and peasants' government* of this state depended on two classes for its decisive mass support, and it was also composed of the parties of two classes. Even after the Left S-R peasant party pulled out of the coalition, the all-Bolshevik government was still dependent on the support of the overwhelming mass of the peasantry for its existence, not only on the support of the working class. The designation of the Soviet government as a "workers and peasants' government" can be taken to refer to either of these facts or both—the question of composition and mass support, or the question of social policy followed.

(2) In Germany, on the other hand, we had a Social-Democratic government which was exclusively working-class in its composition—and pro-capitalist in its policies.

Now which is the "correct" criterion for labeling the class character of a "workers' government"—its composition or its policy?

What is the "correct" Marxist term to use for a government which is working-class in composition and mass support, but which does not carry out a working-class policy (that is, which subordinates the interests of its class to the interests of capital)?

Here's the rub: There are two different sets of terminology on this score which have gained a tradition for themselves in the Marxist movement; two and not one. This is bound to be confusing? Of course! And it has indeed been a source of rife confusion. Would it weren't so, but since it is, we had best understand what these two different terminologies are and where they come from.

(Next week: "Workers' Governments" in the Early Comintern.)



LABOR ACTION

October 26, 1953 Vol. 17, No. 43

Published weekly by Labor Action Publishing Company, 114 West 14 Street, New York 11, N. Y.—Telephone: WAtkins 4-4222—Re-entered as second-class matter May 24, 1940, at the Post Office at New York, N. Y., under the act of March 3, 1874.—Subscriptions: \$2 a year; \$1 for 6 months (\$2.25 and \$1.15 for Canadian and Foreign).—Opinions and policies expressed in signed articles by contributors do not necessarily represent the views of Labor Action, which are given in editorial statements.

Editor: HAL DRAPER
Asst. Editors: GORDON HASKELL,
BEN HALL, MARY BELL
Business Mgr.: L. G. SMITH

PRESS AGENTS OF THE PENTAGON

A Documented Study of the Military Propaganda Mill

We begin publication below of the first detailed and factual survey of a little known department of the U. S. military establishment—its propaganda activities, the vast ramifying network of agencies and agents whose sole function is to inundate the public with the military point of view.

The series we will publish is taken from the pamphlet just published by the National Council Against Conscriptation, written by John M. Swomley Jr. and entitled Press Agents of the Pentagon. The NCAC is an organization supported by prominent liberals for the purpose of combating the growth of militarism, in particular fighting against universal military training and conscription.—Ed.

The growth of military influence and control over American life and institutions which has developed since the Second World War is in large part the result of an effective military "public relations" program. With millions of dollars available each year, the Pentagon and its branches throughout the world have been able to employ thousands of skilled publicity personnel to sell their ideas to the people.

A little-known report of the Hoover Commission on the reorganization of the Federal Government called much of this activity "thought control." The *Army and Navy Journal* in reporting the Hoover Commission recommendations, said: "Substantial reductions in expenditures for public relations were urged with a view to eliminating special pleading, competitive lobbying and publicity designed to influence public opinion."¹ (Emphasis added.)

It is precisely this desire to persuade public opinion and Congress to support military proposals, including a large and well-paid military establishment, which is the reason for a military publicity service.

When James Forrestal was Secretary of Defense he told a group of 300 military publicity men, as reported in the press, "that it has become as imperative for military commanders to think in terms of the public as of the troops under them."²

Similarly, when General Omar Bradley told a group of "high-ranking officers they must work to sell the Army to the public,"³ he was simply promoting the new postwar military policy.

TEN BRANCHES

Military policy with respect to public relations is a broad one involving many specific responsibilities. An official Army directive on Public Information asks personnel to publicize the "need for an Army," the "objectives of the Army," the "role of the Army in peace," as well as certain other ideas. More specifically, "Public information officers will be appointed to the staff of each installation and to the staffs of all commanders down to and including the regiment or unit of equivalent size."

This means that throughout the United States and in every area there are military publicity experts. One of their "duties" is "planning positive and continuing community relations programs,

conducting press conferences, establishing friendly relations with the local news agencies, press, radio, still and motion picture services."⁴

Centralized direction of publicity and propaganda is assured through the Office of Public Information in the Pentagon. This central bureau is a huge undertaking divided originally into about ten departments:

1. *The Press Department.* It issues news releases to daily and weekly newspapers, and maintains a news room in the Pentagon for correspondents from newspapers and the various wire services like Associated Press and United Press;

2. *The Radio and Television Department* prepares scripts, recordings, pictures, etc., makes arrangements for radio and television coverage of speeches and special shows, and cultivates the radio and television networks as well as producers and commentators⁵;

3. *The Pictorial Branch.* Its duties include the planning and production of "still and motion picture public relations material, cooperation with civilian groups who want to use military pictures in films or other pictorial media, and making arrangements for newsreel, photographic and other coverage of military events."⁶

4. *A Security Review Branch.* Checks all news or other material from military sources before it is issued for public use. This review is not limited to security considerations. Checked also, for example, is any writing for publication by retired military personnel, to make certain it is in accord with military policy.⁷

5. *A Magazine and Book Branch.* Its functions are to "prepare material . . . and arrange for publication of such material in books and magazines," "assist magazine and book editors and writers in the gathering and preparation of material," and "maintain liaison with magazine and book publishers, editors, staff writers and free-lance correspondents."⁸

6. *A Speakers and Public Appearances Branch.* It arranges for Armed Forces speakers to be invited before certain gatherings, evaluates requests for speakers, and provides speeches and speech materials to Armed Forces speakers.⁹

7. *A National Organizations Branch,* whose purpose is to establish and "maintain appropriate liaison with national organizations interested in matters pertaining to the National Military Establishment."¹⁰ (This is a broad field, since many organizations were interested in UMT, for example.)

8. *A Special Events Branch* arranges for "Armed Forces participation in civilian-military activities of national or wide regional significance."¹¹

9. *An Analysis Branch* analyzes and summarizes, radio broadcasts, and "editorial opinion relating to the National Military Establishment."¹² This analysis includes the four major radio networks, the Wire Services Bulletin, and a representative list of 85 newspapers. The purpose of this analysis is to provide personnel with "concise information concerning public opinion."¹²

10. An over-all *Planning Branch* of the Policy Division recommends policies and programs and suggests solutions to specific public relations problems.¹²

Other new departments, such as an *Industrial Relations Branch* and a *Special Public Exhibits Section*, have been added¹³ since the Office of Public Information was launched.

The cost of maintaining such an extensive publicity and propaganda establishment runs into millions of dollars each year. In 1950 public relations and information had an appropriation of \$9,644,143.¹⁴ In 1951 the amount was increased to \$12,293,576.¹⁵ In 1952 an alert Congress, reviewing a military request for \$15,622,902,¹⁶ decided to limit the appropriation to \$10,950,000.¹⁷

Unlike appropriations, which are a matter of public record, it is not so easy to determine the exact number of persons employed as the publicity staff of the Armed Forces. There is no advantage to the Military Establishment in publicizing the number employed for publicity purposes. Various Congressmen and Congressional committees have tried vainly to discover the number of public relations officials at work for the Armed Forces.

ARMIES ON THE PAYROLL

A House Armed Services Subcommittee headed by Rep. F. Edward Hebert, for example, on March 7, 1952 accused the Pentagon of holding back at least 211 names from the list of public relations officials it had supplied to the subcommittee.¹⁸ Moreover, many military personnel who are not technically classified as publicity staff, such as chaplains, ROTC instructors, and other officers, are expected as a part of their duty to do a certain amount of public relations work, including public speaking.

In 1947 the Navy maintained a staff of 601 public relations personnel, of whom 121 were civilians.¹⁹ In 1951 the Navy had 763 military personnel and 81 civilians in public relations work, in addition to those employed in the Department of Defense and paid for by Navy appropriation. In 1952 the Navy had 830 military personnel and 64 civilians in publicity activities.²⁰

The Marine Corps reported 50 civilian public relations employees June 30, 1951 and 48 on June 30, 1952, but did not report the number of military personnel engaged in such work.²¹

In 1948 the Army and Air Force together employed 810 full-time and 431 part-time military men in publicity activities, in addition to 557 full-time and 197 part-time positions held by civilians in the employ of Army public relations.²² In the fiscal year 1951 the Air Force employed 276 civilians and 952 military personnel in publicity work.²³

In 1950 Senator Homer Ferguson said there were 2,706 publicity personnel at work in the Defense Department.²⁴

A reporter for the *Detroit Free Press* on February 18, 1951, who admitted that "the figure is hazy" estimated that the Department of Defense employed "approximately 1800" persons in public relations.

A few months later, Senator Harry F. Byrd, reporting for the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures, stated that the Department of Defense, including the Army, Navy and Air Force, "this year is using 3,022 civilians and uniformed persons in advertising, publicity and public relations jobs at a payroll cost of \$10,109,109." Included in this total are 2,235 military and 787 civilians.²⁵

Still later, Rep. Burr P. Harrison of Virginia charged that there were 4,200 pay-rollers working for the "Pentagon's \$10,950,000-a-year publicity combine."²⁶

GETTING AROUND CONGRESS

By 1952 some Congressmen and Senators were concerned about the pressures on public opinion and therefore also on Congress that arose as a result of military publicity. The result is that the House cut to \$5,254,851²⁷ the military request for \$11,759,702 for the fiscal year 1953. The military made an effort to persuade the Senate to raise the amount but succeeded in getting it raised only to \$6,004,851. In the conference committee that ironed out the difference and in the law as finally passed it was agreed that "Funds provided in this act for public information and public relations shall not exceed \$5,554,851."²⁸

Facing this cut, the Armed Forces reduced staff somewhat and eliminated some services completely. One such service was the industrial services branch, which furnished procurement information to manufacturers. It is not impossible that this non-propaganda function was chosen for the ax in the hope that manufacturers who want this information will put pressure on Congress to have military publicity budgets raised.

In addition to this, a newspaper matrix service that supplied news, feature stories and illustrations to 1,500 small-town newspapers was temporarily discontinued and the mailing of press releases to thousands of specialized publications has been stopped. There have been some reductions in publicity activity

in other parts of the military located throughout the world.

The August 3, 1952 *Washington Star*, reporting the above-mentioned reductions, concluded with this comment: "The reduction in appropriations has brought about a careful screening of all public information activities to determine if some functions should not properly be carried under other labels." The clear implication of this is that the military will try to get around Congressional control by labelling some public relations activities with other names.

The military has sought to get around the intent of Congress also by having officers or soldiers with some publicity or newspaper experience perform public relations work as a part-time or "spare time" activity. The August 2, 1952 *Air Force Times* reported that Col. M. S. Hollidge of the 6160th Air Base Wing had given a "public information trophy" to Lt. Stanley J. Grogan, Jr., radar observer and "spare-time news reporter."

HUCKSTERS IN BRASS

The report went on: "Realizing that the cut in public information funds didn't relieve commanders of the responsibility of maintaining good public relations and an information channel to the people of the United States, Col. Hollidge tackled his problem by setting up public information as an inter-squadron sport."

The report added: "The handsome trophy was procured from non-appropriated funds to be presented to the squadron most active in public information each month. A squadron must win the trophy three months in succession in order to retain it permanently. In addition the squadron reporter receives an engraved keychain charm in recognition of his personal achievement."

Since each commander is expected to be concerned about public relations it is a relatively simple matter to order or persuade someone labeled a "radar observer" or some other classification to do publicity work.

Key generals and admirals continue to have their own public relations men. Reports from Tokyo at the time of General Van Fleet's retirement mentioned "the general's public information officer, Capt. James Holton."²⁹ Undoubtedly one reason for the fact that important generals like Eisenhower and MacArthur were so well-known and popular as to be considered for the Presidency is their full-time publicity men.

General MacArthur in 1948 had 135 military and 40 civilians assigned to his command in the Far East as publicity personnel, though of course not all of these were at headquarters. The Chief of Staff had 44 military and 113 civilians doing his public relations work. The Commanding General in the European theatre had 107 military and 30 civilians in publicity activities.³⁰

(Next week: The Extent of Military Publicity.)

1. *Army and Navy Journal*, December 18, 1948.
2. *New York Times*, August 5, 1948.
3. *Congressional Record*, July 28, 1948.
4. *Federal Register*, April 30, 1952, Page 3820.
5. Secretary of Defense memorandum, April 22, 1949.
6. *Ibid.*, May 2, 1949.
7. Public Information Consolidation Directive No. 1, Office of Secretary of Defense James Forrestal.
8. Secretary of Defense memorandum, May 19, 1949.
9. *Ibid.*, May 20, 1949.
10. *Ibid.*, May 24, 1949.
11. *Ibid.*
12. *Ibid.*, April 14, 1949.
13. Public Hearings, 1952, Senate Subcommittees on Appropriations, Department of Defense, p. 1185.
14. Public Hearings, 1952, Senate Appropriations Committee, p. 1769.
15. *Ibid.*
16. *Ibid.*
17. Public Law 179, 82nd Congress, first session, page 7.
18. *New York Times*, March 8, 1952.
19. *United Mine Workers Journal*, June 1, 1947.
20. Public Hearings, 1953, House Appropriations Committee, Navy Department, pp. 58, 59.
21. *Ibid.*, p. 495.
22. Official Army figures furnished by the Budget Division, Department of the Army.
23. Public Hearings, 1953, House Appropriations Committee, Department of Air Force, p. 95.
24. *Congressional Record*, May 24, 1950, page A4164.
25. *Ibid.*, July 11, 1951, page 8121.
26. *Chicago Tribune*, February 14, 1952.
27. *Congressional Record*, April 9, 1952, page 3952.
28. Public Law 488, Sec. 637, 1952.
29. *New York Times*, February 11, 1953.
30. Memorandum of Chief of Budget Division of the Army, August 26, 1948.

World Politics — —

(Continued from page 4)

Yet there was a large "overproduction." The truth is that the purchasing power has dwindled so much that large sections of the population cannot buy daily necessities. It was thought that the canning industry would absorb the surplus product. Yet it is a fact that about 30,000 tons of tomatoes were thrown to the manure heaps. This created a public scandal and investigations are going on to trace the culprit.

The trial of the fascist terrorist youth has just been completed. All were sentenced to terms of imprisonment. They were the ones who terrorized the Stalinist (Soviet and Czech) embassies and bookstores. Unfortunately Al Findley published a lot of misinformation in LABOR ACTION. He attributed the bomb in the Russian embassy to the Canaanites. There was no record of this in the Israeli press. Due to a combination of circumstances the Mapam in the Knesset was not present and could not vote against the notorious "Law on Domains."

[The report about the role of the "Canaanites" in the anti-Russian acts was given by Al Findley as a report taken from the Jewish press in this country.—Ed.]

Read the
NEW INTERNATIONAL
America's leading Marxist review

The U.S. and British Guiana

By HAL DRAPER

Wide sections of British public opinion have been rather set back on their heels by the crude strong-arm methods of British imperialism in Guiana, but so far the only forthright protests there have come from two prominent Labor Party men, Aneurin Bevan and Fenner Brockway.

The official leadership of the Labor Party have been intimating that they considered the action too precipitate, but they have limited their action to requesting more evidence and hinting that they will look over this evidence very, very carefully. At the same time they indicate that they will be satisfied if the colonial secretary adduces proof that the People's Progressive Party of British Guiana is indeed "communist."

While these Laborite right-wingers may possibly utilize the issue to attack the government—perhaps only for its precipitancy rather than for its policy—the cry of "communist danger" will perhaps be enough to make them overlook their often-platonic anti-colonialism.

It took other sections of the British press and public a little time, as much as a whole 24 hours in some cases, to get over the slight feeling of shock at the idea that democratic Britain had just crushed a constitutionally elected government by force and violence. Pleadingly they begged the government to bring forward some evidence about that Communist "plot" in Guiana so that their outraged consciences might be salved. After all, since 1945 much has been heard about the demise of imperialism in the world; and wiseacre articles galore have been written deploring the "backwardness" of radicals who still insisted on talking about imperialism. . . .

The attitude of the official leaders of the BLP is not far from this too. The raids now being conducted by Her Majesty's servants in Guiana, on the headquarters and homes of PPP leaders, are designed to dig up some items of "proof" that will satisfy those critics in Britain who are yearning to be satisfied.

Brockway's Questions

In Parliament, Fenner Brockway, one of the leading figures in the Congress of Peoples Against Imperialism and a Labor MP himself, put down some provocative questions for Colonial Secretary Lyttelton to answer, as he described the Guiana coup as "out-McCarthying McCarthy." His questions:

- (1) Why were British troops sent to Guiana?
- (2) What evidence is there that the PPP was planning to take power unconstitutionally?
- (3) What hand did the Americans have in this?
- (4) What pressure was brought to bear by the sugar barons?

Brockway's question about the role of the United States is one, of course, that has occurred to many others. The answer as yet lies in the dark, of course, but we do not tend to believe that it was Washington which pushed Britain to mobilize the guns of its fleet against the British Guiana government. This opinion does not stem from any faith in Washington's benign intentions with regard to Latin American opposition movements, but merely from the view that available evidence seems to point to the initiative being in the hands of Britain this time.

There is, however, not the slightest possibility of doubt that London took the step in consultation with the State Department, with its fervent approval, and it is not at all unlikely that if the British initially hesitated at all, the U. S. gave them whatever extra shove was necessary to get the warships steaming.

The United States' interest need not necessarily stem directly from its own stake in Guiana itself, but it will be interesting to look at this latter point, as background.

Aluminum in the Background

As far as economic interests go, the British stake is most immediately in the sugar planta-

tions while North American financial interest lies in the rich bauxite deposits of the country. Now, as we explained in last week's LABOR ACTION, the focal point of ferment in the colony lay in the struggle over sugar, which is the British preserve; and as far as we know, there has been no boiling up situation among the bauxite workers.

In the latter field, the pre-eminent foreign power has been the Aluminum Company of Canada, which controls most of the very rich bauxite deposits (bauxite being the basic ore from which aluminum is extracted). This company employs 2500 workers in British Guiana, and British Guiana is its biggest source of the ore. It represents upwards of a \$30 million investment, according to the Wall Street Journal of October 9.

The U. S. firm of Reynolds Metals has a small mining property employing a couple of hundred workers, purchased only this year, but the tie-ins between the Aluminum Company of Canada and the Aluminum Company of America are probably not negligible.

This would give Washington plenty of reason to be "concerned" (as the diplomats say) about the situation there, but it was not the immediate and burning concern which the British felt as a result of the September general strike among the sugar workers.

As a matter of fact, the development of the bauxite industry has had perhaps its most notable effect in deepening the discontent in the sugar fields. Bauxite has provided the Guianese workers with an alternative field of employment, making them less dependent on the sugar lords, and therefore freer to swing their weight around.

U. S. Military Bases

There is, however, a second source of "concern" by the U. S. in the British Guiana situation. This is the presence in the colony of two U. S. military bases. And incidentally, one of the not-so-peculiar features of the treatment which the American press has given the events is the fact that, so far as we know, not one paper has mentioned this little fact.

These two military bases are comparatively small ones, and they have not been any central target of the Guianese anti-imperialist movement. They have, however, excited a good deal of anti-American feeling.

In 1941, as a result of the over-age destroyer deal with Britain, the U. S. leased these bases for 99 years—one at Hyde Park on the Demarara River and the other at the mouth of the Essequibo River. A well-publicized incident took place in 1945, involving the leader of the Manpower Citizens Association, the labor union which is now looked on as the right wing of the Guianese labor movement and which does not at all excite the British.

In that year, 1945, Ayube Edun of the MCA was excluded from the base by a sentry and he raised a storm over it in the Legislative Council, demanding that the U. S. "hand us back the territory that we have given during the war." The Caribbean Labor Conference passed a formal resolution on the issue: it said "it views with abhorrence the agreement whereby, without consulting the views of the people concerned, such bases are to be of a permanent character for 99 years by reason of the transfer of 50 over-age destroyers, and demands that the British government should immediately take under advisement the question of ending the agreement on the termination of hostilities . . . [or else] its continuation should be determined by a plebiscite of the people of the colonies in accordance with the principles of the Atlantic Charter."

Racism as Usual

There has been much friction between the U. S. troops stationed there and British Guiana's racially diverse population.

One issue that became prominent was the growth of the number of brothels in the capital Georgetown—allegedly 79! And the Guianese attributed this naturally to the American

troops. A staff writer of one of the leading Georgetown papers, the *Daily Chronicle*, wrote in October 1945 that one person in every 10 in the city now had venereal disease and said of the foreign troops: "[They] are the principal patrons of the brothels. . . . Countless maidens have been and still are being ravished, quite a few half-breed bastards are now being tugged along behind afterwards-enlightened mothers on our city sidewalks and avenues, and a number of decent homes have been wrecked."

As might be expected from the racist ideas so prevalent in the U. S., all this is complicated and worsened, for the native people, by the attitude of the Americans toward the people. In 1943 a tremendous scandal was unleashed when it was brought to light that a U. S. officer had sent out the following general order to local troops:

"Dates: There is a strong color line observed in British Guiana; while it does not in any way affect inter-business relations among the local inhabitants, it is very strongly marked in social contacts.

"Generally speaking, social life in Georgetown may be divided in the following categories: (a) British White; (b) Portuguese; (c) Mixed Portuguese; (d) Mixed Colored.

"Officers' dates should derive from (a) above and to a very limited extent from the upper group. (b) Officers are advised that they are not expected to associate with groups in this colony with which they would not associate at home."

We need not enlarge on the thought that coming into live contact with U. S. racism and militarism did not lead the Guianese to feel more kindly toward the partners in imperialism of their own British oppressors. The ECA's grant in June 1951 of \$621,000 for a drainage and irrigation scheme in British Guiana, which would benefit the sugar planters, was hardly enough to mollify this sentiment.

When, on October 8, after the outbreak of the crisis in Guiana, the U. S. consul general in the West Indies, W. P. Maddox, flew into Georgetown in order to "keep in touch with events," it was as an ally of the British gunners and not as an angel of Uncle Sam come to protect his wards down-under.

Guatemala Next?

But at the very least it is highly doubtful whether any case can be made out which would indicate that Washington's main interest in the Guiana situation stems decisively either from the bauxite deposits or from the two small military bases. The involvement of American imperialism in South America and the Caribbean is broader than that.

There is evidence that the U. S. authorities would like to utilize the British action in Guiana to prepare the ground for a wider action against Stalinist threats in the area, most particularly in Guatemala. Bolivia, where anti-imperialist struggle has at least impeded the U. S.'s exploitation of the country for its tin, might be the next objective.

From this point of view, U. S. mouthpieces are not reluctant to chortle a bit at the British step against Guiana. *U. S. News & World Report* (Oct. 16) impossibly points out, for example:

"Queen Elizabeth's government, which has been concerned about 'witchhunting' and 'McCarthyism' in the search for Communists in the U. S., now is calling out the British navy and the British army to deal with so-called Communist movement in British Guiana. . . . It all depends on whose Communists are involved."

In return for its moral support (and any other support) to Britain in crushing the Guiana colony, will Washington expect some "cooperation" from the British in maneuvers to overthrow the government of—say—Guatemala through intrigues conducted via Guatemala's more amenable neighbors?

Meanwhile one of the possible tragedies of the situation inherent in this "anti-Communist" action of the imperialists may be the strengthening of Stalinist influence inside the PPP of British Guiana. The "Communist plot" in Guiana, even if it existed, could scarcely have given Russia a military base in the Western Hemisphere; but the "anti-Communist" plot of the imperialist suppressors may well give the Kremlin a more solid political base there than before. If this turns out to be the reaction in the PPP, British Guiana may be "another Indo-China" or "Malaya" in more senses than one. It is enough to keep this in mind as a possibility.

Pacifist Group Goes Over To a 'Third Camp' Line on War

A militant absolute-pacifist group, the Peacemakers, has taken a step forward in adopting an anti-war resolution based forthrightly on the concept of the "Third Camp" in the present war crisis and proposing a revolutionary solution for the fight for peace.

While the resolution also interweaves the absolute-pacifist ideas of the organization to which it is committed, it is the first pacifist group to come out so clearly for such political views.

The Peacemakers' conference took place in Chicago on October 1-4, attended by about 75 supporters plus "members of other groups refusing support to the two major war-making blocs in world politics" (as the group's bulletin explains). After hearing Sidney Lens and A. J. Muste as speakers, smaller panel sessions developed the conference's resolutions. The bulletin *Peacemaker* also states:

"A committee was named to contact all groups and individuals who might be interested in the idea of a 'Third Camp,' asking them to join in planning and carrying through some kind of action program. This committee is composed of representatives of Peacemakers and Young Socialists. The committee was directed to begin work on the preparation of a leaflet outlining several specific actions in opposition to the suppression of ideas, loyalty oaths, investigating committees, etc. Some of the ideas for action to be presented in the leaflet were non-cooperation with investigations on the lines suggested by Albert Einstein, daring committees to look into individual activities, helping victims of loyalty oaths.

"A committee was set up to coordinate work among young people especially at the college level. The conference agreed to cooperate with *Anvil*, the student anti-war magazine."

The group's resolution also included a statement of radical social views in favor of the democratic social ownership of "the natural and productive resources and key instruments of distribution and communication."

Of course, LABOR ACTION quite disagrees with the absolute-pacifist views of the Peacemakers and with its conception of conscientious objection as a means of fighting the war drive and war itself. We would particularly point out that, at the end of the second paragraph, the resolution, in pursuing its pacifist bent, goes to the length of apparently identifying all "coercion and violence" (in general and abstractly) with "undemocratic means"—a conception which seems to us a good deal less tenable than even the "principled" pacifism of the rest of the document. But we consider that the resolution will be of interest to many readers concerned with the pacifist movement and the development of its political ideas.

The Resolution

The second half of the twentieth century finds the world in a profound crisis. In the midst of tremendous opportunity for material abundance, made possible by technological advance, we are living under the shadow of war and economic insecurity, and in danger of social disintegration. Armaments increase, cleavages deepen, wars which cost the lives of hundreds of thousands of men are fought under the guise of "police action." Despite surface changes in the international scene, each day seems to bring us closer to an appalling Third World War fought with weapons more barbaric than poison gas, more destructive than atomic bombs. For these and other reasons, large numbers of people in this and other countries are victims of fear, apathy and a sense of frustration which prepare the ground for yielding to totalitarian control.

In facing this situation, we have as our starting point, a deep-seated concern for and belief in democracy. By this we mean a way of life and an order of society based on the recognition of the dignity and worth of the human individual and of his need of and inalienable right to self-determination. Only on this condition is he able to achieve true self-expression and to make his full contribution to the development of community among all men in all relationships and throughout the whole world. Integral to our conception of democracy is non-violence of spirit and method. Democracy ceases to be democracy when it seeks to base itself on coercion and violence rather than upon consent. A democratic society can neither be achieved nor maintained by undemocratic means.

It follows from the nature of the crisis and from our deepest convictions, that we cannot look to either of the power blocs which divide the world into two armed camps—American or Russian, Western or Eastern—for the solution of the crisis by the achievement of a global democratic society. The world is undergoing the most complete and far-reaching social revolution in history. From the Ganges to the Nile, peasants and workers who have been oppressed by poverty, disease and tyranny for thousands of years are suddenly striking out for freedom. Africa and Asia are afire with movements for independence. British, Dutch and French imperialism, which flowed from the West's betrayal of democracy, is discredited and is in retreat where it has not already been overthrown.

No Hope in Either War Camp

Both the Soviet Union and the United States belong in a real sense to the past from which these groups are revolting. The latter has consistently ignored the world revolution, or sought to thwart it, giving support to those governments and those groups which could maintain the status quo, act as a "bulwark" against Communist thought, and help in the attempt at military "containment" of Communism. The United States cannot support the revolutionary movements, partly because she is so involved in the political-economic pattern of imperialism, and partly because she dare not risk freeing a nation lest it take an independent course in the cold war.

The domestic as well as the foreign policies of this nation force us to the conclusion that the longer men support the "American Camp," the more certain the prospect of war, the more inevitable the prospect of the Garrison State.

Nor do we look to the heavily armed bloc of Communist totalitarianism and the regimes which it inaugurates in various countries, as instruments to abolish war, end oppression and terror, and build a true community of free men. Communism has indeed recognized the significance of the great popular revolution, which largely accounts for its spread in recent years and still gives it a formidable appeal to multitudes of people, especially in the technologically backward and exploited lands. But Communism sets up totalitarian regimes where it comes into power, imposes a rigid state collectivism without regard to the human cost, and regiments the masses into huge war machines instead of leading them to peace as it professes to do. Thus Communism betrays the popular revolutions and in its own way is clearly a part of the undemocratic, imperialist past rather than the free society of the future.

Since, therefore, neither of the present dominant regimes and power blocs provides a democratic answer to the problems of world revolution and the needs of mankind, we necessarily take a third position and belong to what is sometimes called "The Third Camp."

Extension of Democracy

Concretely, this means that:

We believe in the fullest possible extension of democracy and individual freedom.

We believe unequivocally in the right of all peoples to independence from foreign control, whether military, political, economic or cultural. We support movements by which they seek equal status as members of an interdependent world of free and peaceful peoples.

We believe in the abolition of exploitation, segregation and discrimination wherever these exist. We repudiate high living standards, special opportunities or favored status based on the tyranny of one group over another whether that tyranny is expressed through force of arms or through the more subtle means of economic exploitation.

We believe that the economic problem is a global one and requires a world approach for its solution. Any solution must guarantee to all people the basis for equal status, opportunity and personal dignity.

We believe that feudalism, land-lordism, imperialism and control of the materials and means of production in basic industries by privately owned corporations must end.

We believe that the natural and productive resources and key instruments of distribution and communication belong to all and should be socially owned and democratically administered through the people's own cooperative, community and other instrumentalities.

We believe that technology must be the servant and not the master of the human race. Irrational support of technological efficiency for its own sake, and the centralization of power entailing the growth of bureaucracy and statism, which go with such a policy, violate our democratic faith and threaten to destroy any possibility of a self-governing society.

We believe that the attempt to achieve basic social change by violence is self-defeating, that non-violence is the essential means for achieving a democratic, mature society.

If freedom is to be preserved and enriched, it can only be done by the people everywhere rising and asserting their resistance to tyranny and injustice. And they can be successful only if they recognize the global nature of the struggle and commit themselves to non-violence, since violence involves the use of man himself as a means to an end in the hand of the State. A movement of opposition to both war camps—a movement avowedly non-violent or deeply concerned to explore the possibilities of non-violence—already exists. In a number of Asian and African countries, the concept of a Third Camp is a working political reality. A number of Asian Socialist parties, with millions of members, are part of the Third Camp and are largely non-violent. In India, the Praja Socialist Party is in close relation with key Gandhian groups.

Immediate Steps

The preservation of democracy and its extension, in our own and other lands, depend on our ability to join in those efforts to create an international non-violent revolutionary movement affirming its loyalty to the concept of a Third Camp. Such a movement will necessarily have to take account of existing conditions and possibilities in various countries. It may sometimes proceed slowly, sometimes make rapid strides. It may use ordinary democratic instrumentalities where these are available, or resort to non-violent direct action.

Nor need we wait for some distant morning to begin work on this revolution. Among immediate steps are the following:

- The rejection of war, the refusal to fight, and the boycott of all efforts to mobilize the nation for war and any forms of aggression upon other peoples.
- Support for all programs which can move the world toward a democratic society. Working in and with cooperatives, for example, support of international communities, of basic education, and work with the Congress of Racial Equality, may provide the training and arena for building the values of non-violence within the old order itself.
- The working out of a broader program of political and social action, which would include direct action on the race and civil liberties issues, work with migrants in helping to solve their problems, participation in the struggles of farmers and workers.

The issue is between modern organized violence and enlightened cooperative control. The negative act of civil disobedience and other forms of resistance to war and exploitation, and the positive act of developing and applying a "constructive program" are merely two sides to the same banner which free peoples must now raise. In so doing, they become creators of the future. In spite of the grim aspects of today's crisis, that future belongs not to war but to peace, not to any of the tyrannies which men seek to impose upon their fellows but to free men and the freedom they shall achieve by their united efforts. To this goal, the members of this Conference express renewed devotion.

T-H Hobbles —

(Continued from page 1)

not want a strike anyhow; they had summoned the workers off their jobs only to prevent others from calling the strike against them. The AFL figured that an 80-day "cooling-off" period would give it more time to win over new men and if this was achieved by a Taft-Hartley injunction, what matter?

But on October 15, the injunction which previously applied only to the ILA was extended by the judge to restrain the AFL as well and thus to take away its right to strike. Neither the ILA nor the AFL, according to this decision, has the right to strike the piers.

Fair and just? Not at all. The ILA does not need the strike weapon; it can rely on fear. The AFL must have the right to strike in order to overcome and defeat fear. How this works out in practice was demonstrated by a dramatic struggle on Brooklyn piers.

STALEMATE

It took place in the stronghold of Anthony Anastasia, up to now the boss of Brooklyn docks who has wielded his power like an independent feudal prince, contemptuous not only of the members of the union but of his fellow racketeers who dominated the national structure of the ILA. On Wednesday, October 7, fifty Anastasia men ganged up at Bull Lines pier at 21 Street, Brooklyn, where longshoremen of Local 1199-I had voted to join the AFL. The strong-arm men seized union books of AFL supporters and stopped them from working.

AFL seamen, members of the Seafarers International Union, and truck drivers, members of the Teamsters Union, stopped all work on the pier and Anastasia had to withdraw. "Any place in the harbor where AFL longshoremen are intimidated," announced the AFL, "longshoremen, teamsters, and seamen will not work."

In retaliation, the AFL decided to demonstrate its power at one of the piers still dominated by Anastasia. This became an important tactical move to show longshoremen that one of the most hated and feared of all the ILA officials was far from invincible and invulnerable. The seamen and teamsters stopped all deliveries and cargo movement at the Breakwater pier, an Anastasia stronghold. They demanded that the stevedoring contractor, the Jarka Stevedoring Company, get rid of two Anastasia lieutenants as hiring bosses and replace them with AFL men.

The company yielded and the fight was on. A supporter of the ILA said, "This is Custer's last stand. If we lose this pier to the AFL we lose the whole waterfront." Actually, it ended in a stalemate.

BATTLE ON

When the AFL hiring bosses blew the whistle on the morning of October 11, no one answered. The local longshoremen at that pier remained for the time being under the direction of the Anastasia-ILA.

For two days, a hundred pro-AFL longshoremen from other docks moved into the Breakwater pier to unload the cargo of the freighter, the Steel Vendor. On the streets, two hundred ILA supporters demonstrated in protest. It required more than 100 police to stall off a pitched battle. A temporary halt came when the company repudiated its agreement with the AFL and moved its operations from the Brooklyn pier to Newark where the ILA was unchallenged.

Anastasia's men fought with the police and some were arrested. While the conflict was still taking place, he announced that he was going to round up 10,000 ILA longshoremen to "teach the AFL a lesson." But he soon learned from ILA headquarters that he couldn't get 100, much less 10,000. In Brooklyn, the battle between Anastasia and the AFL was confined to a relatively small number of men. If the ILA racketeers were unable to rally thousands, neither was the AFL.

The job of winning over the mass of longshoremen in New York has only just begun but one thing is already clear: the AFL must shake off the restraints of the Taft-Hartley Law in order to mobilize its forces against gangsters.

Get acquainted with the

**SOCIALIST YOUTH
LEAGUE**

Write to the SYL at

114 West 14 Street, New York City

Let the People of Trieste Vote—

(Continued from page 1)

should be returned to Italy. This declaration gave a tremendous boost to the political fortunes of the Christian-Democrats and other center parties in the Italian elections held that year.

Since then, however, Tito's break with the Kremlin has shoved Yugoslavia toward the anti-Russian military camp. In their effort to woo Tito, the powers which dominate the North Atlantic Treaty alliance have done nothing to put their 1948 declaration into force.

Till October of this year, their position has been to urge the governments of Italy and Yugoslavia to reach some kind of agreement over the whole territory. Neither government can afford to do this.

BOILING UP

The territory has considerable economic importance to both. And even more important, since both are strongly nationalist governments, there is an emotional and prestige factor which makes any kind of deal (which would consign a large number of the nationals of each side to the position of a minority left to the tender mercies of the other) extremely difficult.

At the beginning of October of this year, the British and American governments suddenly announced that they would withdraw their troops from Zone A and turn it over to Italy. Their reasoning seems to have been that as Tito already has Zone B, only such an action would place Italy in an equal bargaining position, and thus make possible some kind of negotiated settlement between the two governments involved.

Another strong factor in their decision has been the financial drain of the occupation, particularly on Britain. And finally, Pella's government is a bit shaky, and this was calculated to prop it up.

The announcement of this decision by the occupying powers let loose a storm of protest by the Yugoslav government, accompanied by the usual government-inspired demonstrations which can be expected in such cases. Tito proclaimed that Yugoslav troops would march into Zone A the moment Italian soldiers set foot on its soil. His government stated that it could not possibly accept Italian occupation of Zone A, not because

Yugoslavia claims a national majority in this area, but because Italian occupation of Zone A would be but a prelude to Italian demands for Zone B as well.

Premier Giuseppe Pella's government gave weight to this contention by stating that it would never accept Zone A in exchange for permanently giving up all claims to Zone B, although he was willing to promise that Italy would not resort to force to get the latter.

ITALY THREATENS

As LABOR ACTION goes to press, there has been a prolonged silence on the matter by the British and American governments. This has led the Yugoslavs to hope that the ferocity of their statements and demonstrations have made an impression, and that the occupying powers may retreat from their decision.

Pella's government seems to fear the same thing, and he has announced that if the Anglo-American allies retreat from their position his government will resign, and further that in such an event ratification of the European Defense Community by Italy will become impossible. Even De Gasperi in his day had threatened that if the question of Trieste were not settled to Italy's satisfaction, she would have to re-examine her relationship to the North Atlantic

Treaty Organization.

And of course, the Russians have not kept out of the act. They have claimed that the British and Americans have turned Trieste into a secret military base and that their proposal to turn Zone A over to Italy is a violation of the peace treaty with that country. (The peace treaty had provided for the setting up of a permanent "Free Territory of Trieste.")

ASK THE PEOPLE!

They have also taken Tito's side in the dispute in ways which keep alive the fears of the Western allies that if they push Tito too far in this matter some kind of a patching-up of relations between his government and the Russian Stalinists is still a possibility.

In all this diplomatic maneuvering, there is one group of people most vitally concerned who have not been consulted. These are the people who actually live in the territory of Trieste. Their desires and opinions, it would seem, have nothing to do with the matter. From all reports, they are fearful of the possibility that their territory may become a battleground between Italy and Yugoslavia. For the people of the city itself, the withdrawal of Allied troops will have a serious economic effect.

Premier Pella has proposed a plebiscite to be held in both zones

to determine the fate of the territory. Tito has rejected this. It is quite true that as the city's overwhelmingly Italian population is larger than the rest of the population of the whole area, a plebiscite would probably go against Yugoslavia. Tito is not willing to risk the bird he already has in his hand (Zone B) in such a vote.

Yet a plebiscite, or possibly even plebiscites held under proper democratic safeguards separately in both zones, would be the only approach to a democratic solution to the problem.

That even such a "solution" could not really assure the welfare of all the people of the territory goes without saying. The Italians have not had a history of giving their minorities complete equality and cultural autonomy. But short of a socialist United States of Europe, in ethnically mixed areas like this, no one can guarantee full democracy to the minorities.

Such a "solution" by plebiscite would at least give the people of the area a chance to choose between the evils of Tito's Stalinism and the capitalist democracy of Italy. Once the people had freely expressed their will, the threat by either Italy or Yugoslavia to upset the choice of the people by force or the threat of force would be clearly exposed for the imperialist ambition that it is.

Behind the POW Riots — —

(Continued from page 1)

the mass resistance of the prisoners to the "persuasion" process is based solely on their personal experiences or their political conviction. It is clear that they, like the Stalinist prisoners of war mentioned above, are also subject to strong pressure.

There is evidence that before they were turned over to the neutral commission, the anti-Stalinist prisoners of war had been heavily propagandized by agents of Chiang Kai-shek's government on Formosa, and by those of Syngman Rhee. There is evidence that even now they are in contact with agents of these governments, and their leaders receive instructions from them. (Indian guards caught a prisoner signaling and receiving signals from the United Nations lines). And most of them can be pretty sure that if they resist the Stalinist persuasions, they will eventually have to live either on Formosa or in South Korea.

Syngman Rhee has made it very plain that he wants to disrupt the truce by any method possible. One method of doing this is obvious. If the prisoners refuse to permit any "explanations" to be made to them, this aspect of the truce agreement would be, in effect, torpedoed. The Stalinists would then be confronted either with the prospect of accepting the blow to their prestige of giving up any hope of persuading the 15,300 men to return to their side, or of breaking up the truce themselves.

RHEE'S ALLY

At the moment, Rhee seems to have achieved quite a success. The Polish and Czech Stalinist representatives on the neutral commission have walked out, on the charge that the rest of the commission has refused to use force to get the North Koreans into the "persuader" rooms. The Chinese, it seems, have been more willing to take their chances that their men would stand up under the "persuasion" while the North Koreans have resisted in mass any attempts to herd them through the process.

Rhee's determination to end the truce is as great now as ever. He has threatened to use force to "liberate" the prisoners of war rather than permit them to suffer the "persuasion" process. He has been removing the most pro-American officers of his army on charges of opposition to the government.

And it is quite evident that he does not stand alone in his determination. Ever since he took his stand against the truce, LABOR ACTION has pointed out that he has received encouragement from elements in America. This was dramatically confirmed by the revelation that Republican Congressman Alvin E. O'Konski of Wisconsin has sent him a letter in which he wrote:

"In this hour of murder, plunder and appeasement—you Mr. President, stand almost alone as the hope of the free world. You, almost alone, realize that the forceful murder of minds of helpless patriots is even more ghastly than murder itself. My deepest prayers and hopes are with you, Mr. President.

"Would that God grant you the courage and vision to liberate those remaining helpless patriots as you did the others...."

This open and direct incitation of Rhee to break the truce by "liberating" the

POWs is a clear violation of the Logan Act which prohibits American citizens from carrying on any "correspondence or intercourse" with any foreign government for the purpose of "defeating the measures of the United States." But, over and beyond that, it is the kind of thing which can well lead Rhee to believe that if he succeeds in breaking up the truce, he will not be abandoned by the American government. The failure to prosecute O'Konski under the Logan Act will, of course, reinforce such a belief.

The actions of the POWs in Korea are not solely a curious social aspect of the war in that far-off country. They are part of the cold war between Stalinism and capitalism. The role which history has forced upon them casts a beam of light on the social and political conflict which makes this war different from the imperialist conflicts of the past century in which all contenders had basically the same social and economic systems.

READ ABOUT SOCIALISM

The Fight for Socialism cloth \$2 paper \$1
by Max Shachtman

Socialism: the Hope of Humanity10
by Max Shachtman

Marxism in the U. S.35
by Leon Trotsky

Plenty for All: The Meaning of Socialism25
by Ernest Erber

The Principles and Program of Independent Socialism10
(LA Special Issue)

Independent Socialist Press
114 West 14 Street, New York City

As a security measure against sabotage, we are taking this

YOU TOO CAN

CAUTION! all personnel cleared for admission will be required to sign the following LOYALTY PLEDGE: "I hereby swear not to sow any wild oaths."

HUNT A WITCH

SORRY! in answer to many requests, we must state that we refuse to provide baby-sitters for any son of a witch.

at our Halloween Witches' Sabbath

Sabbath will take place on Saturday, October 31 at 9 p.m. at

Labor Action Hall, 114 West 14 Street, New York City.

Round-about way of announcing that the Halloween Witches'