

LABOR ACTION

Independent Socialist Weekly

JULY 3, 1950

FIVE CENTS

**South Africa Vies with the U. S. —
For Worst Racism in the World**

... page 5

Stalin Speaks Out... on Philology

... page 6

U. S. Pushes for a Deal with Franco

... page 3

Stoolpigeon or Hack? CP Can't Tell

... page 7

The Only War Aim on Both Sides in Korea: Which Imperialist Power Will Control Asia?

Seeds of War Planted at Yalta; Korean People Pawns in Struggle

By JACK BRAD

Korea's tragedy has been its natural geographic location between great militaristic states, and this circumstance has haunted its history.

When in 1945 the country was split by the Russian and American occupation, it was placed between the jaws of the vise of the growing post-war world conflict. The imaginary line that is the 38th parallel became the border between the two world powers in Asia. Such a proximity became increasingly intolerable under the changing relationship of forces in Asia, particularly after Stalinism conquered China and Man-

churia, isolating South Korea as the last vestige of American power in northern Asia.

If Stalinist Asiatic victories had made America's perch precarious, the depths of the cold war, with all its ramifications in all parts of the world depending on maintaining the exact balance of power, gave to Korea a role far in excess of any immediate local significance. Thus post-war Korea has been shaped by the cold war, never having achieved independence.

Korea first became involved with the new world powers when at the Cairo Conference in 1943 it was proclaimed that "in due course Korea shall become free and independent." That was the first time since the Japanese conquest in 1905 that any country had recognized Korea's right to existence other than as a colony. It was the United States which arranged the Portsmouth treaty

in that year 1905 to give Korea to Japan in spite of an earlier commitment to respect her independence.

DIVISION HARDENED

The phrase "in due course" became an immediate subject of controversy. Clearly it implied that Korean independence would come at the pleasure of the powers. By 1945 and Yalta, it was decided to split the country along an arbitrary line for purely technical military reasons. As yet, neither Russia nor the U. S. projected any long-range plans.

Yet in this division of Korea was planted one of the first seeds of the cold war. As early as Potsdam in December 1945, when the victors met to divide the spoils, the program decided upon in relation to Korea could only deepen the split of the country and the split between the powers. It was agreed to consult all the "democratic" groups in the country looking toward the formation of an all-national government of these groups.

Russia immediately made clear that "democratic" would be equated with Stalinist, while the U. S. floundered. Thus the first post-war decision of the victors on Korea began already to make its division permanent. Subsequent meetings in 1946 and 1947 between Russian and American authorities were already part of their respective strategies in the world conflict.

In the North, Russia quickly created a state in its own image, utilizing all the techniques of Stalinist totalitarianism from the secret police to Stakhanovism. But with this difference from all the other satellites: Northern Korean Stalinism never even achieved a facsimile of independence.

It was completely imposed from above, merely utilizing Koreans to perform the tasks of the Russians. The Korean Communist Party never had a wide base in the country; its leaders were almost entirely unknown; they owed their accession to power entirely to the Russian army of occupation. So severe was the repression and terror instituted to establish this alien power that

(Turn to last page)

Syngman Rhee's Insurance

The nature of the Syngman Rhee government of South Korea, behind which the U. S. has now entered the shooting war in the peninsula, is highlighted by some unstressed facts given among the dispatches coming from that area.

While the overwhelming probability, of course, is that the North Korean government-puppet of Russia was the immediate aggressor in the present situation, the U. S. itself has had no faith in the pacific policies of the Rhee regime, which has been deterred only by its own weakness from carrying out repeated threats to invade the North.

A UP dispatch reports: "Officials heading the State Department's civilian mission, which replaced the American military occupation, gave this reason for stripping the South Korean air force of any possible effective activation: 'President Syngman Rhee's men can't be trusted with bombers or fighters. They might fly northward over the parallel and start a war involving the United States.'" (N. Y. Post, June 27.)

A New York Times dispatch by correspondent Walter Sullivan mentioned in passing: "The warlike talk strangely has almost all come from South Korean leaders. In asserting that his government needed more heavy weapons, Dr. Rhee said at an Independence Day rally March 1 that the cries of distress from his countrymen in the North could not long be ignored. On a number of occasions Dr. Rhee has indicated that his army would have taken the offensive if Washington had given its consent." (June 26)

Hated by its own people and unable to rely on any political attractive force capable of rallying the people of North or South behind its cause, the Rhee government has been able to see only U. S. guns and bombers as an insurance of its own rule. This is the kind of government put forward by the U. S. as its alternative to the monstrous Stalinist totalitarianism.

By GORDON HASKELL

In response to the invasion of the U. S.-dominated South Korea by the Russian-dominated North Korean government, President Truman has ordered U. S. air and naval forces to jump into the shooting war. The cold war has blazed out into armed conflict for military control of a vital strategic key to the Asian continent between the Big Two in the imperialist struggle for the world.

In this war there is no question at stake of the right to unification or self-determination of the Korean people. The only issues at stake are: Shall the power of Stalin's totalitarian state extend itself over the whole of the Korean peninsula and subject to its rule the whole of the Korean people, or shall the United States government retain a strategic foothold in Korea as a bastion essential to its Japanese staging-area for World War III in Asia?

The policies of Russian and American imperialism which have led up to this war are discussed elsewhere in this issue of LABOR ACTION. The questions which face every American now are: What will be the probable consequences of the war? Is there anything we here in America can do to influence those consequences?

We, as Independent Socialists, are opposed to the extension of Stalinist control anywhere in the world. We have insisted over and over again that there are two ways by which Stalinism can be defeated as a world force. Either the common people will organize themselves to resist it, and will take the initiative of the resistance into their own hands—or American imperialism, along with its capitalist, reactionary and imperialist allies, will resist it with naked force with the result that the world will be plunged into the most horrible war in history.

In Korea the people were given no opportunity to organize themselves for resistance. Their country was divided by an inter-imperialist deal at Yalta over which they had no control. In each of the truncated areas reactionary police regimes were installed by the conquerors.

In the North the Stalinists installed a government in the image of the Russian government, or more precisely, in the image of the puppet governments ruled by the Russians. In the South the Americans brought to power the most reac-

(Turn to last page)

New York Public Meeting

War in Korea!

Speakers:

JACK BRAD

GORDON HASKELL

Friday, July 7—8 p. m.

LABOR ACTION HALL, 114 West 14th Street, 3rd Floor
Contribution 35 Cents

Switchmen Strike Another Blow at Railway Labor Act

By LARRY O'CONNOR

Five major Western and Mid-western railroads were tied up last week by a strike of the Switchmen's Union of North America (AFL).

Chief issue in the strike is a demand for the 40-hour week without a reduction in take-home pay. At the present time switchmen work 48 hours a week at straight-time pay.

This strike is part of the movement of railroad workers since the war to equalize their conditions with those which prevail in most other industries. In their last wage movement the non-operating crafts won the 40-hour week without reduction in take-home pay, and with a slight basic wage increase. Yet a presidential emergency board which was called to investigate the claims of the switchmen ruled that they are entitled to the 40-hour week but not to the same weekly take-home pay they are getting now.

Even with the full increase in pay demanded by the workers, daily pay for switchmen would be from \$12.21 to \$14.65; from \$10.71 to \$12.86 for switch-tenders; and from \$13.06 to \$15.67 for switch foremen or yard conductors.

RR ACT IN WAY

The Railway Labor Act, with its long and involved procedure, was hailed by both unions and employers as a model for other industries to follow. But since the war this "model" has proved obsolete. Twice in a row now major unions have rejected the proposals of fact-finding boards. In both cases the unions had been prevented from striking for over six months by the procedural complications of the Railway Labor Act, and then were forced to strike in the face of adverse recommendations.

The union now on strike represents only a small portion of the nation's switchmen. The rest are

represented by the Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen. They have served the same demands on the companies, and are also in the process of rejecting the same proposed settlement of the emergency board.

Most people in America do not realize that railroad workers were excluded from the provisions of the Wages and Hours Act which established the 40-hour basic week in most industries. Up through the war all classes of railroad workers worked up to 56 hours a week without overtime pay, though all but trainmen and engineers who work on a mileage basis received overtime for hours in excess of eight in any one day.

Railroad workers are excluded from the 40-hour week for the same reason that they never came under the Wagner Act and do not now come under the Taft-Hartley Act. Their organizations have so managed things that railroad workers are subject only to the special legislation covering collective bargaining of the Railway Labor Act, and special legislation covering old-age and unemployment benefits.

TWO UNIONS INVOLVED

It must be born in mind that switchmen do some of the hardest and most dangerous work on the railroad. Their work requires them to jump on and off moving cars in the dark and in all kinds of weather. They have to release couplings on moving equipment, work on moving cars and do other hazardous work.

Electrical Union Struggle Shows IUE-CIO Far in Lead over CP

The struggle for control over the workers in the electrical industry has been going on since last November, when the split took place between the CIO and the Stalinist-dominated United Electrical, Radio and Machine Workers (UE). Right after the divorce, the CIO chartered a new union, the International Union of ER & M Workers (IUE), and the battle was joined. It has been fought out all over the country in a series of NLRB elections to determine the allegiance of the workers.

Counting all elections held in which either the UE or IUE or both were participants, the results were:

	Elections	Won	Received
IUE-CIO	185	127,858	
UE	123	73,618	
All others	26	10,649	
No union	18	9,416	

In something over half the cases, the elections were straight-out duels between UE and IUE-CIO, with no other claimant in the field. In these cases, the results add up:

	Elections	Won	Received
IUE-CIO	100	104,281	
UE	63	61,084	

ISL PICNIC for European Workers' Relief

TIBBETTS BROOK PARK
Picnic Plot No. 2
SUNDAY, JULY 9

We've taken a large plot, so there'll be plenty of room to relax in. Bring your own food and cook it over the grill if you like. Rowing, baseball, and swimming for your enjoyment.

You can get there under your own steam, or you can meet a group at the Jerome Avenue station of the IRT (end of the line) at 11 a. m.

A collection will be taken to aid needy workers abroad.

MICHIGAN LABOR NOTES

Briggs UAW Wins New Gains; Mathews Slate Upset in Vote

By WALTER JASON

DETROIT, June 26—Despite the tension on both sides of the bargaining table over the outcome of the crucial Tiger-New York Yankee game last Friday night—time being taken out to listen to the score—the negotiations between Briggs and the United Auto Workers (CIO) were climaxed with another victory for the union.

The negotiators, headed by Emil Mazy, won a union shop, the checkoff, a five-cent hourly raise for all employees, a three-cent per hour health and insurance package, reduction of the wage differentials with out of town plants, and a \$100 a month pension plan.

Walter Briggs Jr. had only the consolation that the Tigers won that night and also took a three-out-of-four-game series with the Yanks.

The smashing victory of a somewhat dissident Reuther group over the slate backed by Norman Mathews in the runoff election at Chrysler Local 7 was the talk of UAW circles this past week.

Tony Cassara defeated incumbent Joe Hattley, by 3775 to 3170, for the presidency. The Cassara slate also took five other key spots in the runoffs by about the same margin.

End-Result of the "Compromise" on Academic Freedom—

U. of California Fires 157 Refusing To Sign 'Anti-Communist Oath'

The Board of Regents of the University of California has voted to fire 157 members of the university staff who refused to sign either a loyalty oath or a statement in their contracts that they "do not belong to the Communist Party or any other organization which advocates the overthrow of the government by force or violence."

This attitude was persisted in despite the fact that a large part of the academic world came out in strong condemnation of the whole loyalty oath procedure and offered support to the embattled professors. They persisted in their timidity despite the fact that the non-academic employees were willing to support the senate with a strike, if necessary, and despite widespread student support mobilized by progressive student organizations.

Now they are being hit with the consequences. The most courageous among them refused to sign any degrading oaths or contractual clauses, or to appear before any committees to "justify" their action. And even those who did appear and were given a clean bill of health, what is to save them now?

The compromises and delays have so exhausted and worn down and divided the potential opposition to the whole reactionary procedure that it is quite probable that at this late date the forces have been dissipated which could have been mobilized both against the infringement of academic freedom and against the reduction of the academic senate to an impotent creature of the regents.

RESULT OF COMPROMISE

At this writing, at least, it appears that the board has won hands down. If they proceed to discharge also those faculty members recommended for retention, they will simply be rubbing salt in the wounds of the vanquished.

This action by the regents is the final act in a long drama of tragic compromise. From the beginning it was clear that unless the battle was fought on the clear-cut basis of academic freedom, of the right of teachers to hold political and social beliefs without threat of dismissal, the battle would be frittered away and lost.

Yet only a minority of the faculty understood this or had the courage to act on their understanding. The majority were willing to accept the principle of ban-

ning faculty members because of political beliefs or associations, as long as the procedures involved were not too degrading to the dignity of the Academic Senate.

This attitude was persisted in despite the fact that a large part of the academic world came out in strong condemnation of the whole loyalty oath procedure and offered support to the embattled professors. They persisted in their timidity despite the fact that the non-academic employees were willing to support the senate with a strike, if necessary, and despite widespread student support mobilized by progressive student organizations.

OPPOSITION WORN DOWN

Now they are being hit with the consequences. The most courageous among them refused to sign any degrading oaths or contractual clauses, or to appear before any committees to "justify" their action. And even those who did appear and were given a clean bill of health, what is to save them now?

The compromises and delays have so exhausted and worn down and divided the potential opposition to the whole reactionary procedure that it is quite probable that at this late date the forces have been dissipated which could have been mobilized both against the infringement of academic freedom and against the reduction of the academic senate to an impotent creature of the regents.

When the final "compromise" had

IF YOU ARE—

- For socialist democracy
- Against Stalinism
- Against capitalism

YOU BELONG WITH THE

INDEPENDENT SOCIALIST LEAGUE

Write to the ISL
4 Court Square
Long Island City 1, N. Y.

been worked out between the senate and the regents, and when this was being widely hailed as a "victory" for academic freedom, LABOR ACTION ended its story on the fight at the University of California as follows: "That no FUNDAMENTAL or effective compromise has occurred will be evident, at the end of this semester as scores of members of the faculty—both Senate and non-Senate—will emigrate from the campuses of the university." (May 8, 1950.)

All we can add to that is: May the students and faculties of other institutions look and take heed!

New York
SOCIALIST YOUTH LEAGUE SUMMER SCHOOL
Six sessions. Every Tuesday night for six weeks
STARTING TUESDAY JUNE 27
THE THEORETICAL ROOTS OF MARXISM
7:30-9:00 p.m.
THE RUSSIAN REVOLUTION AND THE EUROPEAN REVOLUTION 1917-1923
Instructors: Max Shachtman and Hal Draper
9:00-10:30 p.m.
50 cents for each class or 10 cents for each session
at
LABOR ACTION HALL
114 West 14th Street, 3rd floor
New York City

American Labor Must Stop the Deal!

U.S. Preparing to Rescue Franco If He Relaxes Economic Controls

By WILEBALDO SOLANO
General Secretary, Spanish POU

The economic and financial difficulties of Franco Spain have been greatly aggravated in the course of the last few weeks. The general situation is becoming critical. The misery spreads into the industrial and commercial fields. Doubt and uncertainty are moving into the Falangist political spheres and into the center of government itself. [The Falange is the Francoist political organization.—Ed.]

The declarations of Minister of Commerce and Industry Suances before the Courts (May 3 session), the violent incidents arising in the between Suances and some of his colleagues, the declarations of Culbertson, American charge d'affaires, on the aspirations of Yankee capitalism in the domain of Spanish economy and the speech of Franco before the National Congress of Engineering—all reveal that we are on the eve of an important turning-point in Francoist economic policy.

What is occurring, in brief? The big international press has furnished us with contradictory stories of late. First, it has published as imminent the resignation of Suances, the man of "state-controlled economy" and the total reorganization of the government and of its economic policy. Later, basing itself on the last speech of Franco, it has announced a less radical change, more slow and moderate.

The Washington government—and needless to say, Wall Street—are favorably disposed towards important credits. Let us recall in this respect the famous letter of Dean Acheson to Senator Connally. But, without going too far afield, the significant words pronounced by Culbertson on May 16

in the North American Chamber of Commerce in Barcelona prove this fact to the hilt.

Just now, Washington—faithful to the practice of bilateral agreements signed with various European countries—will give no dollars to Franco except under certain conditions and with tangible guarantees. Culbertson has been particularly careful to make this clear without equivocation.

U. S. PRESSURE

Some time ago the well-known American magazine Newsweek wrote: "Today they (the United States) ask only that Spain liberalize the control of its industry. And that it give greater freedom of monetary exchange for United States imports." In his speech at Barcelona, Culbertson was more explicit. He asked for "the free and normal development of private enterprise and banking transactions, as well as other commercial activities. . . ." It was made to appear "that the Spanish government has increased the share of foreign investments in Spanish enterprises from 25-45 to 100 and ceded to foreign investments a more favorable role than exists in actuality." But, obviously, all this is not enough. The State Department representative in Madrid "expects other signs in this direction."

The speech of the Yankee charge d'affaires was made—it is worth repeating—May 16. Three days later the clamorous incidents we have referred to above were produced in the Council of Ministers. These incidents were commented on ironically by Culbertson at a banquet given by the Spanish Minister in Switzerland.

Two tendencies seem to emerge from the interior of the Franco government. Suances was deter-

mined upon the defending of the state-controlled economy by the regime and believes it is possible to continue obtaining credits "piecemeal" (the expression of the English magazine "The World Today," which has recently been concerned with the theme) without giving important guarantees. Other ministers, more closely allied to big private enterprise and to the Alto Banca (brokerage) favor a capitulation to the pressures of American capitalism.

Until May 19, Franco had held the Suances thesis. In the Council of Ministers held that day, the Caudillo withdrew into a prudent reserve. When this rapidly became known in Madrid, it caused the American press correspondents to predict the liquidation of Suances and of his economic policy.

Suances' position has neither declined nor has he been eliminated. Moreover, the decision to create a large iron mining center with large capital from the National Institute of Industry adopted by the Franco government and the defense of the control policy by Franco before the National Congress of Engineering, show that the tendency represented by Suances still continues, even if the conditions are ever more precarious.

THREE CONCLUSIONS

Everything points to the strengthening of the pressure of American capitalism. Also that state-controlled economy will beat a retreat. Already "El Economista" of Madrid is campaigning in favor of an open-door policy for North American capitalism. And Franco himself couples his defense of "state control of industry" with "appealing" words in which he refers to the reception which foreign capital will receive.

This permits us logically to es-

tablish a certain number of conclusions which carry their inevitable political lessons.

1. The danger that the reactionary Franco regime may be saved by American credits remains. It is perhaps more menacing than ever when one takes into account the many intrigues, maneuvers and pressures. It is therefore necessary to intensify the campaign against any economic aid to Franco, mainly in the ranks of the workers and liberals of the U. S. Passivity or excessive confidence are not justified and can have only dire results.

2. There are some in the anti-Franco camp—the bloc of least resistance—who reason thus: "The actual American pressures on Franco are healthy. Liquidation of Falangist economic control will lead to disintegration of the entire present political regime." This hypothesis, aside from being illusory, seriously compromises the future. American capitalism is interested in maintaining a reactionary regime in Spain. The establishment of new foreign economic interests in our country will raise a formidable barrier to the ultimate struggle for democratic rights, the Republic and socialism.

3. The crisis of the Falangist economic system which we witness, with all its derivations and consequences, can easily be transformed into a serious political crisis. The first manifestations have already appeared. It is necessary, then, to make an end to small and ineffectual pseudo-diplomatic gestures, to reconstruct the resistance and the anti-Franco emigration and to begin an authentic counter-offensive against the totalitarian tyranny.

In London, the Union of Post Office Workers demanded that the postmaster general revoke an ancient law prohibiting postmen from smoking while delivering the mail. The union declared that the postmen were often embarrassed at having to refuse cigarettes from smoking housewives.

Not in the Headlines

Out of His Own Mouth

At the May meeting in Budapest of the World Federation of Trade Unions, a statement by one Stalinist leader came closest to admitting that the workers' strike struggles in CP-led unions are conducted as auxiliaries of Russian foreign policy.

Saillant of France put it this way: "It is clear that our policy is in favor of every manifestation in every field and in every organization directed against the imperialism of the U. S. Monopolists and their satellites. Every struggle of the workers for their claims is inseparably attached to this more general struggle."

Pro-Union

The workers are still showing in overwhelming votes that they want unionization. The NLRB's latest report on elections held (for April) reveals that in 574 collective-bargaining votes, mostly among unorganized workers, 89.1 per cent of the 105,000 workers who balloted plumped for union representation.

In votes on the union shop, 97.3 per cent of the elections (496 out of 510) went in favor.

Demand

In London, the Union of Post Office Workers demanded that the postmaster general revoke an ancient law prohibiting postmen from smoking while delivering the mail. The union declared that the postmen were often embarrassed at having to refuse cigarettes from smoking housewives.

Ukrainian Organ Says Partisan Fight Must Be for Socialism

The anti-Stalinist underground behind the Iron Curtain can fight the Kremlin dictatorship only on the basis of a struggle for socialist democracy and by avoiding any orientation toward Western imperialism. This is the main conclusion of a theoretical article featured in the latest issue of the Ukrainian partisan organ, Vpered (Forward), just received in this country.

Vpered, which is published as the voice of the heroic UPA, the Ukrainian People's Army guerrillas, displays on its front cover an international montage of socialist periodicals which have been carrying news of its work. Many of the headlines and articles shown in the assemblage are from LABOR ACTION.

The lead article is by P. Poltava. Vpered summarizes its contents as follows, with regard to the present-day tasks of the underground fighters: "We shall unmask Stalinism as a reactionary, anti-humanitarian, imperialist force. We have to show that the oppressed peoples and exploited toilers can free themselves by way of revolution only. We have to prove that the classless society, with real freedom and social justice, can be constructed only on the basis of socialized property in the means of production and on the basis of real democracy.

"We have to prove that in our international politics we are against all kinds and colors of imperialism. We have to prove that the menace of Russian imperialism can be liquidated only by the division of the Russian empire into independent national republics. "Poltava further emphasizes the experience gained by the Ukrainian underground in its struggle for other peoples oppressed by Moscow, especially for the countries

of the 'people's democracies.' He says that a successful struggle against Stalinism is possible only from the standpoint of a program of real democracy, national liberation, and classless society based on socialization of the means of production. All those movements which, in their struggle against Stalinism, are based on restoration of capitalism and oriented on the intervention of anti-Stalinist imperialist powers, will inevitably fail because they will never find the support of the masses of their peoples. Such are the conclusions reached from the experiences of the Ukrainian revolutionary underground under Stalinism."

In another article in the same issue on "The Agrarian Problem of Our Epoch," by Iv. M-ko, the author stresses that "the restoration of small private agricultural enterprises in the USSR is impossible. The agricultural producer in the USSR does not want that. He struggles at present not for the land but for the ownership of the production of his labor. The anti-Stalinist revolution will take the kolkhozes away from the state and hand them to the producers, transforming them into cooperative socialized enterprises."

WEEK by WEEK...

LABOR ACTION screens and analyzes the week's news, discusses the current problems of labor and socialism. A sub is only \$2 a year!

The ISL Program in Brief

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

INTERESTED?

Get acquainted with the Independent Socialist League—

4 Court Square Long Island City 1 New York

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

I want to join the ISL.

Name

Address

City

State



Schools Closed Down for NAM Propaganda

A year ago, the NAM and the U. S. Chamber of Commerce announced a program of B-I-E days. The initials for Business-Industry-Education, and the plan was one for propagandizing teachers in favor of "free enterprise" and against the various pet hates of the NAM-ericans. How it works in practice has been told by a liberal Wisconsin paper, the Madison Capital-Times. It's been going on in cities and towns all over the country, including a "score of Wisconsin communities."

First of all, to further the program, the schools are closed down for the whole day or half day, releasing the teachers to the tender mercies of the capitalist propagandists. When George E. Watson, state superintendent of schools, was asked whether he would approve closing the schools for a Labor Union Day, he replied, "I will have to think that over." His thought processes were quicker on receipt of the scheme from the NAM.

With the kids' safely out of the way, the businessmen take the teachers on "personally conducted" tours through local industrial plants, followed by a "banquet in the evening, at which the teachers are fed and entertained by the local Chamber of Commerce or some other organization of business or industry."

At these banquets, the following themes predominate: High taxes are killing private initiative. The health-insurance program is socialism or communism. Government regulation is ruining America. Teachers should tell their pupils that freedom is being stifled by radical plans made in Washington. Etc., etc.

At one town, for example, 200 school teachers heard Carl N. Jacobs, corporation president and a director of the U. S. Chamber of Commerce, urge them to become propagandists for big business:

"You can inspire the youth of today to choose its form of society. The choice will, in large measure be determined by the kind of thinking you stimulate."

There hasn't been a clearer invitation to reactionary propaganda in the school since the post-war attacks on academic freedom for radical teachers started—attacks based on the cry that "we don't want propaganda in the schools" . . .

Invitation to Fraud

The comptroller general of the U. S., Lindsay Warren, watchdog over government expenditures, has charged that during the war Congress opened wide the sluice gates for widespread fraud and plain gyping by big business.

The army, navy and other agencies were busy signing contracts by the billions. Often the signing was done by big businessmen with temporary uniforms. In the midst of this orgy, their representatives in Congress popped up with a bill which directed the agencies to "settle" and pay their war contracts without any independent audit by Warren's office. The bill was passed, limiting the "watchdog" to a hasty search for the horse after it was stolen from the barn whose doors Congress had thrown wide open.

Warren now reports that a total of 323,933 contracts have been settled. Of these the General Accounting Office has been able to investigate only one out of twelve, and only after final payments were made. Even this "small sampling" revealed "excessive or fraudulent" payments in "more than one out of seven of those examined, with a loss to the government exceeding \$25 million." He said he "would hesitate to hazard a guess as to the full extent of fraud or over-payments."

Side Lines

Question: Which city in all the world has the highest average per capita income—\$1975? Answer: Los Alamos, New Mexico. The workers employed on atom-bomb production get the highest average wage in the U. S. . . .

The Standard Steel Spring Company has been running full-page ads in newspapers denouncing the government for making things tough for business. At the end of May the same company announced that it is putting into operation two large new plants. Some people still think that when big business yells with pain at Fair Deal policies, it means they're really being hurt. . . .

There's still an opinion around that the spread of monopoly can be voted out of the capitalist system (which inevitably breeds monopoly) by electing the right liberals to office. Symbolically, we now learn that that will have to be done on monopolized voting machines. The Federal Trade Commission has issued a complaint against the Automatic Voting Machine Corporation of Jamestown, N. Y., charging that it has sought to drive a competitor out of business by "disparaging false and misleading statements" and by "vexatious and groundless" lawsuits. . . .

LABOR ACTION
Independent Socialist Weekly

Vol. 14, No. 27 July 3, 1950

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

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

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

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

Reading from Left to Right

TITO'S THREAT TO STALIN'S EMPIRE, by Peter Meyer. (Commentary, June).

A competent over-all summary of the development of Titoism: most of the material will be familiar to readers of our press. Meyer's comments on the nature of Titoism will also be a welcome change from the swing among some radical elements to regard Titoism as the new socialist dispensation:

"In the annals of the Communist movement, one can find no opposition faction which has produced so little ideological expression as the Titoists. . . . Even after two years of open hostility, the issue remains the degree of relative autonomy, and the comparative financial and social status, of the two Communist bureaucracies. The Yugoslav revolt developed from that of agents who wanted to become junior partners to that of agents who now want to open their own shop. It is still the same kind of shop."

It would, however, be somewhat more accurate (and completely inclusive) to sum up Titoist ideological expressions as being limited to the field of the relations between Stalinist bureaucracies in different national states; but the more important point with which Meyer is justly concerned is the fact that in no way has Titoist ideology even touched the question of the characteristic features of Stalinism.

"Yugoslavia," he continues, "is today as totalitarian as it was in 1948. The 'voluntary' work brigades have been abolished, it is true [on the ground of inefficiency—Ed.] but forced labor in factories was introduced at the same time. The 'election reform' of January 1950 is pure window-dressing: it permits putting up inde-

pendent candidates if they can gather 100 endorsements in their district, but oppositional parties, press and agitation are still forbidden. The deputy who reported the bill to parliament was careful to stress that the Yugoslav government cannot be changed by elections because it was installed by a revolution. . . . Tito himself reiterated, in February 1950: 'Two programs cannot exist in our country . . .'

THE SEIZURE OF POWER IN CZECHOSLOVAKIA, by Paul E. Zinner. (Foreign Affairs, July)

Under the main title of "Marxism in Action," this article on the CP coup sheds no light on those aspects of the event which still remain most in the dark—the "action committees," CP control in the trade unions, etc. It does, however, present the thesis that the coup was precipitated by the fact that "by the beginning of 1948 it was apparent that the Party was losing ground. It could no longer count on the Social-Democrats to maintain the coalition by which the Communists controlled the National Assembly and the Cabinet. . . . Finally, the results of a preliminary secret poll which is said to have been taken indicated that Communist electoral support was decreasing. . . ."

Emphasis is laid by the author on the Social-Democratic Party convention shortly before the coup which voted out the pro-Stalinist leadership. This "overthrow of the [Social-Democratic] party leadership, so hard to accomplish in any Czechoslovak party, was a particularly significant warning that the mood of the electorate was changing."

WORLD POLITICS

Michael Scott's Defense of the South African People

IN FACE OF FEAR—MICHAEL SCOTT'S CHALLENGE TO SOUTH AFRICA, by Freda Troup. London: Faber & Faber.

Reviewed by Janet Wilson (Socialist Leader, May 20)

From time to time men and women of outstanding courage and integrity challenge the inequities of the existing order, often alone and independent of parties and party programmes.

Michael Scott, Anglican priest, erstwhile missionary, is one of these men. Since he returned to South Africa in 1943, and especially since the end of the war, Scott has fought most energetically against the reactionary racial and economic policies of the South African government.

Freda Troup has written the account of Scott's campaign in a book which is exceptional both for its careful use of first-hand information on particular aspects and conditions, and for its epic story of one man's unremitting fight for justice for those whose struggle he has made his own.

Whether or not one is in entire agreement with Scott, one can have nothing but admiration for his integrity, courage and dignity.

Michael Scott has lived amongst native people in Sophiatown and in Tobruk, two of the working class districts of Johannesburg. Over 100,000 people live in them and in other surrounding slums. They are factory workers for the most part; domestic workers, street-sweepers, the people upon whose daily work rests the whole life and prosperity of the city.

It is doubtful whether living and working conditions such as theirs can be paralleled in the history of the modern working class anywhere else in the world. Shanty "towns" consist of shacks built of sackcloth and pieces of tin, each on a plot perhaps twenty feet square.

Scott wrote of Tobruk, "There were no drains, no rubbish clearance, no water, no lights in the streets, no police supervision. While the people were for the most part orderly, murder, rape, thefts and assaults were committed with impunity. Lack of sanitation led to disease. When latrine ditches were full they were filled in and the shacks of sackcloth and wood were built on top of them."

WHITE PARTIES REFUSE SUPPORT

Infant mortality, a reliable indication of general living conditions, is nowhere in the Union of South Africa said to be less than 150 per thousand births among the Bantu. In 1941 in Johannesburg, it was 496.6 per 1,000, and it is supposed that it reaches the figures of 600 and 700 in some areas.

Education, social relief and legal justice are empty phrases when applied to the conditions of life under which the Bantu proletariat is forced to exist.

"Only one child in 600 receives an education beyond the primary school," and eight out of eleven Bantu children never go to school at all. Such education as does exist is of a very inferior standard.

The Labor Party is the party of the white workers. It has supported the most reactionary policies of segregation, as did the South African Com-

munist Party in the days of its "Popular Front." The latter organization played a leading part in the breakup of the All-African Convention which had begun as a strong militant association of the urban African workers against the Native Representation Act and subsequent laws depriving the Bantu of such constitutional and economic rights as they had been permitted to hold.

Eight million people of South Africa since 1940 have had seven representatives, none of whom are elected by themselves, and all of whom are Europeans, in the Union Parliament.

SUPER-EXPLOITATION

Outside the Union Area in Southwest Africa lie the Native Reserves. This part of Africa is divided into the Police Zone covering the temperate grasslands, and the more northerly Native Zones, where the land is less suitable for farming by white settlers.

The Police Zone, under South African administration since World War I, has been divided between 38,000 Europeans owning 80 million acres of land, and 139,000 native and colored peoples occupying 20 million acres.

Life on these Reserves in one of the most sparsely populated areas of Africa is determined by a policy which systematically destroys the pastoral life of the native inhabitants without offering any kind of economic security in return, much less any means of economic development.

The result is a continuous stream of labor to the farms and to industry (for instance the departure of some 3,000 each year to work in the Union gold mines). This is a position which is well to the liking of the profiteers, farmers, mine-owners and industrialists, whose wealth depends upon a cheap and plentiful supply of labor.

The minimum wage on the farms is 9 shillings a month, the maximum 15 shillings. There is no redress for ill-treatment, and deaths are not investigated. A state of helterly exists from which for the farm laborer there is no escape. His life is cheaper to the farmer than that of a single sheep.

The present political organization in Africa is such that minority groups among the whites as well as the majority of the population are in no position to voice their protests and desires.

The Malan administration of South Africa with its determined policies of racial segregation, annexation of territory and ruthless suppression of political opposition, will by June, have established yet more repressive legislation. Using anti-Communist legislation, and a Passports Bill the administration will silence groups and individuals who, like Scott, are out to "tell the world."

They Need Your Help!

Local New York of the ISL sends food and clothing packages to needy workers in Europe. You can help! Send your aid—especially clothing for school-age children—to the New York ISL, 114 West 14 Street, New York City 11.

South Africa Reaction and Racism Reaches Unprecedented New High

By HENRY JUDD

"We must adopt a system of despotism, such as works so well in India, in our relations with the barbarians of South Africa."
—CECIL RHODES

To find a more reactionary regime than that which exists in the Union of South Africa would require a vigorous search even in our world of notoriously reactionary regimes. The history of South Africa based upon the brutal conquest of the African peoples by white imperialism, is a shameful one indeed, and deserves wider recognition throughout the world.

It is not our intention to give here even a sketchy outline of South African imperialist history. For those interested, we refer to the excellent series of articles appearing in the August, September and October 1947 issue of *The New Internationalist* by Robert Stone. The reader will find here both the historic background and a penetrating study of white imperialism on the African continent which is well worth reading.

We are interested, however, in describing the series of acts and measures now being adopted by the South African Parliament whose aim it is to complete, both legally and in practice, the structure of one of the most profoundly revolting regimes known today. All the brutality, racial viciousness and reactionary social policy which the white rulers have stored up in over a hundred years of imperialism are summed up in the measures now before Parliament (some already adopted) which are intended to codify the policy of Smuts, Herzog and the other Herrenvolk dictators of that oppressed nation.

As the Non-European Unity Movement, a united-front organization of many peoples, has expressed it, it would be impossible to "grade the Nazi-like laws of South Africa according to their degree of oppression and brutality." Known severally as the "Immorality Act, the National Registration Bill, the Group Areas Bill and the Unlawful Organizations Bill," their total effect is to set up a regime unequalled in its social tyranny and reactionary essence. Their purpose is to humiliate and degrade all the non-European sections of the population, regimentering and controlling their lives and halting their development.

Jim Crow plus Hitler plus Czar

As Robert Stone proved in his series of articles referred to, the white rulers of South Africa fear any kind of social or political progress, including even the nation's industrial development, since they fear above all to create the conditions for the downfall of their slave regime.

By non-Europeans in South Africa is meant the native African population (6,500,000) consisting of the numerous tribal peoples of the country; those referred to as "colored" peoples, who are the product of intermarriage, and the quarter of a million Indians who migrated from India many years ago. This is the overwhelming portion of the population, since the European whites are in a minority of about 10 per cent of the total population.

The series of measures indicated, in a word, aim at the total subjection of 90 per cent of the people by the white minority. As a forerunner of their intent, the white rulers have already created separate ticket offices for "Europeans" and "non-Europeans," together with separate post offices, railway station platforms and other Jim Crow measures clearly paralleled after the system in the American Southern states. But this is only a beginning, as we shall see in examining the various bills.

The National Registration Bill requires that all individuals in South Africa carry passes. Behind the cynicism that even (!) whites will be obliged to carry passes (the white women's clubs of Cape town have heroically volunteered their willingness to carry passes), a system of internal passports, characteristic of all totalitarian and reactionary governments, is to be instituted. Of course, African natives have been compelled to carry such passes for many years; the measure is intended to strengthen the structure of still more vicious and brutal laws.

Crowning the structure, and at the heart of the system, is the Group Areas (Segregation) Bill. Picture a mixture of Czarist Russia's ghetto segregation policy against the Russian and Polish Jews; British colonial policy in pre-war India and throughout its empire; Hitler's Nuremberg-law racial policy against the "non-Aryans"; and America's Jim Crow system—we say, picture all this combined, refined and reinforced by one of the world's most brutal police forces, and you have the glimmering of an idea of what the South African Herrenvolk propose.

This is their policy of apartheid (segregation), now being rushed through the Parliament. According to its terms, each racial group in the Union is to be confined to a particular ghetto set aside in city, town and countryside by the government. The ghetto breakdown is fantastic, since it is not confined to the larger racial groups but has sub-divisions whose refinement would astonish even Goebbels: Colored (half-castes); Malayan, Indian, Zulu, Xosa and the various tribal groups of South Africa.

Both Parties Give Support

No one may live in any ghetto but his own. No one may hold property in any one of the areas set aside for the Whites (we cannot call their areas ghettos). A non-European holding such property today cannot pass it on to his family upon death.

A concession in the ghetto system has been made—to the whites. We quote from *The Torch*, a Non-European Unity Movement publication. "European teachers teach in non-European schools; European doctors depend a lot on non-European patients; chemists are mainly White, etc. It would be too much to expect these professional classes to travel miles and miles every day from a White area to a Black ghetto. They will thus be allowed to live in a Black Ghetto, if they choose." And this is racial "democracy" at its handsomest!

A whole series of other enforcement measures and details are embodied in the *Apartheid Bill*, intended to set up a network of ghettos throughout the land. So sweeping is the measure that it is clear we are only at the beginning of something, not its consummation. A measure

What Is INDEPENDENT SOCIALISM?

For information and literature about the Independent Socialist League, write: ISL, 4 Court Square, Long Island City 1, N. Y.

The South African "Anti-Communist" Bill Will:

Declare unlawful, by proclamation, Communist "and certain other" organizations.

Restrict the freedom of persons and publications. Take care of the property of an unlawful organization by appointing a liquidator.

Impose a prison sentence of five years, without the option of a fine, for breaking of this law.

Deport any non-South African who breaks the law. Define an unlawful organization as one whose purpose it is to bring about any political, industrial, social or economic change within the Union by the promotion of disturbance or disorder.

Prepare a Black List of all office-bearers, officers or members or active supporters of the organization which has been declared unlawful. Their letters may be grabbed by the Minister of Justice. The Liquidator will prepare the Black List for Minister Swart.

Prohibit the holding of meetings which may further the purposes proscribed by it.

Ban a person for any period from any area, or order him to leave that area, even if it is his place of residence.

Prohibit any newspaper or pamphlet that: Spreads Communism; Is the mouthpiece, or under the guidance, of an unlawful organization; Spreads information that can bring about political, industrial, or economic change by disturbance or disorder.

Allow Police or the Liquidator to enter premises without prior notice.

Prohibit a person from holding any public office if he belongs, or belonged, to an unlawful organization, or was prosecuted under this Act.

of such scope will require a vast framework for reinforcement; to dam up a ghetto has always been the most difficult task for a reactionary ruling class and the *Herrenvolk* of South Africa will learn this.

Part and parcel of the system now in the making is the anti-Communist Bill, details of which are boxed on this page. It is important to note that, in effect, it is directed against any and all political organizations or movements which might, in the minutest degree, challenge the *Herrenvolk* system. It matches the notorious Japanese "dangerous thought" laws.

Both rival capitalist parties of South Africa, the United Party of Smuts and the government Nationalist Party, support this measure. In fact, the so-called opposition party of Smuts (UP) supports, in principle, all the bills although disagreeing on certain aspects such as give the government in power the right to rule by decree. After all, Smuts has created the system which his political rivals now desire to bring to its logical conclusion.

The opposition to this infamy is widespread and organized, but does not find its way into the world press since the various united non-European movements largely practise a policy of boycotting the racially organized parliamentary bodies of the country. It is inevitable that the *Apartheid* system must create overpowering opposition, and crumble to earth along with its white masters. The whites themselves will find they cannot live long in such a system, which will breed a hatred and an atmosphere which will stifle them.

The ghettos will only conceal one of the tensest and most explosive areas of the world; an area where millions of African workers and farmers, together with Indians and people of all colors, may be forced into a temporary misery, but whose liberation is assured. Speed the day when the super-Nazi racial state of white South Africa is destroyed by its mass victims!

Readers Take the Floor . . .

Saboteur at Work

To the Editor:

My attention has been called to a derogatory remark against the New York Giants appearing in my LABOR ACTION column of June 5, 1950, to the effect that they're not in the race for the National League pennant.

I hereby formally disown, disclaim and denounce said remark, whose appearance in the article is a mystery to me. It certainly never appeared in my original copy!

As for the culprit who sneaked it in, a glance at the sports pages will show him, the cur, that the Giants are very much in the pennant race.

Henry JUDD

The editor, the editorial board, cur linotyper, proofreader, and all other persons concerned join with Comrade Judd in expressing dismay and consternation over this unfortunate contretemps. A full-scale investigation is now proceeding to unearth the malefactor or malefactors, who will be mercilessly exposed to public indignation, whether he, she or they be gremlins or Dodger sympathizers.

—Ed.

Note

To a reader who did not sign his name (explaining he is a government worker) and who wrote us regarding the story in our January 2, 1950 issue headed "I Am a Partisan," enclosing a letter from a European friend:

The story was not about the "alleged anti-Communist fervor" of "the inmates of the Ganhof settlement of Regensburg, Germany." This settlement is mentioned only as the place where the interview with the Ukrainian Partisan courier took place and where her comrades met her. Recheck the story.

N.B.: We do not print anonymous letters, though we do hold signatures confidential as requested.—Ed.

It is the policy of LABOR ACTION to encourage our readers to write in their comments and criticisms, pro and con, on articles in the paper. We'd like you to keep them down to 500 words. Letters must be signed, but names will be withheld on request.

Stalin as Philologist

The Boss Himself Steps In to Cover Up Crude Revelation of Russian Chauvinism

By HAL DRAPER

Stalin has just made one of his rare public appearances in print. To the disconcertment of the press, in the midst of burning world problems it turned out to be on the subject of—philology.

Naturally speculation has turned to an inquiry into what deviant relation the Stalin pronouncement on the science of language has to current problems. Or is it just one of those mysterious and unfathomable products of "Asiatic" mumbo-jumbo which the "Western mind" can not hope to understand? The latter "explanation" is the easy retreat from the attempt to understand anything about Russia which is all the more palatable to American commentators since it flatters their prejudices.

In reality, the political relevance of the new Stalin decree on philology is easy enough to understand on the background of some recent developments. Its exact import must be more speculative, but we are willing to advance an educated guess.

Stalin directed his statement, in form, against theories supposedly put forward (more than a couple of decades ago) by a Russian philologist, N. Y. Marr. Marr is represented as teaching that all languages are strictly class languages and that different classes of the same nation necessarily speak "different" languages. Displaying the brilliant dialectic powers for which he is noted, Stalin calls his scientists' attention to the fact (presumably overlooked by them till now) that in actuality workers and rulers speak the same language, and that languages are not simply class reflexes.

So far the thing sounds like an excerpt from Lewis Carroll.

The Real Butt

Did Marr really put forward the ridiculous theories ascribed to him and so easily knocked down by the Genial Corypheus of Science? This writer pretends to no knowledge at all about Marr or his views. We are going to make the point, in fact, that poor Marr has been dragged in only as a stalking horse and that it is not his views that Stalin is exercised over. But if only parenthetically, it should be added that Stalin's version of his theories bears more resemblance to the mentality of the live dictator than of the dead scientist.

For one does not have to go to Marr, rightly or wrongly, in order to find the theories about which Stalin is speaking most certainly. They were not put forward decades ago but only last year. And not by Marr but by one of the most prominent hack journalists of the Kremlin's stable, D. Zaslavsky.

Writing in the Literaturnaya Gazeta of January 1, 1949, Zaslavsky, a well-known mouthpiece for the Politburo, launched the new year with an article entitled "The Great Language of Our Era," in which the scientific discovery is announced that the Russian language is the

language of socialism. Since brief summaries of his article might tend to sound like Lewis Carroll again, we quote his thesis:

"The replacement of one world language by another has occurred time and again throughout the thousands of years of the history of mankind. The Latin language was the language of the ancient world and the Middle Ages. The French language was the language of the ruling class of the feudal epoch. It was maintained for a long time together with feudal traditions and customs in international diplomatic circles. The English language became, the language of world capitalism." And then: "Looking at the future on New Year's Day, we see the Russian language as the world language of socialism."

Zaslavsky actually writes: "The English language corrupted people in Asia and Africa. It created the repulsive profession of compradores..."

More of this "class analysis": "All previous world languages," he writes, "were cosmopolitan languages. They created an international community of ruling classes, but always at the expense of the popular, national tongues. The languages of feudal and capitalist cosmopolitanism..."

But at this combination of the words "feudal" and "cosmopolitanism," the reader may already have his fill, and so we add only that Zaslavsky's conclusion is that Russian is today "the foremost world language of internationalism."

In the Czar's Path

Few people had any doubt about the political meaning of this philological dissertation by the Kremlin's mouthpiece. Besides, its meaning was acted out. In every one of the satellite states a fierce campaign got under way to make Russian the language of the satellites, in fact as well as in Zaslavskian-Stalinist theory.

In all except the theoretical rationalization, the drive was an old story for most of the satellites. Linguistic Russification had been a standing method of imperialist domination by the czars. The branch agents of the Kremlin in the Eastern European capitals proceeded to execute the line. Czech Minister Kopecky stated: "The Russian language, that is the language of our better future." In Rumania, Hungary and down the line, the pressure was put on to force students, for example, to elect Russian for study rather than French or English.

But if linguistic Russification had always been a means of imperialist oppression by the czars, it had by the same token always been a center of nationalist resistance by the people. It is not more important, to be sure, than Russian exploitation of a satellite's economic life—but how many people can see that going on before their eyes? One's language, however—that is what one speaks every day; there are few things more intimately bound up with the most elemental feel of nationality!

The Yugoslav Titoists took up the issue. It is of course made to order for them: this is an aspect of Stalinist policy which is by its very nature peculiar to Russian Stalinism and its imperialism. The national-Stalinists of the Tito camp could (and did) let loose with both barrels, while remaining thoroughly within the confines of their own Stalinist ideology. (This is, naturally, what limits the issues which the Titoists can and do use against Moscow, outside of the demagogic declamations in favor of "democracy" which they share fully with their Russian cousins.)

The Titoists (and anti-Stalinists, for that matter) could here point not only to oppressive acts of Russification and chauvinism on the part of the Kremlin—and try with greater or lesser success to prove them—but they could show the imperialist-chauvinist ideology of Moscow written down on paper, rather crudely at that.

Image of the Benevolent Master

We have before us, as we write, a special pamphlet recently issued by the Belgrade propaganda department, important enough to be translated into English by the Yugoslav agency in this country—among the first they have put out. It is "The Russian Language and Great Russian Chauvinism," by Professor Radovan Lelic of the University of Belgrade. The science of philology seems to be not without importance in the Moscow-Titoist propaganda battle! It is in fact, as it was under the czars, both a practical issue and a potent symbol of nationalist resistance to Russian imperialism.

What of Stalin's venture into the field of philology, then? It would appear that Stalin is repudiating Zaslavsky (under the pseudonym of Marr). Or rather: Stalin is repudiating Zaslavsky's theorizing. The two are not the same: neither Zaslavsky nor the Russification drive is necessarily due for liquidation.

But one of the crudest expressions of Russian chauvinism is no longer "on the books," available for quotation by the enemy. Has not the great Stalin himself spoken out against these "mistakes"? What are you complaining about now? And does not this show that Father Stalin is really watching vigilantly over his children? The image of the benevolent Master as against the erring or brutal servants (if only the misdeeds of the underlings can be brought to his notice) is a gambit well known to the czars. This is indeed why the philological decree appeared under the name of Stalin himself, who does not deign to speak on other matters.

Meanwhile the Russification drive will go on, more or less brutal, more or less subtle, in accordance with the necessity. It did not need the Jabberwocky theory to get started in the first place, and it can do without any theory at all, except the basic one that Russia is the motherland of socialism.

American 'Bad Neighbor' Policy Provokes Reactionary Wave in Latin American States

By JUAN REY

LIMA, Peru, June—In one of my earlier articles I wrote that the situation in Bolivia was poised between military dictatorship and a popular uprising. Subsequent events have brought about a solution. The general strike decreed by the workers' coordinating committee, which represents almost the entire labor movement, has been broken by military force. The arrest of the union leaders and their removal to Coati Island in Lake Titicaca provoked a demonstration of students and strikers which was dissolved by force. A few

groups of demonstrators resorted to arms, giving the army the pretext for bombarding the workers' quarters with heavy artillery and resulting in several hundred dead and wounded.

The workers' cause was lost through the armed intervention of the Stalinist and nationalist groups thereby furnishing an excuse for reprisals. The general strike ended with the defeat of the proletariat. The government took advantage of the situation by issuing a decree permitting it to intervene in union affairs by submitting the elected union lead-

ership to its approval. No "communist or Nazi-fascist element" can be a union leader. This decree gives rise to official abuse and points to the end of union independence.

But the defeat of the working class and the Pyrrhic victory of the government has so exacerbated the situation of the latter that there was talk of a military junta and the cabinet crisis is already a fact. With the economic disruption of the country, thanks to the momentary devaluation dictated by the mining magnates and their "Yankee" advisers, Bolivia lives in a state of "permanent revolution," in a climate of conspiracies and preparations for armed struggle.

The government party has exhausted the rickety "democracy" and only the support of the army maintains control. Reaction is on the march; the right wing which fomented a revolution against the nationalist regime of Villarroel has ended in a military dictatorship.

REVOLT IN PERU

The events in Arequipa, Peru, where a popular insurrection attempted to overthrow the dictatorial regime of General Odría, has much in common with the Bolivian general strike. The Peruvian totalitarian regime is on the eve of its very singular elections, which would give a legal

mask to the Odría government. In these "elections," there will be only one candidate, that of Odría.

The economic crisis which Peru is undergoing and the cynicism of the dictator provoked the popular insurrection in Arequipa, a spontaneous and popular uprising which was crushed with machine guns and artillery as a "Communist conspiracy." The president of the government junta, Mostago, a recognized Peruvian politician, was taken prisoner, as were the other members of the insurrectional government.

The insurrection has demonstrated the weakness and decomposition of the APRA, the party of Haya de la Torre, which had had great ascendancy among the populace. It has likewise proved that the Odría regime is far from being firmly consolidated.

"BAD NEIGHBOR" POLICY

The fundamental reason for these convulsions in the South American countries is the economic crisis, rendered more profound by the "bad neighbor" policies of the American monopolies.

During the war the United States raised the "good neighbor" theme which consisted primarily in the exclusive acquisition of South American raw materials (Bolivian rubber and tin, Chilean minerals and saltpeter, Brazilian, Colombian, and Cuban coffee, su-

gar and other products and Venezuelan petroleum).

Now that the American monopolies no longer require these articles so urgently, they follow the "bad neighbor" policy of lowering the prices of South American raw materials, devaluing their currencies and raising the prices of North American industrial commodities. The lowering of Bolivian tin and rubber, the import duties on copper, the projected lowering of coffee—all fundamentally affect the economy of the Latin American "good neighbors," who are reduced to the role of a Negro slave who, when his task is finished, receives a blow.

Such a policy, promulgated and defended by the "liberal" Mr. Miller, provokes the reactionary wave in South America along with the growth of an anti-Yankee sentiment which is exploited by Peronism and Stalinism. The U. S. workers should oppose such a policy and resist the reaction-ary offensive of the Yankee monopolies which bury political democracy in South America and weaken the native workers' movement.

Read THE NEW INTERNATIONAL

THE BRITISH POLITICAL SCENE IS PORTRAYED EACH WEEK — IN — THE SOCIALIST LEADER Britain's Foremost Weekly Yearly Subscription—Three Dollars Shorter Periods Pro Rata Order from: SOCIALIST LEADER 318 Regents Park Road Finchley, London, N. 3, England

CP's Bureaucratic Regime Eases FBI's Job

They Can't Tell a Stoolpigeon from a Hack...

By DANIEL WELSH

The main problem of the Communist Party in the face of the intensified campaign against it has been, of course, how to combat the isolation which the general political situation is imposing on its membership. It finds itself more and more isolated from the non-Stalinist, neo-Stalinist and pseudo-Stalinist circles which once provided it with a broad and useful arena within which to work.

But the anti-CP campaign has not stopped at this, and makes itself felt within the party apparatus itself. The deportations, firings, contempt convictions, etc. have resulted in the loss or removal of numerous cadre elements in the ranks and leadership. And incompetent and politically illiterate as the American Stalinist leadership may appear to be, the CP has a serious problem in renewing and replacing these elements. It does not have an inexhaustible supply of trustworthy and reliable members who can be promoted to leadership positions.

Not the least of this problem, from the CP's standpoint, is how to prevent the infiltration of government agents into the top committees of the party. This possibility has become very real since there began the large-scale trek of government agents onto the witness stand after they had worked within the party for many years. Reporting to the recent CP plenum, Gill Green described the case of John Lautner, an exposed agent who had been head of the National Review Commission (the party's internal GPU), and as such had protected other government agents who were under suspicion. Another leading member of the Cleveland organization had been a star sub-getter by paying for subscriptions with FBI funds. During the recent trial of the Stalinist leaders, many aspects of the defense strategy were made known to the FBI through another agent who worked in the defense office.

and then testified in court against the defendants. And Pittsburgh and other places have recently been seriously damaged by the exposures made by individual agents who made public the entire membership of the local organization.

HACK OR STOOL The CP's dilemma in this situation is really pitiful, for from Green's discussion it is clear that it has no real means of combating the penetration of police agents. Its special problem flows from the party's monolithic-bureaucratic structure, and its pro-Russian orientation.

Agents are rarely exposed and discovered only with difficulty. Sometimes they are merely sincere American patriots, whom the CP cannot expect to convince that it is anything else but an arm of the Russian government. Thus such agents do not reveal themselves voluntarily, as sometimes has happened in socialist organizations.

More important, it is easy for any agent to rise rapidly in the CP because of the latter's primary emphasis on "irreconcilable opposition to all deviations from Marxism-Leninism (read: Stalinism) in setting down qualifications for leadership." Green describes what this means in the case of a stoolpigeon. This type of person, Green says, "always keeps quiet on ideological questions. He always acts as the 'good' comrade. HE ALWAYS SUPPORTS ALL POLICIES. He dares not participate in ideological discussions for fear of self exposure." (Our emphasis.)

Thus, since an agent finds it easy to act like a perfect Stalinist hack, there is no way really to test his loyalty to ideas, devotion to

principle, or theoretical development. What a revealing picture!

LINE IS STIFFENING

Another problem, which again originates externally but has internal repercussions, is a consequence of the Tito split. While there are no indications of any widespread excitement or dissent from the official characterization of Tito as a "fascist," there is, apparently a tendency to take a "soft" approach toward the neo-Stalinist fellow travelers in the Progressive Party and the nationally oriented organizations. There has been resistance to the idea that the party should isolate itself any further by sharpening relations with some of the CP's few remaining allies.

It was this tendency which resulted in the CP forces at the last Progressive Party convention making substantial concessions to Wallace. This resulted in the foreign-policy resolution which made concessions to Wallace in the direction of a "plague on both your houses" approach. The party leadership feels today that it made a "mistake" in allowing a unanimous vote for this resolution in spite of what it describes as "the very difficult situation there, flowing from some basic weaknesses in our united front work from below."

What is meant is that, at the time, the party was afraid that if it openly showed its strength and imposed its own line, Wallace might choose the opportunity to flounce out of the organization, taking the rest of the non-Stalinist elements with him.

The Tito question has caused a number of fellow travelers to

lines than a historic five-year contract with the union fettering its members for the next half decade? Being in the driver's seat, the company decided to remain there, and will for the next five years, Clause 117 notwithstanding.

The union salvages a one-penny increase annually on "improved productivity." (The increase was four cents a year—Ed.) It might be interesting in passing to note that when this clause was originally submitted in 1948 the union scoffingly remarked: "Unsound and unwise the assumption that workers can expect no more than to remain on the economic treadmill, inching up three cents an hour per year, while management and stockholders reap profits proportionately far in excess of that amount." They rightly called it "the trickledown theory of prosperity." What they scornfully alluded to in '48, they warmly embraced in '50. After all, didn't they increase it by one cent per annum, which evidently more nearly corresponds with what the management and stockholders reap annually? Jason echoes Walter Reuther when he wishes the workers to believe that they are the benefactors of such largesse.

It takes Jason all the way to his final paragraph to negate that which he so assiduously built up in the preceding score—his estimate of "victory." In it he says: "The only qualifying factors—and they are hardly inconsequential—are the doubts that auto production and employment will remain at their present high level for five years. A more accurate appraisal would begin with the statement: If our workers continue to keep their jobs, if model changeovers don't cause too much unemployment, if business keeps up, the package will total perhaps a bil-

The Wooden Medal

Labor, the railroad unions' weekly, says that Casey Jones—the central figure of the most famous railroaders' ballad—was NOT a scab. Anyway, not John Luther (Casey) Jones, who was piloting an Illinois Central train and not a scab SP locomotive when he plowed into badly side-tracked cars in Mississippi.

On the occasion of the issuance of a special postage stamp to honor Casey Jones and locomotive engineers in general, President Robertson of the Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Engineers added the news that Casey was a paid-up member of the union and his widow collected union insurance on his death.

So the Casey Jones who "didn't strike at all" when "the workers on the SP line to strike sent out a call" wasn't John Luther.

Books Received

Received from the New American Library, publishers of Mentor and Signet pocket books, published June 28:

THE OREGON TRAIL, by Francis Parkman. A reprint of the famous classic of the trek to the West. A Mentor book, 256 pages, 35 cents.

THE LOVE-MAKING OF MAX ROBERT, by Robert Shaplen. A Signet book, 192 pages, 25 cents.

HEALTHY BABIES ARE HAPPY BABIES, by Drs. J. Kenyon and Ruth Russell. A Signet book, 240 pages, 25 cents.

NATIVE SON, by Richard Wright. A Signet book. Reprint of the great novel of Negro life in America. 416 pages, 35 cents.

HOW TO KNOW AND ENJOY NEW YORK, by Carl Maas. A Mentor guide, 160 pages, 35 cents.

lion dollars in five years."

Jason's three "ifs"—how they dull the luster of a newly won victory! First you have it, now you don't. What kind of an appraisal is this? Either the company or the union won a victory; he can't have it both ways. This sounds so much like the current NAM manufactured canards about everyone prospering when capital prospers, and labor and management being buddies as to be embarrassing.

What Jason evidently means is that insofar as was possible, the union without resorting to an economically catastrophic strike managed to bridle its workers' demands with a two and a half times more vicious contract than was their misfortune to "gain" previously. When the plutocratic press, as typified by the New York Times, and spokesmen of the company spout ecstasies concerning their victory, it is dubious whether the union has the right to exult in its own victory. The union, yes, with their fingers in the pension fund, will create even more sinecures for their bureaucracy to further tighten its reins on the workers. Its tacit acceptance with the confidence of the company that it will for five years maintain discipline over its members is indeed something to exult over.

If, by this presentation, Jason wished to show how futile it is to struggle for the right to earn a living under the current labor-management setup, he did a masterful job. In spite of his avowals, of union triumphancy, he pointed a despairing picture of what his unions are capable of doing to its members.

Norman JOHNSTONE

The LA article referred to no-

where "admits that GM was in control of the situation and dictated its terms to the union." Our correspondent is perhaps misparaphrasing the statement that "THE INITIATIVE was clearly in GM's hands in this situation." The preceding passage had pointed out why indeed GM could NOT dictate its terms.

We have also pointed out what GM and the "plutocratic press" are in "ecstasies" about, with regard to the contract—the five-year term and the "labor stability" it promises. They are not in ecstasies about the gains made by the union. As we have noted, for example, Business Week magazine points to this contract as stimulating new wage demands by other unions.

It is this double-barreled impact of the contract that, in our opinion, correspondent Johnstone does not understand. The black-and-white light in which he views it makes for simpler thinking and rather vigorous language but does not at all reflect any reality.

This is shown in his references to "muscular gains" and the fobbing-off reference to the actual state of mind of the UAW workers with regard to strike and his complete ignoring of what has happened since 1948 when the UAW held out for more than "inching up three cents an hour per year."

We have concentrated our own criticism of the contract on the feature which merits it: the five-year term. Our correspondent lays his emphasis on attacking it as representing no gains at all of any significance whatsoever—just "two-and-a-half times more vicious" than previously! It is this kind of approach which recalls Jason's remark: "Not the least of Reuther's assets are still most of his critics."—Ed.

where "admits that GM was in control of the situation and dictated its terms to the union." Our correspondent is perhaps misparaphrasing the statement that "THE INITIATIVE was clearly in GM's hands in this situation." The preceding passage had pointed out why indeed GM could NOT dictate its terms.

We have also pointed out what GM and the "plutocratic press" are in "ecstasies" about, with regard to the contract—the five-year term and the "labor stability" it promises. They are not in ecstasies about the gains made by the union. As we have noted, for example, Business Week magazine points to this contract as stimulating new wage demands by other unions.

It is this double-barreled impact of the contract that, in our opinion, correspondent Johnstone does not understand. The black-and-white light in which he views it makes for simpler thinking and rather vigorous language but does not at all reflect any reality.

This is shown in his references to "muscular gains" and the fobbing-off reference to the actual state of mind of the UAW workers with regard to strike and his complete ignoring of what has happened since 1948 when the UAW held out for more than "inching up three cents an hour per year."

We have concentrated our own criticism of the contract on the feature which merits it: the five-year term. Our correspondent lays his emphasis on attacking it as representing no gains at all of any significance whatsoever—just "two-and-a-half times more vicious" than previously! It is this kind of approach which recalls Jason's remark: "Not the least of Reuther's assets are still most of his critics."—Ed.

Norman JOHNSTONE

The LA article referred to no-

The Only War Aim in Korea --

(Continued from page 1)

tionary section of the native ruling class and kept it there through sheer force of subsidies and arms.

Thus when Stalin's government decided that the time was ripe to seize all of Korea, there was no organized force in the South which could develop any kind of effective resistance. Every consistent democrat—let alone every socialist—in the world should and must condemn the ruthless invasion. But no real democrat and certainly no socialist could find any force in South Korea to support in resistance to the invasion. What democratic and socialist forces once existed there have been driven by the reactionary government into the arms of Stalinism, into prison, into the grave or into a precarious semi-legal existence.

As a matter of fact, even the American government could find no one to oppose the invasion with anything but token resistance. Its puppet government, completely divorced from and ardently hated by all strata of the population, could put up no effective fight despite the fact that it had an army trained, equipped and officered by Americans. The soldiers simply refused to lay down their lives in a cause which they knew was not theirs.

Thus the United States has been forced to replace the government of Southern Korea in the war. In doing so it has laid bare the purely imperialist character of the conflict.

BASED ON REACTION

In proclaiming the new military policy for Asia, the Truman administration is taking one more step in a course which can only have the effect of hopelessly compromising it in the eyes of the peoples of that vast continent. In this respect, Stalin will gain much, though in all probability he will not gain the strategic control of the Korean peninsula.

In one country after another American policy has been forced to base itself on reactionary governments which enjoy little or no popular support. All peoples of Asia are engaged in throwing off the yoke of Western imperialism. And everywhere the revolutionary process involved raises, in addition to the demand for political independence, the social and economic demands of the masses against the ruling classes.

But the United States is engaged in a conflict for world supremacy with Russia. Everywhere it seeks social stability as a basis for its military policy. And in seeking this stability, it tends naturally to bolster the existing ruling groups and to oppose any changes in the political and economic relationships in the Asiatic countries.

But in Asia there can be no stability under the status quo. The exploitation and oppression of the peoples, whether at the hands of foreigners or of tiny reactionary native ruling classes, drives them to revolt. More and more, as time goes by, the masses of Asia come to regard the American government and its armed forces as the chief prop of governments which they want to abolish.

GRIST TO CP MILL

Now the United States has openly replaced one such government with its own air force and

navy. It is most unlikely that the American government will once more withdraw its forces from Korea. It has proclaimed its intention of actively intervening to keep the hated French power in Indo-China. It has proclaimed Formosa a military base which it will protect with its navy.

The ruling classes in these and other countries, beset by the twin dangers of Stalinist expansion from China and social revolution within their own countries, will be greatly heartened by the action of the Truman administration. The most reactionary governments will conclude that, regardless of how they mismanage their own affairs, the American air force and navy will effectively intervene to protect them from either of the dangers.

But this will all be grist to the Stalinist propaganda mill throughout Asia. Playing on the misery and poverty of the peoples, they will point out with devastating effect that the United States has already once superseded a reactionary government with its armed forces, and that it will not hesitate to do so again.

They will point out that while Stalinism offers support against the ancient and long-known oppressors, both foreign and domestic, the Americans retain these oppressors in power; or if that cannot be managed, they take the power which is falling from rotting fingers into their own mailed imperialist fist.

Thus a U. S. victory in the war in Korea is not and cannot be a victory for the Korean people or for democracy. It can be a victory for American military power and an aid to the propaganda power of Stalinism at the same time.

DISASTER FOR THE PEOPLE

From the above one other consequence follows. The military victory will in all likelihood reinforce the conviction of the American government and its supporters at home and abroad that Stalinism can be effectively defeated only by purely military containment.

It is quite probable that in the face of determined American military resistance the Stalinists will

either pull their forces back behind the 38th parallel, or will simply leave them to fend for themselves as best they can. This must have figured in Stalin's calculations as one possible consequence of his military adventure. The cold-blooded incitement of others to fight his battles, and the equally cold-blooded abandonment of these others to their fate if it serves his purposes, has been repeated so often that it is one of the distinguishing characteristics of Stalinist policy.

To the American government, set upon its course, this will simply be further encouragement to the idea that air lifts or air bombardments will do the job of containing Stalinism till the day when everything is ready for the grand reckoning.

But this policy is a disaster not only for the common people of Asia, Europe and the rest of the world. It is equally disastrous for the American people themselves.

It means that America is to be burdened from now on with increasingly heavy armaments. It means that the campaign against civil liberties will grow without any end in sight. It means not only the imposition of hated reactionary governments on the peoples of Asia, but of a government which must grow more reactionary on the people of America.

PROP CAPITALISM?

Right now there is nothing we can do to aid the people of Korea, helpless pawns in the conflict between American imperialism and Russian Stalinism. But the American labor movement, which has gone along with the policy of the government, must begin to open its eyes to the consequences of this policy to the workers and all the common people of this country.

To continue to support it is to commit political suicide in the long run. More concretely, it is to doom the American people to the role of a hated oppressor nation throughout the world, and eventually to a horrible war which can end civilization as we know it.

The Truman administration, with

all its proposed domestic reforms has no real alternative which it can possibly adopt within the framework of its foreign policy. It is not a question, really, of blindness or stupidity. The Truman administration is pledged to maintaining the capitalist system here, and consequently to maintaining capitalist systems of one kind or another throughout the world.

But everywhere except in America, capitalism is sick to death. This is not a statement which derives from some Marxist prejudice. In Asia it is demonstrated daily by the inability of the ruling classes to establish stable governments with a large degree of popular support. Throughout the world it is demonstrated by the tendency of masses to swing in one degree or another to totalitarian Stalinism.

Whatever the labor movement may think of the desirability of capitalism here, they must understand that to try to prop it up in Asia and even in Europe will lead to war. And more than that, it will lead to a war in which America will not enjoy the support of the masses of the world in the way she had it during the war against the Nazis.

The simplest conclusion to be drawn from this is an end to labor support of the government's foreign policy. As things are now, that means an end to labor's support of the Democratic Party which is allied with the Republicans in this foreign policy. It means the formation of a political force in the country which can initiate a foreign policy based not on supporting corrupt, hated and impotent ruling classes with American military power, but on winning the common people of the world to an independent, political struggle against both their own oppressors and the Stalinists who seek to enslave them.

That is a long-range policy. As such, it may seem much less "practical" and less likely to succeed in defeating Stalinism than the bombers now smashing Korean towns and cities to bits. But the world cannot stand many more "successes" in American foreign policy of this kind.

This Is Where He Came In—10 Years Ago

A news item summarizes the results of six years of slaughter in the Second World War.

Ten years ago General Marshall wrote a commencement speech for his alma mater, the Virginia Military Institute. He never delivered it. Before commencement day arrived the German army swept into France and the general was called to Washington to prepare the country to get into the second world war to "preserve democracy" and peace.

Last month, in the middle of June, General Marshall shook the dust from the same old speech and delivered it, ten years late. One passage read, for example: "This is a day of high emotion for you men. It may also be one of the most fateful days in the history of the world."

The world was ten years older; a second world-wide massacre had taken place; but the same words fitted.

INTERESTED? Get acquainted with the Independent Socialist League

4 Court Square, Long Island City 1, N. Y.

I want more information about the ideas and principles of independent socialism and the Independent Socialist League.

I want to join the Independent Socialist League.

Name Tel.

Address Zone State

Seeds of Yalta --

(Continued from page 1)

from 3 to 5 million people fled North Korea.

In the South, the United States army began its rule by ordering the Japanese police, which had been hated by two generations of Koreans, to remain at their posts to assist the occupation. General Hodge then began a series of repressions against all who attempted to take the liberation literally. When in September and October of 1946 a national revolution swept Southern Korea the extreme reactionary forces, led by Syngman Rhee's terror groups, got U. S. assistance in maintaining a white terror of vast proportions.

RULE BY TERROR

From then on the U. S. became committed to Rhee's regime, probably the most hated government in all Asia.

This was the instrument for U. S. policy in the country: a government thoroughly isolated from all popular layers of the nation and based only on a few landlord cliques. Its corruption, inefficiency, simple stupidity, brutality and crude police methods were far worse than anything in Kuomintang China. Hardly a week passed without a new revolt in the army, among the peasantry, students or workers. Indeed, the smallest criticism of the state was labeled rebellious and treated accordingly.

It was a state living on terror because it lived in fear of popular overthrow or invasion. It existed only on American subsidies of about 100 million dollars a year.

It gave to its 300 million people no reason to support it in any war. Thus the Rhee regime could expect to survive an invasion only by spreading the war to the world stage and getting American intervention.

The Russians saw in this rotten regime their best weapon for the conquest of South Korea. To the thousands of Koreans who fled to the mountains to escape repression, the Northerners offered an end to Rhee's cruel despotism as well as national unification. And these tens of thousands of peasants, transformed into guerrillas by Rhee's methods, may yet link up with the Stalinist troops.

But for most of the people there is no alternative. They are not in this struggle. They are being fought over but they have nothing to fight for. That is why the United States has so speedily sent its forces into action, since every report indicates that Rhee cannot muster support within the country.

The question that continues to puzzle observers is why the invasion was launched at this time. Certainly there is no national Korean aim involved on either side. The Russians did not launch this war in order to unify the country, but to oust the last vestige of U. S. power from Northern Asia. Specifically, the Russians are replying to the blatantly announced new U. S. policy toward Japan for permanent military bases, with or without a peace treaty.

It now appears that, while MacArthur was busy driving the

Communist Party underground and otherwise grooming Japan for its new role in the American strategic scheme for the North Pacific, Russia was equally busy in a plan to outflank these preparations. The Korean war, if successful, would have placed Russian power 125 miles across the straits from Japan, rendering the entire U. S. military program useless. It was a gamble which at a cheap price would have gained an enormous advantage to Russia, establishing her supremacy in the entire North Pacific.

Can she simply withdraw now and rest on political advantages consequent to U. S. intervention? Wars do not always go according to plan.

PERMANENT TINDER

Basing themselves on the feebleness of the South Korean state, Russia calculated on a speedy adventure to be over before it could spread to dangerous proportions. But instead of Syngman Rhee, Russia's puppets now meet American forces. Whether Russia's commitment is so great that she must now make the final plunge, which will precipitate World War III, is doubtful.

Nevertheless it would be baseless optimism to believe that the American action will speedily end the war. Whatever relative stability is re-established eventually, a Korea divided between the powers will be a permanent tinderbox and a peninsula containing two military states waiting for the final signal to launch a total war.